Andrews University

# SEMINARY STUDIES

Volume 25 Number 2 Summer 1987

Andrews University Press

# ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES

The Journal of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
of Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104, U.S.A.



*Editorial and Circulation Offices:* *AUSS*, Seminary Hall, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI 49104, U.S.A.

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES publishes papers and brief notes on the following subjects: Biblical linguistics and its cognates, Biblical theology, textual criticism, exegesis, Biblical archaeology and geography, ancient history, church history, systematic theology, philosophy of religion, ethics, history of religions, missiology, and special areas relating to practice of ministry and to religious education.

The opinions expressed in articles, brief notes, book reviews, etc., are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

---

*Subscription Information:* ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES is published in the Spring, Summer, and Autumn. The subscription rate for 1987 is as follows:

| | U.S.A. | Foreign (in U.S.A. funds) |
|---|---|---|
| Regular Subscriber | $12.00* | $13.50* |
| Institutions (including Libraries) | 15.00* | 16.50* |
| Students | 9.50* | 11.00* |
| Retirees | 9.50* | 11.00* |

(Price for Single Copy is $6.00)

*NOTE: These are net rates for *prepaid* orders. A handling and service fee of $1.50 will be added if orders are to be billed.

Subscribers should give full name and postal address when paying their subscriptions and should send notice of change of address at least five weeks before it is to take effect (old address as well as new address must be given). Send all communications to *AUSS*, Seminary Hall, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI 49104, U.S.A.

---

Composition by Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN 46590
Printing by Thomson-Shore, Inc., Dexter, MI 48130

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES

Volume 25 Summer 1987 Number 2

## CONTENTS

* * * * * * * * * *

## ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES

The Journal of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
of Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104, U.S.A.

The articles in this journal are indexed, abstracted, or listed in: *Book Reviews of the Month; Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus; International Bibliography of the History of Religions; Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete; New Testament Abstracts; Old Testament Abstracts; Orientalistische Literaturzeitung; Orient-Press; Recently Published Articles* (publication of the American Historical Association); *Religion Index One: Periodicals* (formerly *Index to Religious Periodical Literature); Religious and Theological Abstracts; Seventh-day Adventist Periodical Index; Subject Index to Periodical Literature – Mosher Library; Theologische Zeitschrift; Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

 ISSN 0003-2980

*Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Summer 1987, Vol. 25, No. 2, 145-161.


# THE BIBLE AND THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY[1]

ROBERT D. LINDER
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

One of the basic assumptions of Reformation history is that the Bible held a central place in the Protestant movement.[2] However, there seem to have been few attempts to determine exactly what this meant for Protestants in France in terms of the French Bible's

[1]This essay is a revised version of a paper read at a joint meeting of the Society for Reformation Research and the Twentieth International Congress on Medieval Studies held at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, on May 9, 1985. I wish to thank the Bureau of General Research of Kansas State University for its support of a part of the research upon which this article is based.

[2]This study is not concerned with the related and important issue of whether or not the printed Word was as important as the preached Word in the sixteenth-century French Protestant Reformation. The importance of printing and literacy in the diffusion of Protestantism has been emphasized by a number of historians, including Henri Hauser, who called the Reformation in France "the heresy of a Book." Others have corroborated this view by pointing out that during this period a vast number of French Bibles and NTs were printed, that many French people had the Bible rather than the Books of Hours read to them in church, and that even many of the almanac and alphabet-books produced in that day combined reading lessons with scriptural instruction. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that preaching was also central to the spread and consolidation of French Protestantism. For example, Pierre Viret regularly preached to 8,000 people several times a week over a period of more than six months in Nîmes in 1561. Moreover, in other Protestant areas, such as Germany, there was also great emphasis on the Bible, but the majority apparently did not possess (let alone read) a copy of their own. Robert W. Scribner, extrapolating from Miriam U. Chrisman's recent work on the role of books in the Strasbourg Reformation, estimates that in the Strasbourg area in the sixteenth century, only one in five families appeared to have a Bible. Obviously, more research needs to be done on this subject. Pierre Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la réforme*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1905-1935), 3: 336-337, 380-381; Henri Hauser, *La naissance du protestantisme* (Paris, 1940), p. 59; Robert Sauzet, *Contre-réforme et réforme catholique en Bas-Languedoc: le diocèse de Nîmes au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1979), pp. 151-152; J.-M. Constant, *Nobles et paysans en Beauce au XVI e et XVII^e siècles* (Lille, 1981), p. 327; Miriam U. Chrisman, *Lay Culture, Learned Culture: Books and Social Change in Strasbourg, 1480-1599* (New Haven, CT, 1982); Richard

origins and uses, and especially its influence. In other words, how did the first-generation French Protestant Reformers establish and use the Bible in their perceived calling of restoring the Gospel to the Christian church, and with what results? In particular, why did there emerge no "authorized version" of the Scriptures in French, no translation which achieved anything like the universal authority of Luther's Bible in Germany or the King James Version in England?[3]

These questions for the most part will be examined through the eyes of three important first-generation French Reformation leaders: John Calvin (1509-1564), Pierre Viret (1511-1571), and Theodore Beza (1519-1605). More than any others, these three men provided the leadership of the early Protestant movement in French-speaking lands, a movement which they preferred to call the Reformed Church but which eventually became known popularly as Calvinism.[4]

## 1. *The French Reformation Bible in Historical Perspective: An Overview*

However, the story of the French Reformation Bible does not begin with Calvin, Viret, and Beza, but with the humanist

---

Gawthrop and Gerald Strauss, "Protestantism and Literacy in Early Modern Germany," *Past and Present*, no. 104 (August 1984), pp. 31-55; and Robert W. Scribner, "Images, Piety, and the Reformation," lecture, Annual Meeting of the Historical Association, Homerton College, Cambridge, April 4, 1986. For a recent, highly suggestive study of the place of literacy and popular culture in the Lutheran Reformation, see Robert W. Scribner, "Incombustible Luther: The Image of the Reformer in Early Modern Germany," *Past and Present*, no. 110 (February 1986), pp. 38-68.

[3]For a first-rate discussion of the place of the Bible in the Reformation, see Roland H. Bainton, "The Bible in the Reformation," in S. L. Greenslade, ed., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Eng., 1963), 1: 1-37.

[4]The first-generation Calvinists usually referred to their movement as "the Reform" and to the institutional expression of it as "the Reformed Church." "Calvinism" is a later term, one which Calvin would have deplored. In France, Protestants in general began to be called "Huguenots" around the middle of the sixteenth century. Very soon thereafter, the term was applied in particular to those adherents of what had become the dominant form of Protestantism in that country, namely the Reformed Church. See "Calvinism," *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 12 vols. (Oxford, 1933), 3: 45; and Janet G. Gray, "The Origin of the Word Huguenot," *SCJ* 14/3 (Fall 1983): 349-359.

scholar and reformer, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples. With a Protestant resonance, he wrote in the Preface to his French translation of the NT in 1523:

> And in order that everyone who has a knowledge of the French language and who does not understand Latin, be disposed to receive this present grace which God, by his sovereign goodness, pity, and mercy . . . has arranged for you in the common tongue, by his grace, the Gospels . . . in order that the simplest member[s] of the body of Christ, having this in their own language, be able to ascertain the truth of the Gospel . . . and afterward they will be, by his good pleasure, immersed in the New Testament, which is the book of life and the only rule of Christians. . . . [5]

Lefèvre's OT was printed in Antwerp in 1528, and the New and the Old were brought together in the so-called Antwerp Bible of 1530. There were further editions, with extensive corrections, in 1534 and 1541, all allegedly in harmony with medieval Catholic reverence for the Scriptures, but apparently alarming enough to earn the Antwerp Bible a place on the Index in 1546. Even though Lefèvre protested that he was a good Catholic and that all he sought was the internal reformation of the Church, his efforts at Bible translation were suspect by many in high places.[6]

Meanwhile in the borderlands of France, reform was proceeding even more rapidly as the Waldensians met on September 12, 1532, in a synod at Chanforans in what is now Piedmont, to authorize a new translation of the Bible into French. The gathering included not only a number of Waldensian leaders, but also the French reformers Guillaume Farel and Antoine Saunier and most likely

[5]"Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples a tous Chrétiens et Chrétiennes," June 8, 1523, in A.-L. Herminjard, ed., *Correspondance des Reformateurs dans pays de Langue Française*, 9 vols. (Geneva, 1864-1897), 1: 133-134. There was a sharp break in the history of the publication of Scriptures and Scripture portions in France beginning in 1523. Before that year, the publications were mostly abridgments, collections of excerpts, and paraphrases, nearly always with accompanying medieval glosses. After 1523, there was a flood of Testaments and Bibles in fresh translations by Christian humanists like Lefèvre.

[6]Bettye Thomas Chambers, *Bibliography of French Bibles: Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century French-Language Editions of the Scriptures* (Geneva, 1983), pp. xi and 42-44; Henry Heller, "The Evangelicism of Lefèvre d'Étaples: 1525," *Studies in the Renaissance*, 19 (1972): 42-77; and Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *Lefèvre: Pioneer of Ecclesiastical Renewal in France* (Grand Rapids, 1984), pp. 154-162.

Pierre Viret and Pierre Robert dit Olivétan. The last-named was Calvin's cousin and, like Lefèvre and Calvin, also a native of Picardy. From this decision to underwrite a new translation emerged the Olivétan Bible (also known as the Neuchâtel Bible), translated by Pierre Robert and published by Pierre de Wingle in June, 1535. Following the Reformation principle of translation from the original languages, this version would be used by all of the Calvinist reformers in the first two decades of the movement.[7]

Interestingly enough, this first true Protestant version in French was dedicated to Farel, Viret, and Saunier. It contained three prefaces by Calvin (one in Latin for the entire Bible, and one in French for each of the Testaments), and three prefaces by Pierre Robert (one an exposition on the true church, one an explanation of the linguistic principles employed in the translation, and one an introduction to the Apocrypha in which its non-canonicity was explained).[8] Calvin's Latin preface is remarkably similar in tone and content to that of Lefèvre in the latter's 1523 translation, except that Calvin's is longer and more pointedly evangelistic. This Olivétan Bible became the basis for all "Geneva" versions of the Scriptures well into the nineteenth century, including the widely used Geneva edition of 1588.[9]

The avowed purpose of the Olivétan translation was to provide for the reform of the church and the spread of the Gospel. As Olivétan says in his first preface: "Jesus charged and commissioned me to draw this precious treasure out of Hebrew and Greek coffers and to pour it into French travellers' purses."[10] In his preface to the NT, Calvin assures his readers: "Without the Gospel all wealth is poverty, all wisdom is folly, all strength is weakness. . . . But through Christ the poor are made rich, the weak are made strong,

[7]Chambers, p. xii.

[8]*La Bible Qui est toute la Saincte escripture. En laquelle sont contenus, le Vieil Testament et le Nouveau, translatez en Francoys* (Neuchâtel, 1535). (Hereinafter cited as Olivétan, *Bible.*) Only Calvin's NT preface was reprinted in subsequent printings and versions of this Bible. For more information on the 1535 Olivétan Bible, see Chambers, pp. 88-92.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Pierre Robert dit Olivétan, "P. Robert Olivétanus lhumble et petit Translateur a Leglise de Jesus Christ. Salut," in Olivétan, *Bible,* sig. *ii; and Paul T. Fuhrmann, "Calvin, The Expositor of Scripture," *Interpretation,* 6/2 (April 1952): 188-189.

the fools wise, the sinners just, the desolate comforted, the doubtful certain, and the slaves free."[11]

Unfortunately for the Protestants, the constantly changing and evolving state of the French language in the sixteenth century served to outdate Olivétan's translation soon after it was published and therefore diminished its usefulness. Throughout the century, it was subjected to continuous revision by the pastors of Geneva. Calvin and Viret played a leading part in these revisions during the two decades after the initial publication of the Olivétan Bible. During the 1550s, they were joined in this effort by Beza, and gradually the younger man took over the main burden of revision. Finally, in 1588, a committee of Geneva pastors headed by Beza and Corneille Bertram, professor of Hebrew at the Academy of Geneva, published what became known as "The French Geneva Bible."

This 1588 revision of the original Olivétan version contained a number of corrections in light of the latest and best biblical scholarship and represented a major linguistic improvement over all previous French translations of the Scriptures. It remained the standard French Protestant Bible, virtually uncorrected, until the revision of David Martin in 1699-1707, and was not significantly changed until 1805.[12]

### 2. *Importance of Scripture to the French-Speaking Protestants*

Why were the French-speaking Protestants so determined to keep an up-to-date translation of the Bible in circulation during the sixteenth century? It was because they believed that the Christian knows God *only* through the Scriptures, the written Word of God, and that a person is empowered to believe in the Gospel (liberated by, with, and in Christ) by the Holy Spirit, who makes alive in the reader the promises made to others. The church, the congregation of believers, needs no other authenticator, no other source of

[11]John Calvin, "A Tous Amateurs de Jesus Christ et son Evangile, Salut," in Olivétan, *Bible*, sig. aa ii.

[12]This is only a brief sketch of a large number of revisions of the Olivétan Bible in the years 1535-1588. For further details, see Chambers, pp. xii-xiv and 479-481. For a discussion of the history of the French language in the sixteenth century, see Ferdinand Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à nos jours*, 9 vols. (Paris, 1966-1967), vol. 2: *Le XVI^e siècle*; and Lucien Febvre, *Le problème de l'incroyance an XVI^e siècle: La religion de Rabelais* (Paris, 1942), pp. 383-411.

authority. The church must stand under the Word of God if it wants to understand itself and its mission rightly.

*The Sufficiency and Authority of Scripture*

The principle which in Luther was expressed by the characteristic formula of *sola scriptura* appears in Calvin as a fully articulated "doctrine of sufficiency." He repeatedly affirms the sufficiency of Scripture in his writings, both in its negative and in its positive form: (1) the Christian need not look outside of Scripture for guidance in faith and morals because (2) Scripture contains everything that the Christian may require for salvation and spiritual welfare. Moreover, Calvin taught that the Bible was above the church and should be read by each person for himself/herself. Thus, in his *Institutes* Calvin asserts:

> But a most pernicious error widely prevails that Scripture has only so much weight as is conceded to it by the consent of the church. . . . But such wranglers are neatly refuted by just one word of the apostle. He testifies that the church is "built upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles" (Eph. 2:20). If the teaching of the prophets and apostles is the foundation, this must have had authority before the church began to exist. . . . For if the Christian church was from the beginning founded upon the writings of the prophets and the preaching of the apostles, wherever this doctrine is found, the acceptance of it—without which the church itself would never have existed—must certainly have preceded the church.[13]

Again, in another place in the *Institutes*, he exclaims:

> Read Demosthenes or Cicero; read Plato, Aristotle, and others of that tribe. They will, I admit, allure you, delight you, move you, enrapture you in wonderful measure. But betake yourself from them to this sacred reading. Then, in spite of yourself, so deeply will it affect you, so penetrate your heart, so fix itself in your very marrow, that, compared with its deep impression, such vigor as the orators and philosophers have will nearly vanish. Consequently, it is easy to see that the Sacred Scriptures, which so

[13]John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, The Library of Christian Classics, vols. 20 and 21 (Philadelphia, 1960), 1.7.2. (Hereinafter cited as *Institutes*.)

> far surpass all gifts and graces of human endeavor, breathe something divine.[14]

Little wonder that the early Protestants in France were called "Biblians"![15]

From this high view of Scripture flowed all other French Protestant concerns for the restoration of apostolic Christianity. They saw the Bible as the means to reform the visible church; as the authority for Christian doctrine and practice; as the agency for meeting the spiritual needs of people, especially the Elect; as a source of inspiration for living and dying; and as the centerpiece for civilized living.

*Scripture as a Means to Reform the Church*

The Reformation had begun, after all, as a movement to reform the visible church by applying to it the superior and incontestable authority of the Word of God. Thus, the Word became the panoply of the Protestant movement, its bulwark of strength, and its seal of divine approval. This devotion to the Word appears from Luther's early literary efforts onward through Calvin's entire work, and it is a familiar theme in the writings of nearly all of the French Protestant leaders, including Viret and Beza. No expression came more readily to the pen of Calvin, Viret, or Beza than *"la parole de Dieu."*

Therefore, in his commentary on Jeremiah, Calvin states, in essence, that there can be no true religion without the Bible:

> This is how we can distinguish true religion from superstition: when the Word of God directs us, there is true religion; but when each man follows his own opinion, or when men join together to follow an opinion they hold in common, the result is always concocted superstition.[16]

In fact, Calvin declares in the preface to the reader of his *Institutes* that one of his main purposes in publishing this work is " . . . to

[14]Ibid., 1.8.1.

[15]Fuhrmann, p. 188.

[16]John Calvin, *Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss, 59 vols. (Brunswick, 1863-1880), 37: 692. See Jer 7:21-24.

prepare and instruct candidates in sacred theology for the reading of the divine Word," in order that they might understand it and use it in reforming the Church of God.[17]

Beza, too, shared this view and contributed heavily through the use of his considerable philological gifts to making the French Bible available to the cause of reform. On the important question of what distinguishes the true church from the false, he wrote: " . . . in each place where the Word of God is purely announced, the Sacraments are purely administered, with church polity furnished in accordance with the holy and pure doctrine, there we recognize the church of God."[18] If one first searched the Word, then all else would fall into place in a truly reformed church, according to Calvin and Beza.

*The Bible as Authority for Christian Faith and Practice*

In particular, the French Reformers saw the Scriptures as the sole authority for Christian doctrine and practice. Calvin taught that the Scriptures are a "depository of doctrine," and the only sure guide for practice in the Christian life. He argued: "Now, in order that true religion may shine upon us, we ought to hold that it must take its beginning from heavenly doctrine and that no one can get even the slightest taste of right and sound doctrine unless he be a pupil of Scripture."[19] Indeed, the binding authority of Scripture in these matters has nowhere been more forcefully laid down than in Calvin's *Institutes*: "For our wisdom ought to be nothing else than to embrace with humble teachableness, and at least without finding fault, whatever is taught in Sacred Scripture."[20]

Viret expressed his views on this subject early in the Reformation, at the Disputation of Lausanne in 1536, when representatives of the Reformers and of the established church met to determine the religious fate of that city in French-speaking Switzerland. The edict of convocation specified that all churchmen were to come ready to prove the truth of their teaching "by the Holy Scriptures." Thus, the central question of the disputation was raised almost

[17]"John Calvin to the Reader," *Institutes*, 1: 3-5.

[18]Theodore Beza, *Confession de la foy chréstienne, contenant la confirmation d'icelle, et la refutation des superstitutions contraires* (Geneva, 1559), p. 122.

[19]*Institutes*, 1.6.2-3.

[20]Ibid., 1.8.4.

immediately when the claim was made for the Church of Rome that since that church was "before and above Scripture," it alone had the right to interpret Scripture, and that correct interpretation was contained in papal decrees, conciliar decisions, and the writings of the church fathers and doctors. Viret immediately challenged this position and insisted that the Scriptures were " . . . given to us of God through the prophets and apostles" and they alone are "sufficient to instruct, teach, admonish, and correct us; to cause us to be perfect, engrossed in and ready to every good work." Moreover, he affirmed that "the canonical Scriptures are alone infallible and ordained to regulate and authenticate all others," which without the authority of the Bible "would have no weight or power."[21]

Beza agreed with Calvin and Viret on this point. However, during the last years of his otherwise distinguished leadership of the Geneva Church and Academy, Beza presided over a diminution of this strong linkage of Scripture and doctrine in French Reformed thought. He did his best to be true to the work of Calvin, but his teaching methods led to innovations. Calvin had taught theology primarily by means of biblical exegesis, a fitting commentary on his high view of Scripture and strong emphasis on biblical doctrine. Beza, however, felt the need to clarify and to systematize the Bible passages under study. Consequently, the content of the lectures which Calvin delivered under the rubric of "Scripture and Doctrine" became so unwieldy that Beza finally reluctantly agreed in 1595 to a division which resulted in a separate set of lectures on each subject: "Scripture" *and* "Doctrine." Ironically, the historic Calvinist close linkage of the Bible and Christian doctrine thus was first weakened by Calvin's successor and best-known disciple, a man often accused of being "more Calvinist" than Calvin himself—Theodore Beza.[22]

*The Bible in Spiritual Nurture*

The first-generation French Protestant Reformers also emphasized the Bible as the means of meeting the spiritual needs of people, especially the Elect. This process begins, declares Calvin in

[21]Arthur Piaget, ed., *Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne*, 1536 (Neuchâtel, 1928), pp. 40-42.

[22]Pontien Polman, *L'Elément historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVI^e siècle* (Gembloux, 1932), pp. 126-127.

his preface to the NT portion of the Olivétan Bible, when individuals can read for themselves in the Scriptures that "Jesus is the Messiah." In fact, he points out that the burden of the four Gospels is precisely to demonstrate this truth. Moreover, since Jesus is the Messiah, salvation is available through faith in his work on the cross. Moreover, Calvin asserts:

> Scripture is also called gospel, that is, fresh and joyful news, because in it is declared that Christ, the sole true and eternal Son of the living God, was made man, to make us children of God his Father, by adoption. Thus he is our only Savior, to whom we owe our redemption, peace, righteousness, sanctification, salvation, and life.
>
> Furthermore, we are called to this inheritance without respect for persons; male or female, little or great, servant or lord, master or disciple, cleric or lay, Hebrew or Greek, French or Latin—no one is rejected, who with a sure confidence receives him who was sent for him, embraces what is presented to him, and in short acknowledges Jesus Christ for what he is and as he is given by the Father.[23]

Viret, too, makes clear this connection between Scripture and salvation, in some ways even more clearly and forcefully than Calvin. In a large section of one of his major works, Viret discusses the means which God has ordained for making the blessing of faith in Christ available to people. In summarizing his passage, he affirms:

> This means is the preaching and manifestation of His Word, the hearing of which will bring His elect to a knowledge of Him. And thus they obtain eternal life by this knowledge. . . . And because of this He condemns all service and all religion which rests on any other foundation than upon His only and pure Word, in which He has given a clear declaration of His will.[24]

[23]Calvin, "A Tous Amateurs de Jesus Christ," in Olivétan, *Bible*, sig. aa ii. This is perhaps Calvin's most comprehensive and eloquent statement of the manner in which God's salvation knows no sexual, economic, social, or racial barriers. As such, it is reminiscent of the Apostle Paul's similar declaration in Gal 3:26-29.

[24]Pierre Viret, *Instruction chréstienne en la doctrine de la loy et de l'Évangile; et en la vraye philosophie et théologie tant naturelle que supernaturelle des Chrétiens; et en la contemplation du temple et des images et ouevres de la providence de Dieu*

The French Protestant Reformers also saw the Bible as the basic guide to the Christian life. In this regard, Calvin likened the Scriptures to a pair of spectacles, given to human beings so that they can begin to understand the Creator and his creation.[25] In his preface to Olivétan's NT, Calvin urges all to "take and read." In addition, he admonishes the clergy to allow Christians to read the Bible for themselves. Prodding the shepherds of the sheep, he chides:

> O you who call yourselves bishops and pastors of the poor people, see to it that the sheep of Jesus Christ are not deprived of their proper pasture; and that it is not prohibited and forbidden to any Christian freely and in his own language to read, handle, and hear this holy gospel, seeing that such is the will of God, and Jesus Christ commands it. . . . Surely, if you are truly their vicars, successors, and imitators, it is your office to do the same, watching over the flock and seeking every possible means to have everyone instructed in the faith of Jesus Christ, by the pure Word of God.[26]

In one of his major works Viret summarizes this point concerning the link between the Scriptures and the spiritual needs of humanity in a near-classic statement of the Reformed position:

> If then it is a question of the true service of God, we can reduce what is required of us to four points according to the declarations given to us in Holy Scriptures. The first is that man should place his complete trust in him [God] only, expecting from him alone his salvation through Jesus Christ. Second, that he should call upon him for all his necessities, both temporal and spiritual, according to the rules which he himself has given us. Third, give thanks for all the blessings you have received and receive daily from him. Fourth, be obedient to him in all that he commands you, both in regard to his holy person and in regard to your neighbor.[27]

---

*en tout l'univers; et en l'histoire de la création et cheute et réparation du genre humain*, 2 vols. (Geneva, 1564), 1: 7.

[25]*Institutes*, 1.6.1.

[26]Calvin, "A Tous Amateurs de Jesus Christ," in Olivétan, *Bible*, sig. aa ii *verso*.

[27]Viret, 1: 7.

*Scripture as Source of Inspiration for Living and Dying*

In addition, the French Reformers saw the Bible as a source of inspiration for living and dying. This was especially true of the Psalms, the translation of which was begun by the French Protestant poet Clément Marot (49 Psalms, published 1533-1543) and completed by Beza (101 Psalms, published 1551-1562). Really a verse translation rather than a version of this portion of the Bible, these Psalms became the hymnal of the French Protestants.

Although scholarly consensus usually ranks Beza's translations below those of Marot, the Geneva pastor succeeded in his purpose of providing the French Reformed Church with a model of serious, pious poetry, while at the same time being faithful to the biblical text. Moreover, the Huguenot Psalter provided a source of inspiration and encouragement to the embattled French Protestants during the Wars of Religion and was carried with them to other places in Europe and ultimately to America. They sang Scripture as they went to the stake and into battle, and the biblical hymns served as a signal of recognition wherever Huguenot believers gathered. Particularly impressive was Beza's Huguenot battle-song, Psalm 68, which begins:

> Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered;
> whose majesty is over Israel,
> and his power is in the skies.
>
> Terrible is God in his sanctuary,
> the God of Israel,
> he gives power and strength to his people.
>
> Blessed be God![28]

[28]Clément Marot and Theodore Beza, *Les Pseaumes mis en rime françoise* (Lyon, 1562). As Jill Raitt points out, the quality of Beza's translations of the Psalms was affected by the fact that he wrote them while at the same time working on other major projects (such as his NT *Annotations* and translations) and during periods of great activity in the Academy of Lausanne, where he taught. See Jill Raitt, "Theodore Beza," in Raitt, ed., *Shapers of Religious Traditions in Germany, Switzerland, and Poland, 1560-1600* (New Haven, CT, 1981), p. 101. On the Huguenot Psalter and its use, see Michel Jenneret, *Poésie et tradition biblique au XVI^e siècle* (Paris, 1969), pp. 88-105; and Emmanuel-Orentin Douen, *Clément Marot et le psautier huguenot*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1878-1879), 1: 3-5. For a scholarly discussion of the many editions of the Huguenot Psalter, see Pierre Pidoux, ed., *Le Psautier huguenot du XVI^e siècle*, 2 vols. (Basel, 1962).

*The Bible as Centerpiece for Civilized Living*

Finally, the early French Protestants believed that the Bible should become the centerpiece for civilized living, a guide for society based on humane and godly values. Calvin taught that learning and culture should manifest God's glory because the Bible taught that they were his handiwork. Both Scripture and nature bear testimony to God's sovereign rule in the world, a sovereign rule which makes sense out of life.

In this connection, Calvin believed that because of sin no sound natural theology was possible. Scripture was the only medium of truly knowing the Creator and of apprehending his revelation in creation. Similarly, it was the only sure way of making sense out of creation. Remaining traces of the image of God distinguish the human race from other creatures and provide momentary lightning flashes of what could have been if the first parents had not sinned in the Garden. But it is Scripture and not any memory of primeval purity which provides the basis for civilized behavior and orderly conduct.

This is illustrated by Calvin's advice to rulers and magistrates in his preface to Olivétan's NT. He warns:

> And you kings, princes, and Christian lords, who are ordained of God to punish the wicked and to uphold the good in peace according to the Word of God—to you it belongs to have this sacred doctrine, so useful and needful, published, taught, and understood in all your lands, realms, and lordly domains, to the end that God may be magnified by you, and his gospel exalted. . . . What is more, you ought to know that there is no better foundation, nor one firmer, for keeping your domains in true prosperity, than to have him as Chief and Master, and to govern your peoples under his hand; and that without him they (your domains) can be neither permanent nor endure for long, but shall be accursed of God and shall consequently fall down in confusion and ruin.[29]

But perhaps Viret says it even more clearly in one of his major works. After discussing what it is that makes humans different from the animals of the forests and the beasts of the fields, Viret concludes:

[29]Calvin, "A Tous Amateurs de Jesus Christ," in Olivétan, *Bible*, sig. aa ii *verso*.

> There can be no true civilization, no consideration for the very young and the very old, no concern for the poor and the afflicted, no true courtesy and no true love, no true peace and no true commerce unless the behavior of mankind is governed by the rules and precepts of Holy Scripture. Without the Word of God to guide us, we soon shall return like dogs to our vomit and like pigs to our sties.[30]

### 3. *French Bible Translation After 1535*

For all of the reasons mentioned above, the French Protestant Reformers exhibited the greatest enthusiasm for up-to-date and accurate translations of the Bible in the language of the people. After the initial Olivétan translation of 1535, and despite repeated royal edicts which forbade translation of any part of the Bible and the printing or selling of translations, commentaries, annotations, tables, indices, or epitomes concerning Holy Scripture in the Kingdom of France, the revisions rolled from the presses. (Unfortunately, vernacular translations became associated in the eyes of the stronger party in France—the Roman Catholics—with schism and heresy.) New editions rapidly supplanted each other nearly every year at first: in 1536, 1538, 1539, 1540, and 1543.

The last of the afore-mentioned editions—that of 1543—was the first NT to carry Calvin's name as reviser. Calvin then corrected and updated the entire French Bible in 1546, and he did so again in 1551, this time aided by Beza and Louis Budé. Another new revision appeared in 1553, followed by yet another new version in 1560 done by Calvin and Beza.

Meanwhile in France itself, no vernacular edition of the Scriptures was published in Paris, the seat of both political and ecclesiastical authority, between 1525 and 1565. Lyon, on the other hand, continued to be an active center for the printing of Bibles all during the period. However, printers in that city, most of them in sympathy with the Protestant cause, had to adopt measures of prudence not necessary in Geneva. Various techniques were used to evade royal censors, such as omitting the most blatantly Protestant expressions from title-page phraseology and incorporating St.

[30]Pierre Viret, *De l'authorité et perfection de la doctrine les saintes Escritures, et du ministère d'icelle; et des vrais et faux pasteurs, et de leurs disciples; et des marques pour cognoistres et discerner tant les uns quelles autres* (Lyon, 1564), p. 6.

Jerome's prefatory epistles instead of Calvin's prefaces. Yet, despite all the precautionary measures, it was apparent from the version of the biblical text used, from the marginal notes, and from certain peripheral texts that these Lyonese editions were Protestant works. When Lyon became a Protestant city and Viret became its chief pastor in the early 1560s, all of these pretenses were dropped and the printers made their editions openly Calvinistic.[31]

By 1565, the Geneva version of the Scriptures was being published in all French-speaking printing centers, including Caen, Lyon, and Paris itself. In order to counterattack, the Roman Church allowed and encouraged several approved French Bibles. One translation, produced by René Benoist of the theological faculty of the University of Paris, appeared in 1566. Although the Benoist Bible had been protected by royal "privilege," the Sorbonne quickly condemned it in 1567 as little more than an amalgam of several Geneva editions. However, this censure did not prevent its frequent reprinting and its use as the basis for what became known later as the Louvain Bible, the authoritative French Scriptures for the Roman Catholic faithful. The Louvain Bible, with officially approved marginal notes, was first published in 1578 and gradually superseded the Benoist Bible, remaining the accepted French Catholic text for the next hundred years.[32]

Therefore, by the end of the sixteenth century, there were two authoritative French translations of the Bible: the Louvain Bible of 1578 for Roman Catholics and the Geneva Bible of 1588 for Protestants. Both were ultimately based on the suspected and tainted Lefèvre Bible, and both had been produced outside of the Kingdom of France.[33] In addition, France itself was torn by violent theological controversy and religious war. All of these factors—as well as an unparalleled transformation of the French language during the

[31]Chambers, pp. xii-xiii.

[32]Ibid., pp. xiv-xv.

[33]The problem of establishing a viable indigenous movement with a separate identity while relying heavily on outside help is a familiar theme in the history of Christian missions. Such an arrangement often carries with it all of the political and diplomatic problems inherent in this type of situation. In any case, this dependency on Bibles produced outside France illustrates the complexities of the religious scene in France in the sixteenth century. Moreover, this reliance on external resources for Bible translations and Bibles also helps to offset recent arguments that the role of Geneva in sixteenth-century French Calvinism, though

sixteenth century—explain why no French translation of the Scriptures attained the universal acceptance in that country comparable to the status achieved by Luther's Bible in Germany and the King James Version in England.

### 4. *Conclusion*

In the end, the French Protestants failed in their efforts to win France and in their crusade to provide a suitable translation of the Bible acceptable to the overwhelming majority of French people. The fact that the Roman Catholics did no better in terms of providing a standard version of the Scriptures was small consolation. Authority in the Roman Church rested on a different center of spiritual gravity.

This failure to exert a long-term cultural impact through a standard translation of the Bible, despite the strong biblical emphasis of the French Protestant Reformation, had important repercussions for French national life beyond the sixteenth century. The fact that the French Protestants failed to make France a biblically oriented society in the same sense that Germany and England were biblically oriented societies meant that biblical ways of expression penetrated much less deeply into the French idiom than into that of English or German. Also, perhaps the fact that the French Protestants failed to reform the mainstream church in France in a biblical sense and failed to persuade the French people as a whole of the benefits of a civilization with the Bible as its centerpiece helps explain why France became the first major Western nation to embrace secularism.

Even more interesting and certainly more ironic, as with Calvinist thought in general, the great emphasis of the first-generation French Calvinists on the Bible in church and society had its greatest impact not in France but in England and Scotland, not among French-speaking people but among English-speaking people, not

---

significant, was not really as crucial and extensive as formerly supposed. This emphasis on the determinative influence of Geneva in the French Reformed movement can be seen in Imbart de la Tour, *Origines de la Réforme*, and in Robert M. Kingdom, *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France, 1555-1563* (Geneva, 1956). The recent challenge to this view is illustrated by Menna Prestwich, "Calvinism in France, 1555-1629," in Prestwich, ed., *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 71-107.

among Reformed French Christians but among Puritans and Presbyterians. Thus, the first-generation French Protestant concern that the Bible be the centerpiece for reform in the church and for civil behavior in society-at-large would be more fully realized in London, Edinburgh, and Boston than in Paris.[34]

[34]J. N. V. van den Brink, "Bible and Biblical Theology in the Early Reformation," *SJT*, 14/4 (December 1961): 337-352, and 15/1 (March 1962): 50-65. Van den Brink makes a strong case for the primary importance of the Bible in the Protestant Reformation and for its positive cultural impact on the sixteenth-century European society. Unfortunately, his argument contains only one illustration from the Reformation in France, a reference to Guillaume Farel's insistence at Montbéliard in 1525 that the sum total of the Christian religion was nothing more than "the pure contents of the Scripture." See 14: 341.

*Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Summer 1987, Vol. 25, No. 2, 163-181.


# CELIBACY IN JUDAISM AT THE TIME OF CHRISTIAN BEGINNINGS

HARVEY McARTHUR
Wilmington, Vermont 05363

In view of the fact that ancient Judaism seems to have regarded it as a religious obligation for a man to marry and raise a family, it is startling that three of the best-known Jews of the first century C.E. appear to have been unmarried—three Jews, moreover, who were prominent in connection with the beginnings of the Christian movement: John the Baptist (forerunner), Jesus (founder), and Paul (Saul) of Tarsus (a chief apostle). Various hypotheses have, of course, been raised concerning the data (which are especially scant in the case of John the Baptist, and, generally speaking, are inconclusive). The purpose of this study is not to explore any of the current hypotheses, but instead to investigate the information available concerning marriage of Jewish males in the first century and to evaluate the conclusions which may be drawn from that information. This investigation in no way challenges the picture which has been drawn of rabbinic Judaism's attitude toward marriage, but it does raise questions about the applicability of that picture to the situation in pre-70-C.E. Palestine.

The first main section of this article summarizes the attitude of rabbinic Judaism, which may be expressed in three statements: (1) Every Jewish male is under a religious obligation to marry. (2) Within marriage every Jewish husband has an obligation to fulfill the marital relation in order to propagate the race and to restrain immorality. (3) Early marriage is strongly recommended (that is, by the time the man is in his late teens or early twenties).

The second main section of this article raises certain questions about the universality of this pattern during the first century C.E. Although in setting forth such questions there may be some overlap, five may be conveniently distinguished: (1) How numerous were unmarried males, even among members of the "establishment"? (2) What was the significance of the stress on abstinence from sexual relations under special circumstances? (3) Was the concern for marriage and propagation of the human race as prominent before 70 C.E. as it was in the rabbinic literature of the second

century C.E. and later? (4) Was marriage as universal outside of "establishment" circles as within the latter? (5) What evidence is there for males being married only at 25 years of age or later?

It will be noted from the foregoing that the three items summarizing the attitude of rabbinic Judaism are put in the form of positive statements, while the five items relating to actual practice are formulated as questions. This difference in formulation is not a stylistic accident. The first main section of the article deals with easily documented views of the rabbinic tradition—though questions may arise about the applicability of that evidence to the pre-70-C.E. period. The second section actually deals with questions—specifically, questions that relate to the life-styles of persons or groups who may not have conformed to the pattern portrayed in the rabbinic literature. This is a matter where the evidence is fragmentary and sometimes even in the form of evidence from silence. Such evidence obviously is notoriously difficult to evaluate.

## 1. *The Pattern in Rabbinic Literature*

### *Obligation to Marry*

The basic statement on the religious obligation of every Jewish male to marry is found in *m. Yebam.* 6:6:

> No man may abstain from keeping the law *Be fruitful and multiply,* unless he already has children: according to the School of Shammai, two sons; according to the School of Hillel, a son and a daughter, for it is written, *Male and female created he them.* . . . The duty to be fruitful and multiply falls on the man but not on the woman. R. Johanan b. Baroka says: Of them both it is written, *And God blessed them and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply.*[1]

[1]Quotations from rabbinic or other Jewish sources are taken from the following translations: *APOT*; *Josephus*, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, *et al.*, 9 vols., LCL (Cambridge, Eng., 1926-1965); *The Mishnah*, trans. H. Danby (London, 1933); *The Tosefta*, ed. and trans. J. Neusner, 6 vols. (New York, 1977); *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*, trans. J. Z. Lauterbach, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1933-1935); *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. and trans. Rabbi I. Epstein, 18 vols. (London, 1961); *The Minor Tractates of the Talmud*, ed. and trans. A. Cohen, 2 vols. (London, 1965); *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan*, Version B., trans. A. J. Saldarini (Leiden, 1975); *The Midrash Rabbah*, ed. H. Freedman and M. Simon, 5 vols. (London,

The same motif appears in the corresponding passage in the Tosefta—"The man is not allowed to be without a wife; however, the woman is permitted to live without a husband" (*t. Yebam.* 8:4)—and in the Babylonian Talmud (*b. Yebam.* 61b), as well as in other rabbinic passages.[2] In addition to these statements are the well-known rhetorical comments about marriage: e.g., "R. Tanhum stated in the name of R. Hanilal: Any man who has no wife lives without joy, without blessing, and without goodness" (*b. Yebam.* 62b), and also "R. Eleazar said: Any man who has no wife is no proper man; for it is said, *Male and female created He them and called their name Adam*" (*b. Yebam.* 63a).

*Obligation to Fulfill Marital Relation*

Furthermore, it was insisted that within marriage the marital relation should be exercised regularly in the interests both of the propagation of the race and of controlling immorality. The Mishnaic passage on this point is found in *m. Ketub.* 5:6 (cf. *t. Ketub.* 5:6):

> If a man vowed to have no intercourse with his wife, the School of Shammai say: [She may consent] for two weeks. And the School of Hillel say: For one week [only]. Disciples [of the Sages] may continue absent for thirty days against the will [of their wives] while they occupy themselves in the study of the Law; and labourers for one week. The *duty of marriage* enjoined in the Law is: every day for them that are unoccupied; twice a week for labourers; once a week for ass-drivers; once every thirty days for camel-drivers; and once every six months for sailors. So R. Eliezer.

The differences between various occupations reflect, in part, a recognition that some trades required longer absences from home. The penalties for failure to fulfill the marital obligation are developed in detail in *m. Ketub.* 5:7 and 7:2-5. Both husband and

---

1977); *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer*, trans. G. Friedlander (London, 1916; reprint ed., New York, 1971); *Pĕsiḳta dĕ Raḇ Kahăna*, trans. W. G. Braude and I. J. Kapstein (Philadelphia, 1975); and *The Midrash on Psalms*, trans. W. G. Braude (New Haven, Conn., 1959).

[2]*M. ʿEd.* 1:13; *b. Šabb.* 31b; *b. Pesaḥ.* 113b; *b. Yebam.* 63b; *b. Qidd.* 29a; *b. B. Bat.* 13a; *Mek. Nezikin* 3: 112-115; *Mek. Pisḥa* 18: 110-112; *Gen. Rab.* 17:2, 34:14, and 60:16.

wife were under the same obligation in this matter, though the penalties for each varied slightly for failure to meet the obligation. The penalties were primarily financial, but in extreme cases divorce was mandatory. The motifs articulated in this section of the Mishnah are repeated elsewhere in rabbinic literature.[3] While stress on the fulfillment of the sexual relation was related to the biblical command of Gen 1:28 ("Be fruitful and multiply"), there is evidence also of a realistic awareness that the role of sex within marriage was to prevent immorality and thoughts of immorality.[4]

*Recommendation of Early Marriage*

In the light of this concern to prevent immorality, it is understandable that early marriages were preferred in rabbinic Judaism. The Mishnaic passage relating to the proper age for marriage is attributed to R. Judah ben Tema, who lived toward the end of the second century C.E. It occurs in *m. ʾAbot* 5:21:

> He used to say: At five years old [one is fit] for the Scripture, at ten years for the Mishnah, at thirteen for [the fulfilling of] the commandments, at fifteen for the Talmud, at eighteen for the bride-chamber, at twenty for pursuing [a calling], at thirty for authority, at forty for discernment, at fifty for counsel, at sixty for to be an elder, at seventy for grey hairs, at eighty for special strength, at ninety for bowed back, and at a hundred a man is as one that has [already] died and passed away and ceased from the world.

One notes in the above passage that the age for marriage is not in the form of a *halakah* or commandment, but is part of a description of the "ages of man." The strong rabbinic preference for early marriage is confirmed by a collection of statements in *b. Qidd.* 29b-30a:

> R. Huna [third century C.E.] was thus in accordance with his views. For he said, He who is twenty years of age and is not married spends all his days in sin. "In sin"—can you really think so?—But say, spends all his days in sinful thoughts.

[3] *T. Ketub.* 5:7; *y. Ketub.* 5:6(7); *b. Yebam.* 44a; *b. Ketub.* 61b-62a and 71b; *b. B. Qam.* 82a; *Mek. Nezikin* 3: 116-134; *Gen. Rab.* 52:12.

[4] *B. Qidd.* 29b-30a; *b. Sanh.* 76a-b; *Shulchan ʾAruk* 1:4.

> Raba said, and the School of R. Ishmael taught likewise: Until the age of twenty, the Holy One, blessed be He, sits and waits. When will he take a wife? As soon as one attains twenty and has not married, He exclaims, "Blasted be his bones!" R. Ḥisda said: The reason that I am superior to my colleagues is that I married at sixteen. And had I married at fourteen, I would have said to Satan, An arrow in your eye. Raba said to R. Nathan ben Ammi: Whilst your hand is yet upon your son's neck, [marry him], viz. between sixteen and twenty-two. Others state, Between sixteen and twenty-four. This is disputed by Tannaim. *Train up a youth in the way he should go*: R. Judah and R. Nehemiah [differ thereon]. One maintains, ["Youth" means] between sixteen and twenty-two; the other affirms, Between eighteen and twenty-four.

*B. Sanh.* 76a-b, while arguing that a young girl should not be married to an old man or to an infant son, urges that daughters should be married when they reach puberty, and the same position is taken with respect to sons. In *Mek. Nezikin* 3:112-114 it is stated that a father should have his son married early in order to ensure grandchildren and thus be able to fulfill the injunction of Deut 4:9, "And make them known unto thy children and thy children's children." (Cf. also *Der. Er. Rab.* 2:16.)

It is fair to conclude that while early marriages were strongly recommended, a precise age was not established by an explicit *halakah.*

All evidence quoted above is from the body of rabbinic literature of which the earliest document, the Mishnah, did not reach its present form until about 220 C.E. The remainder of this extensive library developed and was redacted during the following several centuries. All of this literature contains statements attributed to authorities from periods well before the time of the final redaction, but it is clear that these attributions cannot always be trusted. Recently, major efforts have been made to establish the dates of various traditions and to trace their development in later periods.[5]

[5]Groundbreaking work has been done in this field by Jacob Neusner and others associated with him. His many writings develop a methodology. A convenient introduction to his views may be found in his *Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah* (Chicago and London, 1981). The "Introduction," pp. 1-24, presents his general approach to the Mishnaic materials and to his thesis that the Mishnah's regulations may be classified chronologically into four periods: (1) before 70 C.E., (2) between 70 and 135 C.E., (3) the generation after 135, and (4) the end of the 2d

The attitude toward marriage, however, seems to have remained the same throughout the rabbinic period, and therefore a more precise chronological analysis has not been attempted. Nevertheless, I have taken the basic quotations from the early documents, the Mishnah and the Tosefta. In the next section, the question of chronology will become significant, especially so in regard to "Question Three."

### *2. Departures from the Pattern of Rabbinic Literature*

***Question One*: "How numerous were the unmarried even among members of the 'establishment,' i.e., the rabbis?"**

It is stated by Immanuel Jakobovits in his article on "Celibacy" in the *Encyclopedia of Judaism* (vol. 5, cols. 268-269) that no medieval rabbi is known to have been a celibate and that only Simeon ben ʾAzzai was unmarried from all of the Tannaitic or Amoraic rabbis. Ben ʾAzzai was from the third generation of the Tannaim and lived early in the second century C.E. An early reference to his unmarried state appears in *t. Yebam.* 8:7:

> Ben ʾAzzai says, Whoever does not engage in reproductive sexual relations, lo, such a one sheds blood and diminishes the divine image, since it says, *For in the image of God he made man.* And it says, *And you be fruitful and multiply* (Gen 9:6, 7). Said to him R. Eleazar b. ʾAzariah, "Ben ʾAzzai, words are nice when they come from someone who does what they say. . . . Ben ʾAzzai expounds nicely but does not nicely do what he says." He said to him, "What shall I do? My soul thirsts after Torah, let other people keep the world going." (Cf. *b. Yebam.* 63b and *Gen. Rab.* 34:14.)

Ben ʾAzzai was never ordained, but there is no suggestion that it was his unmarried state which prevented ordination. He was

---

century into the 3d century. However, Neusner states that in practice it is not possible to differentiate clearly between the last two periods in dealing with the Mishnaic materials. His book next works through the Mishnah, classifying the regulations and tracing the development through the periods. Neusner's methodology is only beginning to be debated by those with expertise sufficient to contribute to the discussion. If Neusner is correct, the attribution of sayings or actions to named authorities cannot always be taken at face value.

held in high repute as a scholar, he was quoted frequently in the Mishnah and later documents, and he was remembered in the tradition as an outstanding scholar and saint. Thus, *m. Sota* 9:15 says, "When Ben ʾAzzai died there were no more diligent students," and *B. Ber.* 57b says, "If one sees Ben ʾAzzai in a dream he may hope for piety." (Similar expressions occur in *t. Qidd.* 3:9, *b. Qidd.* 49b, and *ʾAbot R. Nat.* 40:12.[6])

It is sometimes assumed that the story about Ben ʾAzzai was recorded because he was the only unmarried Tannaitic rabbi. This may be true, but the assumption goes beyond the evidence provided by the story itself. The story was recorded because Ben ʾAzzai placed himself in the paradoxical situation of condemning celibacy while himself remaining unmarried. Had he remained silent, there might have been no reference in the tradition to his single status. This does not prove that there were other unmarried Tannaitic or Amoraic rabbis, but what it does make clear is that the story is not of itself adequate evidence that Ben ʾAzzai was unique.

There were perhaps 150 Tannaitic rabbis, and there may have been over 1,000 Amoraitic. In only a few cases can even a minimal biography be created from the available data. Thus, caution is required in making statements about the marital status of these men.[7]

Comment should be made about one other Talmudic scholar, R. Hamnuna, who, though he had apparently received ordination as a rabbi, was still unmarried. He was a Babylonian Amora who lived at the end of the third century C.E., and is referred to in *b. Qidd.* 29b, as follows:

[6]Some references suggest that Ben ʾAzzai did finally marry, such as *b. Keth.* 63a, which implies that he married the daughter of R. Akiba. The general verdict of Jewish scholars, however, is that Ben ʾAzzai remained unmarried. J. Massyngberde Ford, *A Trilogy on Wisdom and Celibacy*, p. 50, argues, on the other hand, that he was not permanently celibate. But one notes that Ford resolves every bit of ambiguous evidence against celibacy! Thus, she argues that despite Jer 16:1-2, Jeremiah married at some later period (p. 24); that the Essenes were not celibates, but practiced continence for periods of time (pp. 28-34); that the same was true of the Therapeutae (pp. 34-36); and that Paul was a widower (pp. 70-71). (Admittedly, my passing comment here does not do justice to her very careful investigation of these matters.)

[7]It must be conceded, however, that for the great majority of Tannaitic scholars it is possible to find at least a passing reference to a wife, son, daughter, or in-law, proving that these Tannaim were married.

> R. Ḥisda praised R. Hamnuna before R. Huna as a great man. Said he to him, "When he visits you, bring him to me." When he [R. Hamnuna] arrived he saw that he wore no [head] covering. "Why have you no head-dress?" asked he. "Because I am not married," was the reply. Thereupon he [R. Huna] turned his face away from him. "See to it that you do not appear before me [again] before you are married," said he. R. Huna was thus in accordance with his views. For he said, He who is twenty years of age and is not married spends all his days in sin. "In sin"—can you really think so?—But say, spends all his days in sinful thoughts.

It would be helpful for the present argument if it could be claimed that R. Hamnuna remained unmarried, and I have not found any reference to his wife or children. But R. Hamnuna appears later in a respectful relation with R. Huna (*b. ʿErub.* 63a), and it is easier to believe that R. Hamnuna married than that R. Huna withdrew his objection to an unmarried Rabbi.[8] Yet, the story is relevant for the present issue. R. Huna's attitude reflected the official view with respect to marriage, but it is equally significant that R. Ḥisda expressed great admiration for R. Hamnuna despite the latter's unmarried condition and that R. Ḥisda had not even thought to alert R. Huna when recommending R. Hamnuna. Furthermore, if R. Hamnuna was already ordained at that time, it means that his peers had not objected to his unmarried state. Thus, the response of R. Huna seems to indicate that R. Hamnuna's unmarried status was an exception to the rule, but the attitude of the others demonstrates that R. Hamnuna could hardly have been an absolutely unique exception.

So far as I am aware, no Talmudic scholars other than the two mentioned above—Ben ʾAzzai and R. Hamnuna—were discussed because of their unmarried status, and it is possible that there were no other such rabbis. But is it not possible that Ben ʾAzzai was mentioned, not as a solitary exception, but rather as the outstanding representative of a small group who were to be exempted from the normal marriage obligation?[9]

[8]It is possible, however, that the R. Hamnuna of *b. ʿErub* 63a is not the same as the one under discussion. There were more than one R. Hamnuna roughly contemporary with R. Huna, and therefore there is disagreement as to which one is intended in some passages.

[9]Cf. *Shulchan ʾAruch* 1:4, where a concession is made that celibacy may be condoned for cases like Simeon ben ʾAzzai.

***Question Two*: "What was the significance of the stress on abstinence from sexual relations under special circumstances?"**

It is often contended that Judaism had a holistic anthropology and a healthy attitude toward sex, unlike the Greek body-spirit dualism and the asceticism which characterized segments of Christianity. This may be a useful generalization, but it must not obscure the fact that in Judaism, as in other religious traditions, there was a recognized tension between sex and the sacred.[10] Abstention from sexual relations was a prerequisite for reception of the divine message and for participation in certain sacred rites.

The basic passage in this connection is the Sinai story in Exod 19, particularly vss. 10-15. Moses was instructed to prepare the people for the Sinai experience, and he said to the people (vs. 15), "Be ready by the third day; do not go near a woman." This narrative is important, not only because of its centrality in the consciousness of Israel, but also because it became the basis for further elaboration of the abstinence-from-sex motif. In various comments on the narrative in the ancient sources, it is argued that Moses determined on his own initiative that if the people were to refrain from sexual intercourse for a brief period when God was to speak to them at a definite time, how much more he (Moses) should abstain permanently, since God spoke to him directly on numerous occasions and without any fixed schedule (*b. Yebam.* 62a; *b. Sabb.* 87a; *b. Pesah.* 87b). That this interpretation existed before the rabbinic period is evidenced by its appearance in the writings of Philo (*Life of Moses* 2:68).

Apparently Moses' wife, Zipporah, was most unhappy with this new development. According to the tradition in *'Abot R. Nat.* 9:2, Zipporah shared her complaint with Miriam, who in turn passed it on to Aaron, and thus it became a factor in Aaron's and Miriam's speaking against Moses—though Num 12 provides no basis for this gossip. In *Sifre,* the early Tannaitic commentary on Numbers, it is reported that when Eldad and Medad began to prophesy because the Spirit was on them (Num 11:26-30), Zipporah exclaimed, "Woe to their wives"— presumably because she believed they would now experience her frustrations. The same commentary

[10]The recognition of this tension does not of itself involve the assumption that the body or sex is *per se* evil. In Judaism, sexual intercourse resulted in temporary, ritual impurity, but this clearly does not mean that sex was regarded as evil.

states too that the seventy elders of the book of Numbers also abstained from sexual intercourse, at least for a time.

What is significant here is that despite the dominant emphasis on the obligation to marry, Exod 19:15 is amplified and expanded in extensive fashion. Again, the statement in Gen 5:3 that Seth was not born until his father was 130 years old was interpreted to mean that Adam abstained from intercourse with his wife after the conception of Cain and Abel. But the reasons given for this are not the same as those for Moses' abstinence (*b. ʿErub.* 18b; *Gen. Rab.* 20:11, 21:9, 23:4).

Also, according to rabbinic tradition, there was to be no sexual intercourse during the time when animals and people were in the ark (*b. Sanh.* 108b; *y. Taʿan.* 1:6; *Gen. Rab.* 31:12, 34:7; *Pirqê R. El.* 23), although there were reportedly violations of this injunction (*b. Sanh.* 108b; *y. Taʿan* 1:6). This period of abstinence might be regarded simply as a concern to avoid a population explosion that would overcrowd the ark. But in *Gen. Rab.* 31:12 and 34:7 a comment of R. Abin implies that such abstinence was appropriate in every time of want or famine.

A further recognition of the tension between sex and the sacred appears in the Midrash on Ps 146, paragraph 4, where it is asserted that sexual intercourse will be forbidden in the time-to-come. This is explained as an application of the command in Exod 19:15:

> Still others say that in the time-to-come sexual intercourse will be entirely forbidden. You can see for yourself why it will be. On the day that the Holy One, blessed be He, revealed Himself on Mount Sinai to give the Torah to the children of Israel, He forbade intercourse for three days, as it is said. . . . Now since God, when he revealed Himself for only one day, forbade intercourse for three days, in the time-to-come, when the presence of God dwells continuously in Israel's midst, will not intercourse be entirely forbidden?

Thus, the ramifications of the account in Exod 19 are very great. Marriage and the regular exercise of the marital duty are the basic norm, but a counter-motif stresses the incompatibility of sexual intercourse with a response to God's presence and participation in his service. Accordingly, it is not a surprise to find that sexual intercourse was forbidden on the Day of Atonement (*m. Yoma* 8:1; *b. Yoma* 74a; *y. Ber.* 5:4), at certain times of fasting for the fall rains (*m. Taʿan.* 1:6; *t. Taʿan.* 1:5), and during years of

famine (*b. Taʿan.* 11a), although in the last-mentioned situation some held that childless couples did not need to abstain. Furthermore, there were restrictions on sexual relations in a room containing the Torah scrolls (*y. Ber.* 3:5); and since any emission of semen constituted temporary ritual impurity, presumably soldiers in situations of Holy War were required to abstain from sexual relations.[11]

Certainly, abstinence from sexual relations on a temporary basis is one thing and complete celibacy is another. But this recognition of the tension between sex and the sacred provides a foundation which makes intelligible the celibacy of Simeon ben ʾAzzai (and possibly others).

***Question Three*: "Was the concern for marriage and the propagation of the race as intense before 70 C.E. or 135 C.E. as it was subsequently?"**

It has already been noted that the insistence on marriage as a religious obligation characterizes the rabbinic literature in a consistent fashion. But the earliest document of that literature was not codified until the beginning of the third century C.E. Biblical passages such as Gen 1:28 ("Be fruitful and multiply . . ."), Gen 5:2 ("Male and female he created them . . ."), Gen 9:7 ("And you, be fruitful and multiply . . ."), and Isa 45:18 ("he did not create it a chaos, he formed it to be inhabited . . .") are general statements about the whole human race, and they are not automatically translatable into the dictum, "Every Jewish male must marry and have children!"

Probably the earliest rabbis quoted on this issue are from the second generation of the Tannaim, i.e., from the end of the first century and the beginning of the second. They are Eliezer ben Hyrcanus (*m. Ketub.* 5:6; *b. Yebam.* 63b), Joshua ben Hananiah (*ʾAbot R. Nat.* 3:6), and Eleazar ben ʾAzariah (*Gen. Rab.* 34:14). While the attributions in this literature are not always reliable,[12] the cumulative effect suggests that the motifs were present before

[11]See the Excursus on "Prophetic Celibacy" in Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (New York, 1973), pp. 99-102.

[12]See Neusner, p. 14, in criticism of G. F. Moore on this point.

the second Jewish-Roman War, i.e., before 135 C.E. This conclusion concerning the time frame is supported by the anonymous passage in *m. Yebam.* 6:6 which affirms the religious obligation to marry and have children but then reports the dispute between the Schools of Shammai and Hillel as to whether two sons or a son and daughter fulfilled the obligation. Although the discussion cannot be precisely dated, it is plausible that the decision about the obligation to marry and have children came first and that subsequently the two Schools argued about the details.[13]

Thus, it is highly probable that the stress on marriage as a religious obligation was present by the end of the first century C.E. Since cultural change was slower then than it is in the hectic modern world, it might be assumed that the prevalence of this motif could be retrojected back at least into the first century C.E. There are two problems with this assumption, however. First, the traumatic impact of the Jewish-Roman War of 66-73 C.E. forced a total reorganization of Judaism, and this was begun by those who gathered in Jamnia with R. Jochanan ben Zakkai. Second, the question arises: Did those who began the task of reorganization represent the mainstream of pre-70-C.E. Judaism? One can note the significant difference in concerns between the post-70 writings of rabbinic Judaism and two other documents produced toward the end of the first century—2 Baruch and the Apocalypse of Ezra.

Unfortunately, as far as the issues treated in this article are concerned, the so-called Intertestamental literature of the pre-70 period is informative chiefly by its silence on the subject of the religious obligation of Jewish males to marry. Sirach has a passage (30:1-13) discussing a father's duties towards his son, but it makes no reference to finding a wife for him. In Sir 7:24-25, fathers are encouraged to arrange marriages for their daughters, but, unluckily, the text of the preceding chap. 30 is disputed. Most translators follow the Greek and Latin readings, which urge strict discipline for sons. The Hebrew reading, however, is an explicit injunction for fathers to arrange marriages for sons while they are still young. This is widely regarded as a late revision of the text, made under

[13]Ibid., p. 20, where Neusner argues that on occasion views were attributed to the Schools of Hillel and Shammai which clearly presupposed perspectives which developed only after 135 C.E. He states: "Indeed, that phenomenon was sufficiently common so that it came to appear likely that the names of the Houses were often used for purposes other than historical."

the influence of the later interests.[14] If this is so, the text as it now stands fits perfectly into the hypothesis that rabbinic Judaism retrojected back into the earlier writings its own stress on early marriage. In any case, Sirach probably does not reflect the strand of Judaism that was most closely related to those who reorganized post-70 Judaism.

*Jubilees*, a document from the end of the second century B.C.E., is essentially a revision of Genesis, the book most frequently quoted in rabbinic literature in connection with the obligation to marry. Somewhat surprisingly, *Jub.* 2:13-14 omits the phrase "Be fruitful and multiply," which appears in the Gen 1:26-28 account of the sixth day of creation. But the phrase does occur in *Jub.* 6:5, 9—thus paralleling the double occurrence in Gen 9:1, 7—so probably no significance should be attached to the earlier omission. Again, a variant of the phrase occurs in *Jub.* 10:4, as part of a prayer of Noah, a prayer not recorded in Genesis. Although marriage is taken for granted in *Jubilees*, there does not appear to be special stress on the obligation of Jewish males to marry, though there is stress on their obligation to marry Jewish wives (*Jub.* 25:1, 5, paralleling Gen 28:1). And *Jub.* 30:7, 14 adds to the Gen 34 narrative explicit emphasis on the prohibition against marrying daughters to Gentile men. *Jub.* 50:8 includes (for the first time?) a prohibition against sexual intercourse on the Sabbath.

The argument from silence is always precarious, but the silence of Sirach and *Jubilees*, as well as 2 Baruch and the Apocalypse of Ezra, at least raises the possibility that stress on marriage was more prominent after 70 C.E. than before that time. Thus, if John the Baptist, Jesus, and Paul were indeed all unmarried, they may not have been as exceptional in their day as they would have been later.

***Question Four*: "Was marriage as universal outside 'establishment' circles as it was in those circles?"**

The rabbinic literature gives the impression of a highly unified society, although one must remember that it reflects a picture of what should be done and not necessarily what actually was done in

[14]See the discussion of the text in T. A. Burkhill, "Ecclesiasticus," *IDB* 2: 14-15. See also the translations in JB, RSV, NEB, and NAB.

the society at large. Furthermore, it is clear that in the pre-70-C.E. period Jewish society in Palestine included a rich diversity of views. The three, or four, groups described by Josephus[15] reflected social and political differences as well as differing religious perspectives, and no doubt there were subdivisions within these groups.

On the subject of marriage the most distinctive group was that of the Essenes, including the people of Qumran. The evidence does not provide a completely clear picture of their stance, but it is widely agreed that some branches of this movement were celibate.[16] For the present purpose it is not necessary to discuss various theories which seek to explain this distinctive attitude toward marriage, though some questions emerge: Had these celibate Essenes been influenced by Hellenistic dualism? Were they applying in a more universal manner the restrictions on sexual activity that had previously been intended for priests when on duty? Were they soldiers in the Holy War? Or were they training for the Age-to-Come? In any event, the attitude toward marriage of some within the Essene movement must have given a degree of respectability to celibacy, not only within the movement, but also—judging by the language of Josephus and Philo—among Jews generally.

Even in the rabbinic literature itself there is recognition of the presence of unmarried men in the society, although this recognition takes the form of regulations restricting the activities of these persons. For example, they were excluded from being schoolteachers, as indicated in *m. Qidd.*4:13-14:

> An unmarried man may not be a teacher of children, nor may a woman be a teacher of children. R. Eliezer says: Even a man that has no wife [with him] may not be a teacher of children.
>
> (14) R. Judah says: An unmarried man may not herd cattle, nor may two unmarried men sleep under the same cloak. But the Sages permit it.

[15]See Josephus, *War* 2: 119-166, and *Ant.* 18: 11-25.

[16]See Vermes, pp. 99-100; and Matthew Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (New York, 1961), pp. 27-32. Some scholars have argued strongly that celibacy among the Essenes, insofar as it existed, was not on account of asceticism, i.e., a dualistic rejection of the flesh as evil. See A. Steiner, "Warum lebten die Essener asketisch?" *BZ* 15 (1971): 1-28; and H. Hübner, "Anthropologischer Dualismus in den Hodayoth?" *NTS* 18 (1972): 268-284. In fact, Hübner feels that scholars may have exaggerated the role of celibacy at Qumran, and that perhaps there were only periods of continence for special reasons ("Zölibat in Qumran?" *NTS* 17 [1971]: 153-167). Cf. Ford, pp. 28-34.

All or part of this material reappears in the parallel passages in the Tosefta (*Qidd.* 5:10), the Palestinian Talmud (*Qidd.* IV 12-14), and the Babylonian Talmud (*Qidd.* 82a). In the last-mentioned source, the explanation is given that the restriction on schoolteachers was not because of a fear of pederasty, since "Israel are not suspected of either pederasty or bestiality." It is indicated that the regulation existed because of the contact an unmarried male teacher might have with the mothers who brought their children to school.

In the *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 9:2, R. Tanhuma interprets Job 41:11-12[E] to mean that if an unmarried man living in a community without schools provided funds to pay teachers of Scripture and Mishnah elsewhere, he would find his prayers for male offspring answered when he married. Of course, this assumes that he would marry, but it also recognizes that there might be unmarried adult males in a proper Jewish community.

In short, the evidence relating to this "Question Four" is limited; but clearly, even after 70 C.E., in the rabbinic period, there were enough unmarried adult males for the codified Oral Law to contain regulations concerning them.

***Question Five*: "What is the evidence for men who married only after the age of twenty-five, i.e., after the deadline approved in the rabbinic literature?"**

If it is difficult to ascertain much about the marital status of named Jews during the first century C.E., it is even more difficult to know at what age they married. For our purpose it is not essential to know whether the ages given in various records are strictly accurate, since even folk-tale incidents reflect the expectations and assumptions of their creators.

We begin our survey with Joseph ben Matthias, or Josephus, as he is more commonly known. In his *Life* (414-427) he describes the details of his first, second, and third marriages.[17] The first occurred after the siege of Jotapata, when he was captured by the Romans and then kept as an honored guest of Vespasian. The siege

[17]The article on "Josephus" by A. Schalit in *Enc. Jud.* (10, col. 254) states that Josephus married four times and that his first wife died during the siege of Jerusalem. This seems to contradict the explicit statements of Josephus himself. Vol. 9 of the LCL text and translation of Josephus contains an extensive "General Index" which supports the three-wife interpretation of Josephus.

must have occurred in June-July of 67 C.E., and since he reports that he had been born in the year that Gaius became the emperor (*Life*, 5), i.e., 37-38 C.E., he must have been 29 or 30 years old at the time of the siege. These calculations are confirmed by Josephus' comment when discussing developments in his campaign in Galilee shortly before the siege of Jotapata: "I was now about thirty years of age" (*Life*, 80). Some time later, and at the command of Vespasian (according to Josephus' report), he married one of the Jewish women who had been taken captive at Caesarea. We do not know how long after the siege the marriage occurred, but clearly Josephus was at least 30 years of age.

Almost certainly R. Akiba is another outstanding illustration of a late marriage, although the details of his life have been covered over with legend. It is reported that he came from a poor family, was unlearned, and worked as a shepherd for a wealthy family. He fell in love with the daughter in that family, who agreed to marry him provided that he became a scholar of Torah. He agreed and studied for many years, becoming one of the outstanding scholars of the early second century C.E. In fact, he is one of those most-frequently quoted rabbis in the Mishnah and may have begun the process which led to the codification of Jewish Law in the Mishnah.

According to one version of his romance, Akiba was 33 years old (or older) when he married.[18] But his age is not indicated in the basic passages in the Talmud (*b. Ketub.* 62b-63a; *b. Ned.* 50a), and even these passages contain material that is partially legendary. It is generally agreed, however, that Akiba was well beyond the usual age when he married. This is asserted, for example, by Louis Finkelstein in his biography of Akiba.[19] Finkelstein goes out of his way to argue that for the poorer classes the early marriage as advocated by the rabbis was completely impractical, and he also includes a special note to argue that for "plebeians," whether Jewish or Hellenistic, late marriage was the rule.[20]

Another distinguished rabbi who apparently married late was Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, a Tanna of the second generation, i.e., at the

[18]A. J. Kolatch, *Who's Who in the Talmud* (New York, 1964), p. 168, implies that the age "33" appears in the Talmudic record. I suspect it is from one of the later traditions.

[19]Louis Finkelstein, *Akiba: Scholar, Saint and Martyr* (New York, 1936), pp. 21-23.

[20]Ibid., p. 304.

end of the first century C.E. According to the account in *'Abot. R. Nat. b.* 13, Eliezer wept when he was plowing the fields of his wealthy father. When questioned by his father about his tears, he explained that he wanted to study Torah. His father responded, "You are 28 years old, and you want to study Torah? Go, instead, and take for yourself a wife and beget children and send them to school. . . ." But Eliezer persevered and became a distinguished scholar. This version of the story is supported broadly by *Pirqê R. El.* 1; but in *'Abot R. Nat. a.* 6, the narrative gives Eliezer's age as 22, and *Ber. Rab.* 42 (41):1 makes no reference to Eliezer's age. In none of the versions is it stated that Eliezer married before beginning his studies, though there are subsequent references to his wife and a son.[21]

There are other instances in which marriage was delayed beyond the approved deadline, but the exact age of marriage is not stated. Thus in *b. Qidd.* 71b it is reported that Rab Judah (late third century in Babylon) was criticized because he had not arranged a marriage for his son who was already fully grown and a rabbi. Rab Judah responded by saying, in effect, that he wished to maintain the genealogical purity of his family but was uncertain about the genealogies of the available young women in Babylonia. The critic, though himself a Palestinian rabbi, then quoted Lam 5:11 ("They ravished the women in Zion, the maidens in the cities of Judah"), with the implication that even Rab Judah could not be certain of the purity of his own genealogy, since his ancestors had been in Palestine at the time the Babylonians captured Jerusalem and ravished the countryside.

The biblical tradition itself provided some counterweight to the rabbinic stress on early marriages, since according to that tradition there were some relatively late marriages among the founding fathers. Gen 25:20 reports that "Isaac was forty years old when he took to wife Rebekah," and Gen 26:34 reports that Esau also was 40 years old when he married. *Gen. Rab.* 65:1 comments on this concurrence in age at the time of marriage, saying that Esau led a promiscuous life throughout his youth, but then compared himself with his father: "As my father was forty years old when he married, so I will marry at the age of forty." When the Bible is not explicit about the age at the time of marriage, the later

[21]See *b. Sanh.* 68a; *b. Menaḥ.* 35a; and *b. Shab.* 147a.

tradition sometimes provided that information. *Gen. Rab.* 68:5, after rather intricate calculations, announces that Jacob was 84 when he married. This is then compared with Esau's marrying at age 40, and the comment is made: "Thus we learn that the Holy One, blessed be He, hastens [the happiness of] the wicked and delays that of the righteous." Somewhat surprisingly, *Gen. Rab.* 53:13 states that Ishmael was 27 when he and his mother Hagar were cast out by Abraham. Since his marriage was subsequent to this (Gen 21:21), he was older than 27 when he married.

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is a further document of interest at this juncture. These "testaments" probably originated during the Maccabean period in the second century B.C.E., but in their present form they may contain materials added at a later stage in Jewish history. In *T. Levi* 11:1 Levi states that he married at 28 years of age. A comparison of *T. Levi* 11:8 with 12:4 indicates that Levi's daughter at age 30 married Ambram, who was exactly the same age, i.e., 30. According to his own report, Issachar did not marry until he was 35, although some texts read "30" (*T. Issachar* 3:5). The foregoing represent three instances of "late" marriages mentioned in the Testaments, but they are the only instances thus far noted in which the document mentions ages at the time of marriage. (There is one possible exception in that *T. Judah* 7:10-8:3, where no exact age is given, does refer to Judah's marriage almost immediately after a statement that Judah was 20 years of age. The natural assumption would be that Judah was no older than his early 20s at the time of his marriage.)

There is, of course, no strong reason to trust the accuracy of these statements in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* regarding the ages of individuals at the time of marriage. But one must assume that the authors, or editors, of that document did not themselves find these ages abnormal. The impression created by the document is that men were marrying in their 30s or thereabout.

### 3. *Conclusion*

On the matter of marriage, there is no question about the thrust of the rabbinic teaching on the part of those who reorganized Judaism after 70 C.E.: A Jewish male was under a religious obligation to marry and to have children; and furthermore, it was best for him if he married while in his teens, or, at the latest, in his early twenties.

On the other hand, even after 70 C.E., when this pattern was explicitly promulgated, there were significant exceptions to the general rule. It is true that Simeon ben ʾAzzai is the only Tannaitic scholar of whom it can be said with relative certainty that he remained unmarried throughout his life. But there were regulations governing the behavior of unmarried men—an indication that such a group existed and that it was honorably recognized, even during the period of dominance by the "rabbinic pattern." There is evidence, too, of late marriages during this period, although such were exceptional enough to occasion comment among the rabbis, e.g., Eliezer ben Hyrcanus. It is likely that during this period late marriages were common in the lower economic and social segments of society, but they do not appear in the records.

The absence in the pre-70-C.E. literature of any explicit stress on the religious obligation to marry suggests that this motif developed—or at least intensified—after 70, during the restructuring of Jewish life. It is striking that Josephus did not marry before he was 30. A single instance does not, of course, establish a pattern. Exceptions are sometimes said to prove the rule, but there is not explicit evidence of a rule in the pre-70 period! Presumably during this earlier period, as was the case later, males in the lower social classes married late and some did not marry at all.

Since John the Baptist and Jesus died at a comparatively early age, it is unlikely that their unmarried state, if such it was, created particular comment. The situation with Paul is somewhat different, since he lived to at least a moderate old age and, according to Acts 22:3, had been a disciple of Gamaliel, moving in "establishment" circles! But in the pre-70 period he was probably not as unique as Simeon ben ʾAzzai, though he may have given a similar defense of his behavior. (This is assuming, of course, that Paul was unmarried rather than a widower, which seems to me to be the more likely case.)

Since, so far as is known, the Essenes were the major organized group in Palestinian Judaism with an ambivalent attitude toward marriage, it is tempting to suggest a link between them and John the Baptist or Jesus or Paul. But since it is not clear that an unmarried man was as abnormal in first-century Palestine as might be assumed from rabbinic literature, the temptation should be resisted unless there are other strong links between these individuals and the Essene-Qumran community.

*Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Summer 1987, Vol. 25, No. 2, 183-199.


# THE ESCHATOLOGICAL THEOLOGY OF MARTIN LUTHER

## PART II: LUTHER'S EXPOSITION OF DANIEL AND REVELATION

WINFRIED VOGEL
Marienhoehe Seminary
D-6100 Darmstadt
West Germany

In my earlier article in this series,[1] I treated in a general way a number of aspects of Martin Luther's "eschatological theology," including the existential component in that theology, Luther's allegorical application of apocalyptic language and symbols, his attention to what he considered signs of the imminent advent of Christ, his desire for the "dear last day," his concept(s) of the antichrist, and others. The present essay explores a bit further the great Reformer's eschatological theology by focusing specifically on the attention he gave to the two Bible books that are generally considered as full-fledged apocalypses—the OT book of Daniel and the NT book of Revelation (the latter being also referred to as "the Apocalypse").

### 1. *Luther's Developing Attention to the Books of Daniel and Revelation*

It would appear that in his early reformational career, Luther was not particularly interested in biblical apocalyptic. His negative attitude in particular to the book of Revelation may be seen in the appended position he gave that book (along with Hebrews, James, and Jude) in the first edition of his NT in 1522 and in the preface he also prepared for the same book in that NT edition.

However, as Luther's eschatological concerns deepened, his interest in, and respect for, biblical apocalyptic grew. Factors involved in this were his practical-mindedness in seeing prophetic

[1]Winfried Vogel, "The Eschatological Theology of Martin Luther, Part I: Luther's Basic Concepts," *AUSS* 24 (1986): 249-264.

fulfillments in events and entities of his own day and his growing emphasis on the pope as the antichrist (or, as the main antichrist). By 1529, the advance of the Turkish forces under Suleiman to the very environs of Vienna (after their frightening earlier victories in Christian Europe, including the disastrous defeat of the Hungarian forces at Mohács in 1526) led Luther to hasten his translation of the book of Daniel, placing it ahead of Jeremiah and Ezekiel (which, in the order of biblical books, should obviously have been treated first). From that time on, Luther refers, in his interpretation of Dan 7, to the "little horn" as the Turk, who fights "against the saints of the Most High." We can imagine how convincing this sounded in view of the fact, just mentioned above, that the Turks besieged Vienna in 1529!

Our awareness of this typical phenomenon of Luther's making specific applications of his Bible knowledge to his "here and now" in not very practical terms must not, however, obscure for us the fact that he was never totally carried away by those rather overwhelming political circumstances of his day. The spiritual significance always remained, even as he mentioned the Turk—not just as a political threat, but primarily as a God-permitted scourge on an ungodly Europe. Moreover, his concept of the Turk as antichrist always took second place to his interpretation of the papacy as the antichrist of Daniel and Revelation (and of Paul in 2 Thessalonians). That his main concern still focused on the papacy is clearly evident from various observations Luther made, as we shall see later. This concern appears to be inherent, as well, in his remark that just as body and soul belong together, so it is with regard to the antichrist: The spirit is the pope, and the flesh is the Turk! "The Pope is a liar, and the Turk is a murderer," Luther further declared; but if the two characteristics are combined, then both lying and murdering are found in the pope.[2]

It should be pointed out that in his growing interest in identifying the pope as antichrist, Luther certainly was informed also by earlier expositions. Indeed, the uniqueness of Luther's teaching on the antichrist did not lie in his referring to the papacy thus, for this was an understanding he shared with others, notably

[2]*Weimar Ausgabe* of Luther's works, *Tischreden* 3: 158, no. 3055a. The *Weimar Ausgabe* will hereinafter be cited as *WA*, with additional abbreviations for the *Briefwechsel* (*WA-Br*), *Deutsche Bibel* (*WA-DB*), and *Tischreden* (*WA-Tr*).

the Hussites in Bohemia, as Paul Althaus has pointed out.[3] However, the Hussites' main concern was the unchristian life of the pope, whereas Luther focused on the church's teaching.[4] This new approach assured not only wider attention but also more revolutionary and long-lasting results. And it is, as well, a demonstration of Luther's holistic approach to theology—this interpretation being, to his mind, a concrete building-block within his overall theological concerns.

With this brief background, we are now ready to take a quick overview of some of the specifics of the Reformer's interpretation in his dealing with the books of Daniel and Revelation.

### 2. *Luther's Interpretation of the Book of Daniel*

It has recently been pointed out by W. Stanford Reid that although the book of Revelation was a perennial favorite for all kinds of interpretations and speculations in the time of Luther, the prophet Daniel was preferred by many theologians, including the Reformer.[5] It seems, however, that Luther had originally avoided comment on Daniel just as much as he had done with regard to Revelation, and apparently for the same reason—namely, because he did not want to participate in any of the speculative interpretation which was so rampant in his time, and whose originators he disparagingly called "superficial spirits" and "new quibble masters."[6] In fact, it is of interest to note that it was in the very same year—1529—that he wrote his introductions to both Daniel and the Apocalypse (the latter introduction replacing his earlier negative preface to the book of Revelation prepared in 1521/22).

It has been convincingly argued by Hans Volz that Luther's interest in the book of Daniel was spurred by Philip Melanchthon, who had related certain Daniel passages to the Turks before Luther did so (and that it was spurred also, of course, by the quick advance of the Turks to the gates of Vienna, mentioned earlier).[7] Another

[3]In "Luthers Gedanken über die letzten Dinge," *LJB* 23 (1941): 30.

[4]*WA* 51: 598-600.

[5]W. Stanford Reid, "The Four Monarchies of Daniel in Reformation Historiography," in *Historical Reflections* 8/1 (Spring 1981): 115-123.

[6]Cf. *WA* 23: 485.

[7]*WA-DB* 11/2: xxvi and passim.

influence might have been a pamphlet by the Wittenberg scholar Justus Jonas, who had translated the seventh chapter of Daniel, commented on it, and applied it to the Turks.[8]

Although his Daniel Introduction of 1529 represents Luther's first extensive application of the prophecies of Daniel, he had as early as 1521 interpreted Dan 8:23-25 as pointing to the Pope as the antichrist, as well as applying the little horn in Dan 7 to the papacy.[9] Luther interpreted the prophecies on the antichrist and on the little horn in this general fashion, except that in Dan 8 he saw both the pope and the Turk represented. In one of the table-talks he is even quoted as bringing the pope, the Turk, and the antichrist together into a combined interpretation of Dan 7 and Rev 13.[10] Among these entities, however, it was the pope who remained the chief object of Luther's attention.

In addition, Luther, obviously basing his interpretation of Dan 8 mainly on the Maccabean Books, saw the little horn in that chapter of Daniel as reflecting Antiochus Epiphanes.[11] This Seleucid king he considered as the foreshadowing of the great antichrist, described not only in Dan 8:23-25 but also in chap. 12 (a chapter whose discussion Luther actually begins with 11:36).[12] The Reformer also viewed the Daniel material as a source for the Apostle Paul's portrayal in 2 Thess 2.[13]

Luther's interpretation of the four kingdoms in Dan 2 and Dan 7 was along the traditional line—Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. Presumably, Luther relied here, and in other ways, on Jerome's Daniel Commentary.[14] However, in focusing on the contemporary political situation and seeing in the little horn of Dan 7 the manifestation of the Turkish power, Luther added a peculiar prophetic touch of his own. He derived comfort from the fact that three horns of the fourth beast—namely, Egypt, Asia, and Greece, in his view—had already been plucked out by the Turk. He concluded therefrom that no other horn—i.e., no other nation—

[8]Ibid., p. xxx; see also n. 94.

[9]*WA* 7: 722 and passim; 7: 744.

[10]*WA-Tr* 3: 645, 646, no. 3831.

[11]*WA-DB* 11/2: 14.

[12]Ibid., p. 48.

[13]Ibid., p. 56.

[14]Ibid., p. 6.

would have the same fate as those three and that therefore Germany would be spared![15]

The mention in Dan 7 of a judgment and of the new kingdom was to Luther clear evidence that the end was fast approaching, and for him the book of Daniel had thus become a source of comfort "in these last times"[16]—a book which he commended to all pious Christians to read.[17] He says, in fact, that the book was written for the sake of "the miserable Christians" and had been saved for "this last time."[18]

In interpreting the 2300 days of Dan 8:14, Luther again followed Jerome." He believed these days to be 6 1/4 years when Antiochus raged against the Jews.

In the year 1530 Luther's attention to Daniel focused strongly on the 70 weeks of Dan 9:24-27 and on an historical interpretation of 11:2-35. The 70 weeks were, in fact, treated quite extensively by the Reformer, and the result is indeed noteworthy. Acknowledging these 70 weeks as 490 literal years, Luther refers to Haggai, Zechariah, and Ezra 6 for a clue as to their beginning. Relying apparently on royal genealogies by pseudo-Metasthenes and pseudo-Philo,[19] Luther begins with Darius Hyastasapes as the very king who issued the decree for the rebuilding of Jerusalem. However, Luther seems hardly ever to state the exact year with which to begin the 70 weeks—at least, not in terms of the usual chronological reckoning. In his *Supputatio annorum mundi* of 1541 and 1545, in which he begins his chronology with Adam and paradise, he gives the year 3510 (after Creation) as the starting point for the 70 weeks—which, according to him, was the second year of Darius.

In the same chronology, Jesus was born 450 years later—in the year 3960—and died exactly 33 1/2 years afterwards, in the middle of the 70th week.[20] We should not fail to notice, however, that in 1523, when Luther for the first time tried to calculate the 70 weeks,

[15]Ibid., p. 12.

[16]*WA-Br* 5:242, line 11, to Nikolaus Hausmann on Feb. 25, 1530.

[17]*WA-DB* 11/2: 128.

[18]Ibid., p. 383, in the dedicatory letter of his Daniel translation to Johann Friedrich, Duke of Saxony.

[19]These are believed to be scholarly forgeries that were first published by the Italian Dominican Giovanni Nanni (Annius). See ibid., p. xliii.

[20]*WA* 53: 107, 124, 125.

he reckoned backwards from the 30th year of Christ and arrived at the 20th year of Cambyses as the beginning of those 70 weeks or 490 years.[21] In 1530 Luther mentioned this date again, alongside his new proposal for a dating from the reign of Darius, which he now seemed to favor. He observed that in trying to harmonize the two possible calculations, as well as in figuring out the first one, there is a time lapse of three years. But Luther was not the least embarrassed, and he justified the discrepancy by simply saying that in such grand time calculations it is difficult to pinpoint the exact day and hour, and that therefore one should be content with being so close to accuracy.[22] Later, however, in his *Supputatio* he applied a more mechanical approach, as mentioned above.

While in his Daniel exposition Luther passes by chap. 10 rather quickly, he concentrates his attention on chap. 11 and supposes that he gives help here against confusion over so many names and persons apparently referred to in that chapter.[23] Then, contrary to the usual tradition, Luther begins his treatment of chap. 12 with 11:36, as mentioned earlier. He sees at this point in chap. 11 the end of a mere description of historical events and the beginning of a prophecy of the last time. This also marks for him the transition point at which the pope becomes the real Antiochus. Interestingly enough, one of the first indications for Luther that the pope is meant here is the phrase in vs. 37 that the king shall not regard the lure of women—which Luther connects with the pope's forbidding of clerical marriage. But above all, Luther sees the "bright Gospel" shining through again.[24] In the form of this concluding prophecy in Daniel, it is especially given for the last time.

After voicing his desire that someone else should have taken care of chap. 12 in Daniel in order to "strengthen our faith and to awaken our hope for the blessed day of our salvation," Luther acknowledges the fact that no one else had done this, and so proceeds with his own interpretation.[25] This discussion becomes,

[21] *WA* 11: 334.

[22] *WA-DB* 11/2: 22.

[23] Ibid., pp. 32, 34.

[24] Ibid., p. 48: "Darumb ist hie keine Historien mehr zu suchen, sondern, das helle Euangelion zeigt und sagt itzt einem jedern wol, wer der Rechte Antiochus sei. . . ."

[25] Ibid., p. 50.

in fact, the climax of his whole commentary on Daniel, in which he devotes to Dan 12 more than double the space that he has given to the entire rest of the book! Also, he makes his exposition of this chapter one of his masterpieces on the subject of the papacy and its evil effects. But as was usual for him, the Reformer ends his treatise on a joyful note. He anticipates the "promised and certain" future return of our Savior Jesus Christ as a "blessed and glad salvation from this vale of misery and woe."[26]

Although Luther's interpretation of Daniel was somewhat influenced by traditional views and could not always free itself from the interpretations of forebears and contemporaries, it still shows remarkable creativity and freshness of thought, especially when dealing with the central eschatological concern of the book of Daniel. Perhaps Luther's main innovation with regard to interpretation of Daniel was his incorporation of the Turks; but even here, his treatment clearly indicates that he successfully escaped the pitfall of a mere sensational approach that would take into account only the happenings in the present world. Indeed, there were some inconsistencies in Luther's interpretation of symbols, such as the little horn. Nevertheless, in light of his understanding of his own time and in view of his fervent desire for a soon-returning Christ, he still deserves commendation for not losing sight of the eschatological gospel contained in the book of Daniel, and for demonstrating an appreciation of the real spiritual dimensions of the controversy revealed in that book.

### 3. *Luther's Interpretation of the Book of Revelation*

As we noted in the first section of this article, Luther's attitude towards the Apocalypse underwent a marked and rather drastic change during the time between 1522 and 1529/30. The first of these years saw the publication of a brief preface, in which Luther almost totally rejected the book of Revelation, because to him it did not reveal Christ. At that time he looked upon it as being neither apostolic nor prophetic (apostles, he felt, preach with simple and clear words!), and he also considered that there were "many of the fathers" who had dismissed the book.[27] Indeed, the Reformer felt

[26]Ibid., p. 130.

[27]*WA-DB* 7: 404.

himself in darkness regarding John's visions and descriptions and could not interpret them. More over, he was apparently afraid of being classified with those who claimed all kinds of divergent and speculative meanings to be the correct interpretation of the book.[28] It is even possible to conclude, as does H.-U. Hofmann, that Luther regarded the Apocalypse as apocryphal.[29]

By 1529/30, however, Luther came to have a much more favorable attitude toward the Apocalypse, as we have also noted. This new outlook toward the book of Revelation most probably originated in Luther's concern over the same situation that led to his translation of, and comment on, the book of Daniel, prepared in the same year. By now Luther was willing to acknowledge the striking relationship between these two prophetic books—at least, insofar as they both seemed to him to deal with the papacy and were both for "comfort in this last time." And thus, it is interesting to take note of Luther's new approach to prophecy in this second introduction to Revelation. In it he distinguishes between certain types of prophecy: first, in clear words; second, in pictures and dreams with their interpretation: and third; as in the Apocalypse, only in pictures and symbols, without an accompanying interpretation. As long as this last type of prophecy is not interpreted, it is, says Luther, "hidden" and "mute."[30] Nevertheless, and in any case, it is "given by the Holy Spirit"—a statement that is in sharp contrast to Luther's first preface of 1522.

Hofmann in his seminal work on Luther and the Apocalypse has recently pointed out that in order to gain a correct understanding of the Reformer's relationship to the book of Revelation, it would be most helpful to have an overview of his use of this last book of the Bible in his entire work.[31] Hofmann has taken upon himself this painstaking task and consequently has come up with some quite interesting results, which are presented in statistical tables and their interpretation by the author. What concerns us most, in the context of this article, however, is simply to get a general idea of how Luther used the Apocalypse and how his

[28]Ibid., p. 408, lines 9-24.

[29]Hans-Ulrich Hofmann, *Luther und die Johannes-Apokalypse* (Tübingen, 1982), p. 296.

[30]*WA-DB* 7: 408, line 11.

[31]Hofmann, pp. 9-10.

understanding of it contributed to the eschatological nature of his theology.

It is important to note that despite his new and more positive attitude towards the book of Revelation by 1529/30, Luther still did not see fit to offer his interpretation of it with the same conviction and certainty that he manifested with regard to the prophecies of Daniel. In dealing with Revelation, he saw his efforts merely as a proposal "to cause others . . . to think."[32] Hofmann is certainly correct in his assertion that Luther eventually took upon himself the task of interpreting the Apocalypse because he now wanted to show those "irresponsible Spirits" with their "allegorical playing around" how it could and should be done.[33] Thus, it seems that the situation in the church and in the world toward the end of 1529 was incentive enough for Luther to be motivated into approaching this book because of the very reason that earlier had kept him from doing so.

Luther's major hermeneutical principle applicable here, next to the one that asks for the Scripture text to interpret itself, is the one that takes into account the history of the church and the world and compares that history with the pictures that John describes—this in order to see what had been fulfilled already by Luther's time and what was still pending. Luther's main purpose in using this principle was to arrive at an "indisputable interpretation."[34]

Highlights of this interpretation include, first of all, Luther's preterist view of the seven churches of chaps. 2 and 3. Then, the fourth and fifth chapters, he felt, contain visions and pictures that depict Christendom—i.e., the church—here on earth.[35] In order to give an impression of Luther's way of doing exegesis, it may be of interest to point out that in his interpretation of Rev 5:8 he saw the "playing with harps" as signifying "preaching."[36] This kind of allegorizing is quite common with Luther, and it reveals his preoccupation with certain ideas and his readiness to apply these ideas to the text. Thus, in a sense, he unwittingly fell into the very trap that he so desperately wanted to avoid.

[32]*WA-DB* 7: 408, lines 20-22.

[33]Hofmann, p. 410.

[34]*WA-DB* 7: 408, lines 22-30.

[35]Ibid., p. 431; cf. gloss to Rev 4:1.

[36]Ibid., p. 410, lines 1-7.

Chaps. 6 and 7 in the Apocalypse Luther interpreted as a picture of unfolding world history and then church history in particular. In this panorama angels play a rather important role: The evil angels are heretics, and good angels are the "holy fathers, like Spirido, Athanasius, Hilary, and the Council of Nicea."[37]

In this vein, Luther also offers a very concrete application of the seven trumpets of chaps. 9 through 11. These trumpets, played by (apparently for Luther) evil angels, depict seven major heretics during the early period of church history. However, Luther does not intend to present them in chronological order, but rather has systematic aspects in mind. The first trumpet is Tatian, with his righteousness by works; the second must be Marcion, with his followers, such as now "Muentzer and the *Schwermer*"; the third angel is Origen, with his allegorical interpretations; the fourth is Novatus and later the Donatists;[38] the fifth represents "Arius, the great heretic, and his companions"; and the sixth is "the evil Mahometh."[39] After dealing thus with the first six trumpets in Rev 9, Luther proceeds to Rev 10 and sees the angel with the little book as being in the line of the preceding six trumpeting angels. This seventh angel, or heretic, is the pope, who spreads human teaching—in contrast to the angel with the pure Gospel in Rev 14:6-7.[40] The seventh trumpet, in Rev 11:15 (in Luther, 12:1), is, according to the Reformer, a repetition of the one in chap. 10, with the only difference being that the angel in chap. 10 is the spiritual pope, whereas the one in chap. 11 is the secular (or worldly) pope.[41]

In chaps. 11 and 12 Luther sees two comforting pictures: the visions of the two witnesses and of the pregnant woman and the dragon. These "are to show that there are yet some pious teachers and Christians that remain."[42] Luther says surprisingly little in interpreting chap. 12, although he uses pericopes from it in

[37]Ibid., lines 18-25.

[38]Ibid., lines 31-33.

[39]Ibid., p. 443; cf. gloss to Rev 9:1 and 9:13; see also ibid., p. 412, lines 10-11, 18, 19.

[40]Ibid., p. 445; cf. gloss to Rev 10:9; see also ibid., p. 412, lines 20-22.

[41]Ibid., p. 449; cf. gloss to Rev 12:1.

[42]Ibid., p. 412, lines 27-28.

sermons, hymns, and apologetic statements.[43] One interpretation that he does provide is with reference to the woman that flees from the dragon into the wilderness: This is "the church that is hidden from [literally, "under"] the papacy."[44]

Up to this point Luther seems to have prepared the way for the climactic chap. 13, to which he gives his full attention, because he sees in the two beasts of this pericope a clear reference to "the papal empire and the imperial papacy": "The papacy," he declares, "brings the secular sword under its control" by giving the fallen Roman Empire to the Germans.[45] This *translatio imperii* for Luther is the healing of the deadly wound in 13:3. Hofmann correctly points out that here may be seen a clear connection with Luther's Daniel interpretation—one that helps to explain the lasting presence of the fourth kingdom of Daniel until the end of the world.[46]

Why Luther held this view on the two beasts of Rev 13 in 1529/30, while declaring the first beast to be the Turk in 1539, when the Turkish threat was not so immediate and strong as it had been in 1529 or 1532, is somewhat puzzling. Perhaps this can be regarded as another piece of evidence for Luther's main interest in dealing with the pope, who, in his view, was the church's foremost enemy. In any case, Luther's interpretation in 1529/30 did manifest a dependence on, and embeddedness in, the circumstances of the contemporary political and ecclesiastical scene, for in a description of the devil's last wrath, he interprets the "second woe" (sixth trumpet) as "Mahometh and the Saracens" and the "third woe" (seventh trumpet) as "the papacy and the Emperor." The latter two are joined by the Turk, Gog, and Magog; and "in this most miserable and horrible way Christendom in all the world is plagued from all sides by false teachings and wars, by book and sword." This, Luther adds, "is the rock bottom [*grund suppe*]" and "is followed by pictures of comfort concerning the end to such woes and abomination."[47]

[43]Cf. Hofmann, pp. 426-427.

[44]*WA-DB* 4: 501, line 33: "Ecclesia latet sub papatu."

[45]*WA-DB* 7: 414, lines 2-8.

[46]Hofmann, p. 429.

[47]*WA-DB* 7: 414, lines 17-24.

In treating Rev 13 Luther could not refrain from commenting on the mysterious number "666" of vs. 18. In the margin next to this verse he put the note: "These are six hundred and sixty-six years. For so long [a period] will the secular papacy last."[48] According to one of his table talks, Luther saw the beginning of the secular papacy with the crowning of Charlemagne by Leo III in 800."[49] Since it was not important for Luther that the years fit exactly, he expected the end of the papacy in his own time. Then he also split the number "666" into smaller units and applied these to letters of the alphabet, but there is uncertainty as to which word or even which language he had in mind.[50]

Rev 14 brings, according to Luther, the counterattack of the Word of God against the papacy—this in the figure of the angel with the eternal Gospel, the first of three angels with messages in vss. 6-11. Here it is interesting to recall that Luther never rejected the identification that had been suggested by Michael Stifel and others that it was Luther himself who was symbolized by this angel.[51] This conviction, of course, gave an even greater impetus to the life and work to which the Reformer felt himself called. It dramatically added to his apocalyptic message, and in his own mind it must have placed him near the center of his eschatological theology, with its emphasis on the coming of Christ, the end of the world, and the role of the papacy.

As to the second angel of Rev 14:8, he announces the papacy, declares Luther; and here the Reformer is very clear on the equation of Babylon with the spiritual papacy.[52] The third angel in the series is not even mentioned by Luther.

For Luther, the last part of chap. 14 and all of chap. 15 provide a description of judgment and of the wrath of God coming upon those who adhere to the papacy and resist the gospel. Chap. 16 has an even greater counterattack of God's Word against the papacy; and interestingly enough, the angels with the bowls are considered as symbolizing "learned, pious preachers." The picture

[48]Ibid., p. 453.

[49]*WA-Tr* 4: 108; lines 18-22.

[50]Hofmann, pp. 432-433. Hofmann calls attention to Bousset's suggestion that Luther had in mind the Hebrew term for "Roman" (with "Empire" understood).

[51]See Vogel, p. 257, and Hofmann, p. 434.

[52]*WA-DB* 7:414, lines 29-30.

of the three frogs in 16:13 Luther uses to caricature "the Sophists, like Faber, Eck, Emser, etc."[53]

Rev 17 introduces the harlot, which for Luther was another description of the papacy—a description which he used quite often in order to demonstrate the rise and corruption of the Roman Church. The interpretational gloss that Luther gives for the seven heads and ten horns of the beast carrying the woman as being specific nations of his own time shows once again how much he lived in the contemporary scene and tried to apply Scripture and especially its apocalyptic literature to the "here-and-now."[54] The same is true for his view on the destruction of Babylon in chap. 18, which, as pointed out by Hofmann, Luther applied to the sack of Rome in 1527 and the assault on the Vatican by imperial troops.[55]

The white horse of 19:11 plays a decisive role in the Reformer's interpretation of the book of Revelation and in his expectation of the end of the age. Here he sees the Word of God that goes to a triumphant victory over "the protectors of the pope,"[56] and which causes "both beasts and the prophet" to be thrown into hell[57] (an anticipation, perhaps, of the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 and the ultimate victory of the Protestant confession?).

In any case, it is significant that Luther thought the prophecies of the book of Revelation had been fulfilled up to and including the white horse of 19:11. This he declared to be the case in 1536, in a table talk recorded for that year. On the same occasion Luther also remarked that in his opinion the end would come before 100 years would pass.[58]

Concerning Rev 20, Luther's introduction to the Apocalypse of 1529/30 interprets Gog and Magog as a manifestation of the Turks. (A little later, while at the Coburg Castle in the summer of 1530, he translated Ezek 38 and 39, and in a preface and glossaries therewith he set forth the same view.[59]) With regard to the millennium, Luther suggests that this time period began with the writing

[53]Ibid., p. 414, lines 25-29, and p. 416, lines 3-7.

[54]Cf. ibid., p. 463, gloss to Rev 17:9-14.

[55]Hofmann, p. 444.

[56]*WA-DB* 7: 467, gloss to Rev 19:11.

[57]Ibid., p. 470.

[58]*WA-Tr* 3: 321, lines 25-28.

[59]*WA* 30/2: 223, lines 4-13.

of the Apocalypse and ended with the appearance of the Turks.[60] If he had set the date for the Apocalypse at around A.D. 95, which he never did explicitly, he would have seen the end of the 1,000 years with the First Crusade around A.D. 1095. We have already noted in the previous article in this series that in 1540 Luther held a slightly different view—starting the millennium with Christ's birth and concluding it with the accession of Pope Gregory VII in A.D. 1073.[61]

Luther ends his preface to the Apocalypse with statements of comfort and warning. In fact, he sees the whole purpose of the book as embracing these two contrasting aspects. We should be comforted because Christendom will receive the final victory over all its enemies, he says, but at the same time we should also be warned to guard against heresies and all "annoying evils" that have crept into the Christian church, have distorted her testimony before the world, and have thereby provided an obstacle to the faith of many. The last sentence in the preface is one of expressed comfort: "We should not doubt that Christ will be with us and near us, even if it comes to the worst. Here in this book we see that Christ amidst and above all plagues, beasts, and evil angels. will nevertheless be with and near to his saints and will finally triumph."[62]

### 4. *History and Effects of Woodcuts to the Apocalypse*

Our discussion of Luther's understanding of the Apocalypse would not be complete without mentioning one of the most powerful means the Reformer employed to convey the message that is contained in the book—namely, the woodcuts. Twenty-one of these, most of them apparently created by Lukas Cranach, a personal friend of Luther, appeared in Luther's first NT, the so-called "September Bible."[63] The triple-crown on the heads of the beast

[60]*WA-DB* 7: 469, gloss to Rev 20:3.

[61]Vogel, p. 256; cf. the chart on p. 259.

[62]*WA-DB* 7: 420, lines 14-17.

[63]See, e.g., Ph. Schmidt, *Der Illustration der Lutherbibel 1522-1700* (Basel, 1962), pp. 93-98; Kenneth A. Strand, *Woodcuts to the Apocalypse in Dürer's Time: Albrecht Dürer's Woodcuts Plus Five Other Sets from the 15th and 16th Centuries* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1968), p. 37. Schmidt reproduces a number of these in reduced size

(Rev 11 and 16) and the harlot (Rev 17) rather unambiguously demonstrates Luther's interpretation of certain passages. It appears that Duke George of Albertine Saxony protested to his cousin Frederick the Wise and succeeded in getting the triple-crown reduced to a single crown in Luther's "December Testament" of 1522.[64]

But now something interesting happened. Jerome Emser, Duke George's court secretary, bought the woodcuts from Cranach (with Luther's consent), so as to include them in his own Bible that was meant to compete with Luther's. Thus, in this Catholic Bible of 1527, even though the single crown appeared in the woodcuts for Rev 11, 16, and 17, some of the polemical scenes from Luther's Bible were reproduced—such as the portrayal of the second beast of chap. 13 (the beast from the land) as wearing a monk's cowl, and the depictions for chaps. 14 and 18 of the fall of Babylon as the destruction of Rome.[65]

With regard to Luther's own Bible editions, the triple-crown reappeared in his first complete Bible of 1534. This Bible had a series of twenty-six woodcuts for the Apocalypse.[66] Taken over, copied, and slightly altered by various artists (Holbein, Brosamer, Woensam, and others), the woodcuts from Luther's first NT appeared not only in Bibles but also independently, making these illustrations a powerful communicator during Luther's own time of the message that he wished so fervently to proclaim.

Art historians have pointed out that these woodcuts have also had another interesting effect. In a number of monasteries in the monk's Republic of Athos, Greece, there are cycles of monumental frescoes of twenty-one illustrations each, the first probably prepared in the year 1547. Though these appear in Greek iconic style, they are said to be large copies of the woodcuts from Luther's NT of 1522. They even include the illustration of the Babylonian harlot

---

(nos. 47-51, 53, 54, 56-58, and 60, on pp. 99-103, 105, 106, 108-110, 112). The entire set is reproduced by Strand in full size (nos. 33-43, 45-49, 51, and 53-56, on pp. 38-48, 50-54, 56, 58-61).

[64]See the notation by Schmidt on p. 95, no. 11. Strand has placed all three woodcuts in both forms on facing pages (nos. 43, 44, on pp. 48, 49; nos. 49, 50, on pp. 54, 55; and nos. 51, 52, on pp. 56, 57).

[65]Cf. Hofmann, p. 325; also woodcuts 46, 47, and 53 in Strand, pp. 51, 52, and 58.

[66]See Strand, p. 73. The woodcuts themselves are reproduced as nos. 78-103 on pp. 74-86.

with the triple crown.[67] These frescoes demonstrate again the powerful influence that the Luther-Bible woodcuts had, even apart from the written word, for the Apocalypse was not recognized as canonical in the Greek Orthodox Church!

Luther's intent was to make the Bible accessible and readable to the common person in the street, and he duly realized that woodcuts were an invaluable help in accomplishing this goal. Interestingly enough, when baroque Bible illustrations ceased, the people's interest in illustrated books of the Bible like the Apocalypse also subsided.[68]

### 5. *Conclusion*

The survey of the eschatological themes in Luther's writings as presented in my earlier article and of his interpretation of biblical apocalyptic literature as set forth in the present article not only shows clearly his vivid interest in the end of the age and coming of Christ but also reveals that his understanding of the eschaton strongly protruded into his life and theological thought. Apocalyptic prophecy was not something the Reformer dealt with only from time to time; it was not simply one interesting feature of Scripture among others. I would propose that Luther in his daily activity and ongoing theological enterprise was continually driven by his fervent desire for the consummation of all things and by his firm conviction that events and developments in church, society, and the political arena were the direct fulfillment of biblical prophecy.

This study also shows that there need not be any suspicion on our part that for Luther eschatology meant sectarian rigidity, egocentric particularity, or ethical and social passivity. For him it meant quite the opposite, as evidenced by his lively interest in the things that were going on around him. In many instances he even interfered with pen and voice when he deemed it his Christian responsibility to do so. It would be difficult to make Luther an adherent of quietism.

A number of NT scholars today locate the "core" of the Apostle Paul in the apocalyptic texture of his thought.[69] Perhaps it is not

[67]See Hofmann, pp. 327-328.

[68]Cf. Schmidt, p. 392.

[69]See, e.g., J. Christian Beker, *Paul the Apostle* (Philadelphia, 1980), pp. 16, 17; esp. note 19.

far-fetched, therefore, to claim that inasmuch as Paul's writings had such a strong and penetrating influence on Luther's thought, the Reformer incorporated the Apostle's apocalyptic drive into his own theology. Luther's apocalyptic perspective in no way dethrones his concept and message of *sola fide*, but rather strengthens it in the true biblical sense.

*Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Summer 1987, Vol. 25, No. 2, 201-214.


# JEREMIAH'S SEVENTY YEARS FOR BABYLON: A RE-ASSESSMENT

## PART I: THE SCRIPTURAL DATA

ROSS E. WINKLE
Salem, Oregon 97305

References to "seventy years" as a prophetic period of time occur in several places in the OT: 2 Chr 36:21; Isa 23:15-18; Jer 25:11-12; 29:10; Dan 9:2; Zech 1:12; 7:5. Two of these occurrences, 2 Chr 36:21 and Dan 9:2, refer specifically to prophecies about the seventy years in Jer 25:11-12 and 29:10; and all four of these texts are generally considered to refer to the period of the Jewish exile in Babylon. This study investigates the meaning of these four closely-related texts (I will not deal in any detail with Isa 23:15-18, Zech 1:12, and Zech 7:5, since these three passages do not refer to Jeremiah's prophecies).

### 1. *Views as to the Meaning of the "Seventy Years"*

The reason for a reappraisal of the four above-mentioned closely related texts relating to the Babylonian captivity is the continued variety of interpretations given them by scholars.[1] These interpretations basically fall into three categories: (1) the seventy years represent literal, exact time; (2) the seventy years represent symbolic time; and (3) the seventy years, while neither exact nor symbolic, give an approximate chronological framework for historical events. Even within each of these categories, however, there is a variety of opinion as to what constitutes the correct interpretation.

Among those who consider the seventy years to be literal years, some interpreters believe that the seventy years extended from the

[1]For major studies on the seventy-year prophecy, see C. F. Whitley, "The Term Seventy Years Captivity," *VT* 4 (1954):60-72; idem, "The Seventy Years Desolation—A Rejoinder," *VT* 7 (1957):416-418; Avigdor Orr, "The Seventy Years of Babylon," *VT* 6 (1956):304-306; Peter R. Ackroyd, "Two OT Historical Problems of the Early Persian Period," *JNES* 17 (1958):3-27; R. Borger, "An Additional Remark on P. R. Ackroyd, *JNES*, XVII, 23-27," *JNES* 18 (1959):74; and Gerhard Larsson, "When Did the Babylonian Captivity Begin?" *JTS*, n.s., 18 (1967):417-423.

initial attack of Nebuchadnezzar II of Babylon against Jerusalem in 605 B.C. to the return of the Jews under Cyrus of Persia in 536 B.C. (here, the seventy years are reckoned inclusively).[2] Others have concluded that the seventy years extended from the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. to the completion of the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem in 516 B.C.[3] And still others who recognize the seventy years as intended in a literal sense in the prophecies of Jeremiah, assert that these years were in actuality shortened by God's mercy, since when one works backwards from 539 B.C. (the occasion of the capture of Babylon), it is obvious that none of the traditional starting dates—605 B.C., 597 B.C., or 587/86 B.C.—provides a time period of exactly seventy years.[4]

Interpreters who take the seventy years to be symbolic, however, refuse to see any correspondence between these years and actual history. Usually working backwards from 539 B.C. as the *terminus ad quem*, such interpreters agree that neither 605 B.C. nor 612 (the destruction of Nineveh) as the *terminus a quo* yield a time frame of seventy literal years. Thus, since in their view the seventy years are not exact (and thus cannot be literal), this time reference must be symbolic. For some such interpreters the seventy years can be equated with the general term "many," referring to a long period of domination by the Babylonians;[5] others suggest that these years represent a lifetime, since Ps 90:10 presents seventy years as a normal human lifespan;[6] and still others view the expression simply as the use of a term (already employed in an Esarhaddon inscrip-

[2]E.g., see "Chronology of Exile and Restoration," *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, rev. ed., vol. 3 (Washington, D.C., 1976), pp. 85-110, esp. pp. 90-97; and Charles L. Feinberg, *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), pp. 176, 198. For one who accepts these dates but takes the seventy years to be a round figure, see R. K. Harrison, *Jeremiah and Lamentations: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentary (Downers Grove, IL, 1973), pp. 85, 126.

[3]Whitley, "Captivity," pp. 60-72, esp. pp. 68 and 72.

[4]Derek Kidner, *Ezra and Nehemiah: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentary (Downers Grove, IL, 1979), p. 32.

[5]J. A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI, 1980), pp. 513-514.

[6]E.g., see Loring W. Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1913), pp. 71, 223.

tion concerning Babylon) that referred to the period of desolation for a nation.[7]

The third general category of interpreters—those accepting neither the symbolic interpretation, nor the seventy years as being exact—believe that the prophetic seventy-year period is remarkably close to historical accuracy (612 to 539 = 73 years; 605 to 539 = 66 years).[8]

The variety of interpretations concerning the seventy years of Babylonian captivity has to a large degree been based on the interpretation of the term in 2 Chronicles and Daniel (as well as Zechariah). For example, some maintain that the authors of 2 Chronicles and Daniel reinterpreted the seventy-year prophecy from a completely different theological standpoint than Jeremiah originally did.[9] Thus, to them the seventy-year term is a fluid one.

The purpose here is not to discuss the advantages and/or disadvantages of any of the specific views mentioned above. Rather, we endeavor herein to determine whether the relevant passages in Jeremiah, 2 Chronicles, and Daniel allow for a literal understanding of the seventy years in some manner overlooked by investigators in the literal school of interpretation. I first examine the relevant texts in these three books in order to see whether they allow for a literal understanding. This is the treatment given in the present article. Then in a follow-up article I will examine the relationship between the texts and history in order to ascertain whether history itself allows for a literal understanding of the seventy years.

[7]See the discussion in Borger, p. 74; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 143-146; and Robert P. Carroll, *From Chaos to Covenant: Uses of Prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah* (London, Eng., 1981), pp. 203-204.

[8]See, e.g., F. Charles Fensham, *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), pp. 42-43. See also Thompson, pp. 513-514. For others who take the seventy years to be symbolic, see Edward Lewis Curtis and Albert Alonzo Madsen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1910), p. 524; John Bright, *Jeremiah*, AB (Garden City, NY, 1965), pp. 160, 208; and Peter R. Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* (Philadelphia, 1968), pp. 240-241.

[9]See Ackroyd, "Historical Problems," pp. 23-27; and Michael Fishbane, "Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis," *JBL* 99 (1980): 356-359.

## 2. *The Texts Relating to the Seventy Years*

### *Jeremiah 29:10*

Because of the complex textual tradition in Jer 25, I will begin my discussion here with Jer 29:10, before giving attention to Jer 25:11-12. As is commonplace in Jeremiah, the LXX differs from the MT in this chapter, but there are no major differences in vs. 10, the verse which contains the reference to the seventy years.[10] The MT reads: "For thus says the LORD: When seventy years are completed for Babylon, I will visit you, and I will fulfill to you my promise and bring you back to this place."[11]

The context of this verse indicates that it is part of a letter that Jeremiah wrote to the exiles after the capture and subsequent exile of King Jehoiachin (Jeconiah), the queen mother, members of the royal household, and various craftsmen by Nebuchadnezzar (29:1-2). The letter can thus be dated to 597 B.C. or shortly thereafter. While scholars have disputed the original contents of the letter,[12] it remains clear that sometime near 597 B.C. Jeremiah wrote a letter referring to a seventy-year period of time.

This particular verse furnishes three important pieces of information: (1) the seventy years are a period of time relating to *Babylon*; (2) these seventy years for Babylon are to be completed sometime in the future; and (3) the activity of God on behalf of the exiles will take place at the time of the completion of the seventy years for Babylon (or afterwards).[13] It is helpful to stress, at the same time, what the text does *not* say: (1) the beginning and end of

[10]The LXX of 29:10 (36:10) reads: *hotan mellē plērousthai Babylōni hebdomēkonta etē.* . . . ("when I am about to fulfill seventy years for Babylon. . . ."). However, *mellō* plus an infinitive can take on a meaning denoting certainty or destiny. See William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2d ed. (Chicago, 1979), p. 501. For similar constructions, see Matt 16:27; 17:22; Luke 9:44; and Rev 12:5.

[11]All translations, unless otherwise indicated, are from the RSV.

[12]E.g., see the discussion in Ackroyd, "Historical Problems," p. 23.

[13]I do not agree with the view that Jeremiah did not predict a return from exile. For this view, see Johann Lust, "'Gathering and Return' in Jeremiah and Ezekiel," in P.-M. Bogaert, ed., *Le Livre de Jérémie: Le Prophete et son milieu Les Oracles et Leur Transmission*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 54 (Leuven, 1981):119-142. As for the seventy years referring to Babylon, see Orr, p. 305.

the seventy years are not specifically related to any historical situations; (2) the seventy years do not directly refer to Judah or the Judeans; and (3) the seventy years do not specifically describe the length of the exile.

*Jeremiah 25:11-12*

With these facts in mind, we can turn our attention to Jer 25:11-12. These verses are a part of a prophecy that can be dated to the fourth year of Jehoiachin's father Jehoiakim (25:1).

As mentioned above, the textual tradition here is extremely complicated. The LXX differs from the MT in several key areas, such as the following: (1) the LXX contains no direct references to Nebuchadnezzar or Babylon (cf. vss. 1, 9, 11, and 12 in the MT); (2) vss. 13b-14 are missing from the LXX; and (3) the LXX inserts chaps. 46-51 of the MT between 25:13a and 25:15 (and even in a different order).[14] The implications for interpretation of the seventy years in vss. 11-12 are important.

On the one hand, according to the MT the text states:

> This whole land shall become a ruin and a waste, and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. Then after seventy years are completed, I will punish the king of Babylon and that nation, the land of the Chaldeans, for their iniquity, says the LORD, making the land an everlasting waste.

Thus, according to this tradition, the seventy years refer to the servitude of "these nations," which were the nations "round about" Judah (vs. 9). Here Judah is not specifically mentioned as serving Babylon for seventy years, although becoming "a ruin and a waste." Also, the MT states that God will punish the Babylonian people and its king at the conclusion of the seventy years. This is further clarified in vs. 14 (missing from the LXX), where the text states that the Babylonians will become slaves of many nations, even as they have made slaves of many nations. Thus, upon a comparison with 29:10, the MT—while referring to the seventy years in a different

[14]For an excellent discussion on the textual nature of Jeremiah, see Emanuel Tov, "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah," in Bogaert, pp. 146-167.

context and containing different details—does not disagree with that text's understanding of the seventy years.

In the LXX the picture is different, however, wherein vss. 11 and 12 read as follows (my translation):

> And all the land shall be a desolation, and they will serve among the nations seventy years. And when the seventy years are fulfilled, I will punish that nation, says the Lord, and I will make them an everlasting desolation.

According to this tradition, "they" (the Judeans) will serve among the nations seventy years (instead of the nations serving Babylon for this time period). The expression "that nation" must refer to the unnamed "family from the north" (vs. 9: *tēn patrian apo borra*), which would refer to Babylon (even though the LXX does not mention Babylon by name in this passage). Thus, the only significant difference between the LXX of these verses and either the LXX or the MT of 29:10 is that the Judeans would serve "among the nations" for a period of seventy years. Otherwise, the two texts agree.

*A Broader Context in Jeremiah*

At this point it is important to notice whether there is any information within Jeremiah which points to a literal or a symbolic interpretation of the seventy years. The word *šānāh* ("year") occurs forty-three times in Jeremiah, and thirty-two of these occurrences refer to dates which can be verified historically as referring to literal years.[15] Eight of the remaining eleven occurrences could well refer to literal years also (although four of these perhaps refer to a general period of time).[16] The remaining three occurrences are in the specific texts we are investigating as referring to the "seventy years" (25:11-12 [twice] and 29:10). None of the forty-three references is obviously symbolic in nature. Thus the evidence—on purely quantitative grounds—favors a literal interpretation.

But there is also another persuasive reason to take the seventy years as literal. In Jer 28:3, the prophet Hananiah prophesied that

[15]Cf. Jer 1:2, 3; 25:1, 3: 28:1, 16, and 17.

[16]The texts are Jer 11:23; 17:8; 23:12; 34:14 (2); 48:44; and 51:46 (2). Of these eight references, two (34:14) refer to actual (though non-specified) years, and four (11:23; 17:8; 23:12; and 48:44) favor a literal interpretation.

the vessels from the temple would be brought back to Jerusalem within two years. He then stated (vs. 11) that God would break the yoke of King Nebuchadnezzar over the nations within two years. But Jeremiah later told Hananiah that the latter would die "this very year" (vs. 16: *haššānāh ʾatāh*) because he advocated rebellion. So instead of Hananiah's prophecy being fulfilled in two *years*, he himself died in two *months* (cf. vss. 1 and 17).

Apparently at a not-much-earlier date, Jeremiah had attacked this same false prophecy (cf. 27:16-22; 28:1). But in doing so, Jeremiah prophesied that the vessels of the temple would not be brought back "shortly" (*ʿatāh meʰhērāh*) as the false prophets had declared (27:16); instead, they would remain in Babylon "until the day" (*ʿaḏ yôm*) that God would give attention to them. Then God would "bring them back and restore them" (vs. 22).

In the episode in chap. 28 we find two prophets in conflict. Hananiah had predicted two years or less as the remainder of the exile (28:3, 11). But four years previously (cf. 28:1 and 29:1-2) Jeremiah had already predicted that the exiles would not return to Jerusalem until the seventy years for Babylon had been fulfilled (29:10). On the basis of this comparison, it seems logical that just as the shorter period of two years was meant to be literal, so too the longer period of seventy years was meant to be literal.[17]

*2 Chronicles 36:20b-21*

Chronicles contains a new element relating to the interpretation of the seventy-year prophecy of Jeremiah, and this element is the reference to the land enjoying its sabbaths while it lay desolate. There is here a direct reference to Lev 26:34-35 (see also vs. 43), which reads:

> Then the land shall enjoy its sabbaths as long as it lies desolate, while you are in your enemies' land; then the land shall rest, and enjoy its sabbaths. As long as it lies desolate it shall have rest, the rest which it had not in your sabbaths when you dwelt upon it.

[17]G. R. Driver, who states that Jeremiah foretold of a literal seventy-year desolation and ruin of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., illustrates what erroneous interpretations result when clear textual evidence is ignored (i.e., seventy years for *Babylon*). See "Sacred Numbers and Round Figures," in *Promise and Fulfillment*, ed. F. F. Bruce (Edinburgh, 1963), p. 62.

On the basis of this background from Leviticus, some expositors see the Chronicler as interpreting the seventy years to be seventy years of sabbaths, each sabbath standing for the sabbatical years (Lev 25:1-7) that had not been kept by the Israelites.[18] Thus, during the Babylonian exile, the land enjoyed the sabbaths of which it had been robbed.

Biblical translations of the text of 2 Chr 36:20b-21 itself are not unambiguous. For example, the RSV reads:

> . . . and they became servants to him and to his sons until the establishment of the kingdom of Persia, to fulfil the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed its sabbaths. All the days that it lay desolate it kept sabbath, to fulfil seventy years.

Here the seventy years apparently refer to the time in which the land, while desolate, was enjoying its sabbaths. According to the immediate context (36:17-19), the desolation began when this particular exile began (vs. 20). This was at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem (vs. 19) in 586 B.C.

The NIV translation, however, is less clearcut. It reads as follows:

> . . . they became servants to him and his sons until the kingdom of Persia came to power. The land enjoyed its sabbath rests; all the time of its desolation it rested, until the seventy years were completed in fulfillment of the word of the LORD spoken by Jeremiah.

Here the translators have radically shifted the reference to Jeremiah's prophecy from the beginning to the end of vs. 21, thereby relating it explicitly to "the" seventy years. Thus, the seventy years do not necessarily refer to the period of time that the land rested; instead, the translation appears to state that the land rested until Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years *ended.*

There is some evidence, however, which indicates that the intent of the latter translation is correct. First, we must query as to which prophecy of Jeremiah—25:11-12 or 29:10— the Chronicler is

[18]E.g., see Whitley, "Captivity," p. 68.

referring. The Chronicler views the service of the Judeans to the King of Babylon until the time of the Persian rule a fulfillment of this prophecy. On the one hand, both the MT and the LXX of 25:11-12 refer to the end of Babylon at the end of the seventy years (although this is not explicit in the LXX), but only the LXX specifically mentions the exile as lasting seventy years. On the other hand, Jer 29:10 refers to the end of Babylon (MT and LXX), but it does not specifically underscore servitude for seventy years (although this seems to be implied). Only the MT of Jer 25:14 refers to other nations enslaving Babylon. And only Jer 29:10 refers to the return of the Jews from exile.

The best solution appears to be that the Chronicler conflated Jer 27:7 ("All the nations shall serve him and his son and his grandson, until the time of his own land comes; then many nations and great kings shall make him their slave") and 29:10. All of the elements in 2 Chr 36 relating to the seventy years are contained in these two texts. Also, Jer 29:10 seems to be the clearest source for the Chronicler (as opposed to 25:11-12) because it differentiates between the end of the seventy years and the return of the exiles afterwards. This the Chronicler picks up in 36:22-23, where he records that Cyrus issued a decree for the return of the exiles "that the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah might be accomplished" (vs. 22). The Hebrew of this phrase is exactly the same as in 36:21, except for the use of *likl̲ôṯ* ("to complete, finish, end") in vs. 22 instead of *l<sup>e</sup>mallôṯ* ("to fulfill") in vs. 21. This implies that the Chronicler realized that Jeremiah's prophecy contained two distinct parts: the seventy years (which pertained to Babylon) and the return from exile (which was contingent on the end of the seventy years). Thus, while the overthrow of Babylon fulfilled (*mālē'*) Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years, Cyrus' decree completed or accomplished (*kālāh*) this prophecy by allowing for the return of the exiles.

A second and stronger reason as to why the intent of the NIV translation of 2 Chr 36:20b-21 is superior relates to the literary structure of the passage. In this passage there are two sets of parallel clauses either beginning with *ʿaḏ* or *l<sup>e</sup>mallôṯ*. Displaying the text according to a quasi-poetic style (in order to highlight the parallels) results in the following (my translation):

| *Line* | |
|---|---|
| 1 | **And they were servants to him and his sons** |
| 2 | **until (*ʿaḏ*) the reign of the kingdom of Persia** |
| 3 | **in order to fulfill (*lᵉmallôṯ*) the word** |
| 4 | **of the LORD in the mouth of Jeremiah** |
| 5 | **until (*ʿaḏ*) the land enjoyed its sabbaths** |
| 6 | **(all the days of its desolation** |
| 7 | **it kept sabbath)** |
| 8 | **in order to fulfill (*lᵉmallôṯ*) seventy years** |

Line 2 completes the thought of line 1, while lines 3-4 further clarify lines 1 and 2. Line 5, which starts with the same word as line 2, must be parallel to it. Precedent for this type of parallelism can be found in Exod 16:35:

**And the people of Israel ate the manna forty years,**
**till (*ʿaḏ*) they came to a habitable land;**
**they ate the manna,**
**till (*ʿaḏ*) they came to the border of the land of Canaan.**

This parallelism can also be seen in Jer 1:3:

**It came also in the days of Jehoiakim . . . ,**
**and until (*ʿaḏ*) the end of the eleventh year**
**of Zedekiah, the son of Josiah, king of Judah,**
**until (*ʿaḏ*) the captivity of Jerusalem**
**in the fifth month.**

One more example of this type of parallelism is in 2 Chr 36:16, a text only a few verses away from the text under discussion:

**But they kept mocking the messengers of God,**
**despising his words,**
**and scoffing at his prophets,**
**till (*ʿaḏ*) the wrath of the LORD rose**
**against his people,**
**till (*ʿaḏ*) there was no remedy.**

In all three examples, the second element beginning with "till/until" (*ʿaḏ*) parallels temporally the first element beginning with the same word. One assumes the case is the same in 2 Chr 36:20b-21.

Line 8 of 2 Chr 36:20b-21 is parallel to lines 3-4 not only linguistically (*lᵉmallôṯ*) but also conceptually (Jeremiah prophesied the seventy years). Therefore it makes sense to take lines 6-7 as a parenthetical element further explaining line 5. This appears to disassociate the "seventy years" from delineating the length of time

for the years of sabbath rest. In other words, the land completed its enjoyment of the sabbath rests (which had begun after the desolation of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.) by the time of Persia's conquest of Babylon, this latter event marking the end of the seventy-year "rule" of Babylon.

On the other hand, arguments which attempt to connect the seventy years to the sabbath rest as compensation for 490 years of neglect of the sabbath rest,[19] while attractive, cannot be supported from historical data and are hypothetical at best. While this criticism is based on an argument from silence, such an interpretation in any case skews the previous understanding of the implicit parallelisms within the text.

Thus one can conclude the following from 2 Chr 36:20b-21: (1) Jeremiah prophesied concerning the servitude of the Judeans to the Babylonians; (2) this servitude would end when the Persians came to power; (3) this same time marked the end of the period that the land enjoyed its sabbaths (i.e., the seventy years referred not to the duration of the time of desolation, but to the *end* of the period when the land enjoyed its sabbaths); (4) this *terminus* coincides with the end of Babylonian rule; and (5) the Chronicler apparently equated the end of the desolation of the land with the *beginning* of the rule of the Persians, even though the Judeans were still in exile at that time (the structure of the passage, at least, does not easily allow for a sharp distinction here). In any case, while the Chronicler has injected a new theological issue into the seventy-year prophecy (i.e., the sabbath rest of the land), he does not seem to have radically changed the meaning of Jeremiah's prophecy.

*Daniel 9:2*

The setting of Dan 9:2 is during the first year of Darius the Mede, the first person to rule Babylon after its overthrow (vs. 1). At this time Daniel understood the meaning of Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years (vs. 2), and this caused him to pray a prayer of confession and repentance (vss. 3-19).

Once again, modern translations of vs. 2 are rather ambiguous as far as the timing of the seventy years is concerned. For example, the NIV states that "the desolation of Jerusalem would last seventy years." This forces one to conclude that the seventy years are

[19]Ibid.

symbolic, for Jerusalem by no accounts was desolate for seventy years. On the other hand, the RSV translates the verse so that the seventy years "must pass before the end of the desolations of Jerusalem." This translation at least leaves open the possibility that the seventy years were completed *before* the end of Jerusalem's desolation (i.e., that the end of the desolation of Jerusalem was understood to be contingent upon the end of the seventy years).

And again there is the question as to the text to which Daniel was referring: Was it Jer 25:11-12 or 29:10? It would seem that Jer 29:10 was the source, since this text was part of a letter sent to the exiles (29:1), whereas Jer 25:11-12 was not. Also, Daniel's exile to Babylon during the third year of Jehoiakim (Dan 1:1-6) would seem to have denied him the opportunity to have heard Jeremiah's first mention of the seventy years, for this occurred during the fourth year of Jehoiakim (Jer 25:1).[20] On the other hand, however, neither Jer 25:11-12 nor 29:10 specifically mentions the desolation of Jerusalem, although both 25:11 (referring to the land) and Dan 9:2 contain forms of the root *ḥrb* ("to desolate/desolation").

An even more crucial question (and one which is easier to answer) is whether the end of the seventy years—from the standpoint of Dan 9—is still future or not. The evidence supports the view that it is past and not future.[21] For one thing, "the number" (LXX: *ton arithmon*) of years in 9:2 alludes to Dan 5, where vs. 26 of the LXX states that the time of Belshazzar's kingdom has been numbered (*ērithmētai ho chronos sou tēs basileias*).[22] The Aramaic of this verse—*mᵉnē᾽ mᵉnāh ᾽elāha᾽ malḵûṯāḵ* ("MENE, God has numbered the days of your kingdom")—means virtually the same. This fact plus the fact that *arithmeō* and *arithmos* occur only in Dan 5 and 9 becomes more significant when one realizes that: (1) the seventy years in Jeremiah—especially in 29:10—refer specifically

[20]Of course, it cannot be proved that this text of Jeremiah did not arrive in Babylon at a later date. It is problematical that Jeremiah's prophecy in chap. 25 does not even assume a previous attack against Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

[21]For those who view the seventy years as future, see, e.g., Jacques Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9: An Exegetical Study," *AUSS* 17 (1979):1-22 (reprinted in *The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies*, eds. Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Lesher [Washington, D.C., 1981], pp. 251-276, esp. p. 255); and William H. Shea, "The Relationship Between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9," in Wallenkampf and Lesher, pp. 228-250, esp. p. 239.

[22]Cf. vs. 17 (LXX).

to the end of Babylon; (2) Dan 5 refers to the end of the Babylonian empire; and (3) Dan 9 occurs shortly after its end.

Also, the urgent confessional nature of Daniel's prayer in 9:3-19 makes more sense when one understands the seventy years to be in the past. With the fact that Jer 29:10 explicitly relates the seventy years to Babylon (and Dan 5 implicitly supports this view), it is no wonder that Daniel, in the first year of Darius the Mede, prayed a prayer of confession on behalf of all the exiles. The reason for this is clear: although the seventy years for Babylon were past, the exiles were still in Babylon. Thus, Daniel understood the return of the exiles to be contingent upon the end of Babylon as an independent nation. But the sins of all Israel (vss. 4-15) had delayed the fulfillment of this part of the prophecy. Daniel was thus attempting to remove the last impediment to the return of the exiles by his prayer on behalf of Israel.[23]

This understanding—that the seventy years were over—clarifies several things in Dan 9. First, whatever Daniel considered the relation between the seventy years and the desolation of Jerusalem to have been in Jeremiah,[24] the fact remained that though the seventy years were over, the desolation continued. In other words, whatever *should* have been the case had *not* been the case, and thus Daniel's prayer received its impetus from this fact. Second, the repetition of the phrase "in the first year" (9:2), referring to Darius' reign, becomes understandable when one realizes that Daniel was stunned by the fact that the exiles were still in Babylon *after* the overthrow of Babylon. And third, the reason for Daniel's plea for God to "delay not" (vs. 19) becomes apparent when one adopts a terminated framework for the seventy years, whereas the alternative—the seventy years as *about* to end—would, in the light of this plea, appear to portray Daniel as impatient, demanding, and distrustful of God's promises.

From the preceding discussion, one can see that Dan 9:2 does not demand the seventy years to be related to the desolation of Jerusalem historically. Also, Dan 5 sharply reduces the arguments

[23]See W. Sibley Towner, "Retributional Theology in the Apocalyptic Setting," *USQR* 26 (1971):209-211; and André Lacocque, "The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9," *HUCA* 47 (1976):123-124.

[24]The question concerning the reinterpretation of the seventy years as seventy heptads of years in Dan 9 (see, e.g., F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran*

that Daniel understood the seventy years to be symbolic in nature. Thus, the book of Daniel certainly *allows* the seventy years to be understood as literal.

### 3. *Conclusion*

In this article I have sought to demonstrate that an analysis of Jer 25:11-12, Jer 29:10, 2 Chr 36:20b-21, and Dan 9:2 produces three items of significance for the interpretation of the seventy years. First, the seventy years dealt primarily with Babylon (especially in the MT of Jeremiah), and the return from exile was understood to be contingent on its fulfillment. Second, the seventy years in Jeremiah seem best suited to a literal period of time. And third, 2 Chr 36:20b-21 and Dan 9:2 do not necessitate a symbolic understanding of the seventy years. In the concluding article, I will inquire as to whether the foregoing analysis is verified by historical data.

---

*Texts* [Grand Rapids, MI, 1959], pp. 7-8, 15, and 60-61) is not under discussion here. Rather, I am concerned with Daniel's original understanding of the seventy-year prophecy.

# ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
# DOCTORAL DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS

Andrews University doctoral dissertations are microfilmed by University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. Some dissertations will also have been published in dissertation series (e.g., the Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series), and in such cases, the pertinent information will be noted in connection with the abstract printed herein.

## DESECRATION AND DEFILEMENT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Author and Degree: **Nilton Dutra Amorim, Ph.D.**
Date When Dissertation Completed: September 1985.
Adviser: Richard M. Davidson.

*(**Nilton Dutra Amorim** is currently a member of the Religion Faculty of Adventist University of Central Africa, Rwanda.)*

***Problem.*** The Hebrew roots *ḥll* and *ṭm'* have been translated interchangeably by the terms "desecration" and "defilement." Since the root *ḥll* is used in opposition to the root *qdš*, while *ṭm'* stands in opposition to *ṭhr*, it remained to be investigated whether the equation is justified because they appear in parallel or whether they should be visualized as belonging to two different realms and having different meanings.

***Method.*** My approach was basically a synchronical word study. All the appearances of the roots *ḥll* and *ṭm'* in the OT were analyzed. The roots *ḥnp* and *g'l*, as well as some secondary roots related to the subject, were also investigated. Consideration was given to texts where the idea of desecration or defilement was present although the terminology was absent. The literature of the ancient Near Eastern cultures was investigated to establish to what extent their concepts of desecration and defilement were similar or not to those of Israel.

***Results.*** This investigation showed that the ancient Near Eastern cultures had a developed concept of defilement, recognized by the emphasis placed on purification. Their idea of holiness, however, lacked the majestic dimension found in Israel. As a result, their concept of desecration was limited to its taboo dimension.

The study of the Hebrew roots *ḥll*, *ṭm'*, and other secondary roots revealed that they are used for different purposes in the OT. Textual evidence shows that the biblical writers moved from *ḥll* to *ṭm'*, depending on the object visualized or the emphasis intended. While holy tangible

realities may be desecrated and defiled, intangible realities such as the Sabbath, the Name, and Yahweh are not affected by defilement. The expression *ḥll* knows no sources of uncleanness, as is the case of *ṭmʾ*; rather, *ḥll* action deprives something or someone of holiness, while *ṭmʾ* adds to such a defiling dimension. While *ḥll* may have Yahweh as subject or object, *ṭmʾ* acts have no effect on him, nor does he perform *ṭmʾ* activity.

***Conclusion.*** The roots *ḥll* and *ṭmʾ* have different meanings in the OT, and their equation does not seem justified. Consequently, *ḥll* should be rendered basically by the word "desecration," while *ṭmʾ* by the term "defilement."

## FAITH AND WORKS IN ELLEN G. WHITE'S DOCTRINE OF THE LAST JUDGMENT

Author and Degree: **Jairyong Lee, Ph.D.**
Date When Dissertation Completed: September 1985.
Adviser: Hans K. LaRondelle.

*(**Jairyong Lee** is currently a member of the Theology Faculty of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary of the Far East in the Philippines.)*

This dissertation investigates the relationship between faith and works as the ground of the last judgment in the thought of Ellen G. White.

Chap. 1 provides the basic introduction to this research, and chap. 2 sketches the historical and theological milieu of the Adventist movement in nineteenth-century North America as the background for the formation of Ellen White's concept of the last judgment. As one of the ardent followers of William Miller, Ellen White had been influenced considerably by Millerite leaders in the formation of her eschatological foundation. Many of her own positions related to the judgment scene, such as the Day-of-Atonement theme, the pre-Advent investigative judgment, and the end-time warning message of Rev 14. These came to her as a result of her diligent Bible study and that of other Adventist pioneers.

Chap. 3 sets forth the various aspects of the last judgment as expressed in White's writings. Her concept of the last judgment has been analyzed both thematically and chronologically, with emphasis on her unique contribution to Adventist society. In contrast to Protestant theologians contemporary with her, White viewed the last judgment of God in three distinctive phases: (1) pre-Advent investigative judgment; (2) millennial consultative judgment; and (3) postmillennial executive judgment.

Chap. 4 discusses White's views on the soteriological and eschatological aspects of the last judgment. She consistently acknowledged faith as the indispensable factor in the sinner's experience of justification before God. Nevertheless, she did not deny the importance of works in determining man's eternal destiny of either salvation or destruction.

Chap. 5 summarizes the materials elucidated in chaps. 2, 3, and 4, and provides some conclusions that have emerged as to White's position on the relationship of faith and works in the last judgment. She advocated righteousness by faith (apart from works) but also considered that the last judgment would be on the basis of works, inasmuch as in that judgment human beings would be judged according to their works as the fruit that gives evidence of either their faith or their non-faith.

SLOW TO UNDERSTAND: THE DISCIPLES IN SYNOPTIC PERSPECTIVE

Author and Degree: ***Bertram L. Melbourne, Ph.D.***
Date When Dissertation Completed: July 1986.
Adviser: Abraham Terian.

*(**Betram L. Melbourne** is currently a member of the Religion Faculty of Columbia Union College, Takoma Park, Maryland.)*

The problem of the portrayal of the disciples of Jesus has been the focus of much scholarly investigation. Discussion has been pursued primarily from the Marcan perspective, in keeping with its assumed priority. Consequently, Mark is seen as creating the disciples' incomprehension to serve his theological intent. The correctness of this notion is questioned in this study, which seeks to determine whether incomprehension was an authentic experience of Jesus' original disciples, and whether slowness of understanding was to be expected in teaching and learning contexts.

In chap. 1, recent scholarship on the disciples is surveyed to identify the main issues, approaches, trends, and scope of the ongoing debate. A Synoptic approach to the motif of incomprehension is proposed because of the unsettled question of Marcan priority, the equally—if not at times more—disparaging portrayal of the disciples in the other Synoptics, and the need to explain the tradition history of the seemingly negative portrayal of the disciples.

Next, the ascription of the prevailing image of the disciples to Mark, or the extent to which the prevailing image is Marcan, is questioned (1) in light of the parallel pericopae dealing with the disciples in the other Synoptics, whose authors may no longer be seen as mere redactors of Mark, and (2) by tracing the tradition history of disciples' initial incomprehension, and eventual understanding when hearing and sight converge. These concerns are treated in chaps. 2 and 3, respectively.

In the first instance, it was found that the respective portraits of the disciples in each of the Synoptics seem to betray a well-established tradition from which it was difficult—if not impossible—to break away. In the second instance, it became evident that this tradition is recognizable in the common terms and concepts of comprehension/incomprehension in OT theophanic and didactic contexts and in later canonical and extra-canonical Jewish writings of the Second-Temple period as well as in Greek literature, especially in texts relating to Greek *paideia*.

The convergence of hearing and sight for comprehension seems to be a recurring feature in Jewish writings and in Greek literature, and the conclusion in chap. 4 of this dissertation is that a more accurate image of the disciples emerges when these observations are brought to bear upon the Synoptics.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Baez-Camargo, Gonzalo. *Archaeological Commentary on the Bible.* Translated by American Bible Society. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1984. 288 pp. $17.95. (A Doubleday-Galilee Book edition was published by Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1986. 288 pp. Paperback, $9.95.)

This archaeological commentary by Gonzalo Baez-Camargo was first published in Spanish in 1979. In the preface to the English edition the author states that the book was written "with a modest end in view" (p. xiii). Its original purpose was to provide an "elementary knowledge of biblical archaeology" (p. xiii) for the Spanish-speaking student of the Bible who did not have ready access to current information, most of which is found in publications which are not in Spanish.

With those limitations, the book is probably of greater value in its Spanish edition than in its English translation. The approach followed is to provide a commentary on selected biblical passages from Genesis to Revelation in chapter-and-verse order based on relevant archaeological findings. In order to avoid unnecessary repetition, which this kind of an approach easily could lead to, adequate cross-referencing has been used in most entries.

A significant omission in a book which follows this approach is failure to include a general archaeological introduction to each book of the Bible. In this volume, such introductions could well have been utilized to describe the cultural setting, and thus an otherwise much-neglected aspect of modern archaeology could have been given a more significant place.

In most cases Baez-Camargo summarizes differing interpretations of archaeological findings. In this respect he provides a generally fair representation of ideas, allowing the student to draw his own conclusions.

This book is too general, however, to be of significant value for anyone but the serious lay-person who wants to learn what archaeology has contributed to the understanding of certain biblical passages. Nevertheless, the English edition does meet the original expectations of the Spanish edition—namely, to provide archaeological information to persons who do not have easy access to the professional literature in biblical archaeology. The book could also be used effectively by a gospel minister desiring quick reference to archaeology on a specific text, though in most cases the information would not be adequate, and further reading would be necessary. The bibliographical references usually found at the end of each entry provide an introduction to the relevant literature.

In the process of translating the book from Spanish, some unfortunate transliterations have been allowed to slip through. One such is the Arabic word *yebel*, which in English transliteration should have been *jebel* (p. 34).

This volume provides no attempt to distinguish between textual evidence and archaeological evidence, a procedure which seems to have limited the extent to which each of these disciplines could have been used. To write an archaeological commentary on the Bible is a very ambitious enterprise, especially by a person who is not primarily involved in archaeology. And though the work is of only limited value to the serious student, when we remember its original intent it is not an altogether unhappy result.

Andrews University J. BJØRNAR STORFJELL

Carmignac, Jean. *La naissance des Évangiles Synoptiques.* 2d ed. Paris: O.E.I.L., 1984. 120 pp. Paperback, fr. 80.00.

In this monograph Carmignac presents the first results of twenty years of research on the Hebrew of NT times. After his prolonged immersion in the Hebrew of Qumran, he has come to the firm conviction that Mark, Matthew, and most of the sources for the Gospel of Luke were originally written in a Semitic language. Accordingly, our actual Synoptics are but Greek translations of these Semitic originals, little more than a *décalque littérale* (p. 10) of the Hebrew or Aramaic documents.

Although the author states that the identity of the original language is secondary to his thesis (p. 76), he definitely favors the Hebrew hypothesis. He sees his view confirmed by numerous retroversions of the Gospels "back into Hebrew," listing these in chap. 2. In fact, Carmignac is an expert in this kind of translations, being also editor of an excellent series of reprints of Hebrew translations of the Gospels called *Traductions Hébraiques des Evangiles* (published thus far through vol. 4 [Brepols, 1982]). However, he acknowledges that in order to ascertain whether the Semitisms are Hebrew or whether they are Aramaic will require further study.

In chap. 3 the author expresses his theory on the origin of the Gospels, based mainly upon arguments from Semitisms. After recognizing the difficulty of establishing certain Semitisms, he classifies three groups that are considered the supporters of his thesis. There are, first of all, what he calls the "Semitisms of composition"—that is to say, those which are made evident by the fact that the Greek text would not have its present form if it had not been composed originally in a Semitic language. This might explain, e.g., the connection between "stones" and "children" in Matt 3:9

and Luke 3:8,if the original text had a Hebrew word-play between *ʾabānīm* and *bānīm* (pp. 38-39).

Second, there are some "Semitisms of transmission." These are made evident when two different wordings of our Greek Gospels are explained by an apparent confusion in the reading of a Hebrew or Aramaic text. Thus, the parallel texts of Matt 13:17 and Luke 10:24 are almost identical, except for one word: Matthew has δίκαιοι, whereas Luke has βασιλεῖς. There is no theological reason for this surprising change, which is, however, easily explained if the original document had the word *WYSRYM* (Matthew) read by Luke as *WSRYM* (pp. 42-43).

There are, finally, some "Semitisms of translation," detected in Greek expressions betraying a Semitic form. For instance, Mark 9:49 has the strange phrase "salted by fire," which is obviously a non-Greek idiom. It may be explained if the original had the Aramaic form *mālaḥ*, a verb which has two roots, one meaning "to salt" and the other "to consume" (p. 44).

In spite of the numerous examples given, the author acknowledges that these may not be sufficiently convincing for the specialists. For them he promises to publish soon a more technical work in several volumes, with exhaustive lists and full discussions—an irrefutable proof for his thesis, the author assumes. (p. 50).

If in that fuller study Carmignac can demonstrate his thesis, the consequences for Gospel exegesis may be far-reaching. For if our Gospels were originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic instead of in Greek, the accepted dates of composition must be seriously revised, the relationship between the writers and the witnesses of Jesus becomes much closer, and the influences of Greek thought on the Gospel tradition would be drastically reduced. The author is well aware of the import of his arguments, particularly on the dating of the Gospels. His position (cf. "La datation des Evangiles. État actuel de la recherche," in *Dieu parle. Études sur la Bible et son interpretation*, Mélanges en hommage a Pierre Courthial, ed. Paul Wells [Aix en Provence: Kerygma, 1984], pp. 12-22) reflects that of J. A. T. Robinson (*Redating the New Testament* [London: S.C.M., 1976]) and Claude Tresmontant (*Le Christ Hébreu. La langue et l'age des Evangiles* [Paris: O.E.I.L., 1983]). Referring to Robinson and Tresmontant, Carmignac states: "We agree—he says—in rejecting the vicious circle by which the Gospels are dated on the basis of a supposed theological evolution, and then, the theological evolution is justified by the dating which it has put forward. We reach almost identical conclusions. Without any deliberate intention, our works complement each other and form a kind of trilogy" (pp. 94-95).

On the synoptic problem and the question of the formation of the Gospels, which Carmignac treats in chap. 4, his main conclusions are the following: (1) Mark, Matthew, and the sources of Luke were originally

written in a Semitic language. (2) This language is more probably Hebrew than Aramaic. (3) The third Gospel must have been written between A.D. 50 and 53, and therefore Matthew and Mark must be earlier—Mark around 42-45 and Matthew not later than 50 (p. 71). (4) The author of the Semitic Mark was probably Peter (a thesis that Carmignac fails to demonstrate). (5) The synoptic problem could be explained by an original Hebrew Gospel, namely this *Marc complete* (p. 55). (6) The common source of Mark and Luke are the *Logia* of Matthew. (7) The translator of Matthew used the text of Luke.

Carmignac endeavors to show, in chap. 5, that his conclusions are confirmed by the testimonies of Papias, Irenaeus, Panthene, Origen, and Eusebius (on the basis of *Hist. Eccl.*, 3.24.6 and 39.4, 15-16; 5.8.2-4, 9.1, and 10.1; and 6.25.3-5). In chap. 6 he lists forty-six important contemporary authors who also support the hypothesis of original Semitic Gospels (including E. Nestlé, F. Blass, E. A. Abbott, J. Wellhausen, C. C. Torrey, M. J. Lagrange, C. F. Burney, M. Black, L. Vaganay, R. L. Lindsey, G. Gander, F. Zimmermann, C. Tresmontant, etc.; pp. 77-92). He urges us to examine seriously the arguments of these authors, for it is all the more significant that many of them are Israelites (e.g., Z. H. P. Chajes, H. J. Schonfield, P. Winter, P. Lapide, D. Flusser, S. T. Lachs, etc.). These not only know the Hebrew language well, but are clearly excluded from having any particular interest in strengthening the historical value of the Gospels (p. 91). Carmignac concludes his study by stating that "this will be, I dare to hope, the basis for the exegesis of the Synoptic Gospels around the year 2000" (p. 96).

The author's challenging assertions have not left the scholarly world indifferent. Reactions soon appeared, and in May 1984 a second, revised edition of this book was published. The text revisions are of minor interest: suppression of a paragraph on p. 47; addition of a reference on p. 81 to Hubert Grimme, who advocated in 1911 a Hebrew origin for the songs of Luke; mention on p. 90 of F. Zimmermann, *The Aramaic Origin of the Four Gospels* (1979), and S. Muñoz Iglesias, *Les Cantiques de l'Evangile de l'Enfance selon Saint Luc* (1981), both of whom also favor a Hebrew origin for the songs of Luke; and on p. 95 the addition of fn. 3, where the author repeats the difficulty of proving a date after 70 for the writing of the Gospels, according to the results of the studies by Robinson and the Paderborn Congress (20-23 May 1982).

The most interesting feature of this second edition is the inclusion of an appendix (pp. 97-111) called *Réponse aux critiques*. Here the author defends his work against twenty-two sharp criticisms by Pierre Grelot in *Evangiles et tradition apostolique. Reflexions sur un certain "Christ Hébreu,"* Collection Apologique (Paris: Cerf, 1984), pp. 174-187. Grelot questions the value of all the Semitisms advocated by Carmignac, as well as Carmignac's interpretation of 2 Cor 3:14 and 8:18 (cf. J. Carmignac,

"2 Corinthiens 3, 6-14 et le début de la formation du Nouveau Testament," *NTS* 24 [1978]: 384-386). He also questions the value of the Papias' material on the *Logia* of Matthew, and disputes the value of Irenaeus *Hist. Eccl.* 3.1.1 as a witness to the Semitic origin of the Gospels. But his main criticism of Carmignac is that of "narrow fundamentalism," namely, of "working on the faith assurance of assuming *a priori* that the Gospel is true, and of applying himself to prove it historically" (pp. 178-179).

Carmignac replies to these charges with thought-provoking arguments, and with two relevant questions: first, if there are scientific arguments in favor of an early date for the writing of the Gospels, why not take them seriously? and second, if these arguments help an unbeliever to ponder about the historicity of Jesus, or if they strengthen the faith of a believer, will this result not be worthwhile?

Grelot concluded his series of ironical remarks by prophesying that in the year 2000 the theories of Carmignac "will lay in the graveyard of dead hypothesis" (p. 187). Carmignac, in turn, challenges Grelot to meet at that date (if both are still alive!) and verify then which of the two will have been the best prophet. We would hope that the stimulating discussion brought about by this little book will contribute to the clarification of some important areas of the Synoptic question long before that time.

Collonges-sous-Salève, France R. BADENAS

Gaede, S. D. *Where Gods May Dwell: On Understanding the Human Condition.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1985. 186 pp. Paperback, $7.95.

This book presents a simple but important argument: namely, that since all science is based on assumptions, a Christian should approach science from explicitly Christian assumptions. This is not the first of such arguments, but it is good to see it applied specifically to sociology, a field that in America definitely has Christian roots. The book is a welcome contribution to the age-old dialogue between religion and science, faith and reason. It is very readable with short chapters, easy language, and lively style. The author demonstrates broad knowledge of philosophy and of the history of both Christian and scientific thought, although he draws from such sources mainly to support his Christian apologetics.

The book is divided into two parts. Part A, "Thinking Christianly about the Social Sciences: A Question of Assumptions," examines the assumptions of science, their sources and implications (chaps. 1-4), and assesses the state of objective science in general and social science in particular (chaps. 5 and 6). Part B, "Toward a Christian Understanding of Human Relationships," is a case study of this mainstream sociological topic, outlining a framework that a Christian might use in examining the

subject. The original human condition is a "relational given"; sin brought about separation and thus a "relational problem" which presents a "relational dilemma" (chap. 7). One "illegitimate" solution to this dilemma is substitution by idolatry, humanism, or utilitarianism (chaps. 8 and 9). The other false solution is denial: humanism denies the transcendent, fatalism denies humanity, individualism denies our need for others, communalism denies our need for personal identity, naturism denies humanity's dominion over creation, and technologism denies the problem by trying to exercise absolute control over nature (chaps. 10-12). The conclusion (chap. 13 and epilogue) recapitulates what a Christian social science should be: namely, explicit, integrative, and based on biblical values.

This kind of social science is to be guided by the basic tenets of the Judeo-Christian faith, which Gaede boils down to three assumptions: (1) "God, as the Creator of the world, is greater than His creation"; (2) "the human being, as one aspect of God's creation, is inferior to the Creator"; and (3) humanity is fallen through "the existence and powerful influence of sin" (pp. 50-51). Gaede shows how modern science developed within these "Christian constraints," but how these constraints, seen as impediments to progress, were gradually eliminated through the influence of Enlightenment thought. "Objective science" thus became "arrogant" and "dogmatic," allowing only "naturalistic" interpretation and effectively pushing away any alternative framework.

The author's understanding of "objective science" is perhaps the greatest problem that this book poses. To him, objectivism is really naturalism (pp. 66-67); i.e., it sees the material universe as the sum total of reality and excludes belief in the supernatural. According to him, a Christian cannot follow the model of objective science and simply keep God in the background; to follow the value-neutral model is to be "seduced" into naturalism (p. 74). Gaede confesses having fallen into this trap himself in his earlier experience of social-science research. This equation of objectivism with naturalism, however, seems to be another assumption that the author does not discuss. An attempt to be objective does not *ipso facto* make the scientist a non-Christian, as Gaede seems to assume (e.g., p. 71); in fact, such an assumption belongs to the dualistic framework that he explicitly condemns (pp. 163-165).

Finite beings as we are, our understandings of God and this world are incomplete or even erroneous; if we are seriously searching for the truth, we must allow other interpretations besides our own. By comparison we come closer to the truth, but this implies a certain framework within which the different perceptions are interpreted. Christians hold the Bible as such a framework for matters of faith. Scientific theories have served that purpose for the findings of science. Gaede is right in claiming that science is still far from objective truth; theories and paradigms can change almost overnight. The fact that the scientific community eventually accepts a new

paradigm, however, shows objectivity in the search for truth. In Christianity, the Reformation could be seen as an introduction of another paradigm to the sphere of faith. In both spheres, science and faith, change has apparently come through objective investigation; without it, we would still believe in a flat earth or burn "witches"!

Both in matters of faith and in matters of knowledge, then, we see only "through the glass, darkly," and know only "in part" (1 Cor. 13:12). We are products of our history, and that historicity colors all our interpretations. At the same time, it is this positive prejudice that enables us to understand or interpret in the first place; we cannot interpret on a sterile ground, we interpret within our own frameworks with all their limitations and biases. This insight makes it all the more important to check our interpretations with those of other interpretive frameworks, a process that takes place not only in science but in all interpersonal association. Objectivity may not be possible, but we come closer to it by intersubjectivity, by trying to see with the eyes of another, perhaps a person with a different world view. Gaede himself could not have written such a penetrating analysis without the aid of objective science (how would he know what pantheism is?)!

There are some logical contradictions in this book. As one example, Gaede claims that because science is based on assumptions, its findings are relative (pp. 62-64), yet there is an implication that the findings of Christian science are absolute (at least, not relative) in spite of their assumptions. Looking from a larger perspective, this creates a problem: to someone with different assumptions, Christian science is relative, and within Christianity there are different assumptions and thus different findings. A Christian, however, need not be ashamed to admit that his or her findings are relative, because this need not mean that truth is relative, only our understanding of it is. As a second instance, Gaede portrays natural scientists as narrow-minded (no doubt true in many cases) and considers himself to be taking a broad-minded stand. This, however, leads him to another contradiction, as can be seen in the following statement: "A Christian social science does not require nonparticipating social scientists to operate on the basis of its assumptions. Nor does it deny the legitimacy of social science efforts constructed within other frameworks, though it certainly may deny their claims to truth" (pp. 160-161). How can there be legitimacy without claims to truth? In another place (p. 92) Gaede portrays the Christian scientist as one who is sifting through the findings of naturalistic science and taking what is applicable. If these findings are based on wrong assumptions, what use does the Christian have for any of them? This is simply an admission that scientific findings are not quite so bad as Gaede is portraying them to be.

One last point: the title of the book does not accurately reflect its content, for one would guess from the title that this is an existential treatise. The connection between the title and the content is indeed a bit

farfetched; only in one spot (p. 158) is there a suggestion that the "house where gods may dwell" is science. The subtitle at least could have been used to describe the content, which is the proposal of a Christian philosophy for social science.

In writing this book, Gaede undertook a challenge that has been a controversy of the ages. It is unrealistic to expect that he, or anyone else, could satisfactorily solve it. *Where Gods May Dwell,* however, is valuable as another Christian voice in the dialogue. It gives some creative insights and provokes thought, and can thus profit any Christian who wants seriously to examine the relationship between faith and science and the foundations upon which these rest.

Andrews University SARA M. K. TERIAN

Gladson, Jerry. *Who Said Life Is Fair? Job and the Problem of Evil.* Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1985. 127 pp. Paperback, $6.95.

The problem which Jerry Gladson deals with in this book goes beyond the mere academic world of reflections and information. The issue is not simply theological or philosophical, nor even exegetical, but rather one that concerns every one of us in daily life. It was to be expected, therefore, that the prologue which opens Gladson's study would draw its material from life—in this case, the unexpected and tragic death of a woman named Janet. Thus, we immediately immersed into a feeling of pain mixed with the consciousness of the overwhelming reality—"the abiding question"—of the meaning of suffering.

The author first considers briefly various attempts that have been made to deal with the question of theodicy. The Eastern view denies the reality of suffering. Augustine and Irenaeus assume it as a necessary condition—the former to guarantee freedom, the latter as a means to spiritual development. Process Philosophy sees the solution within a common struggle involving God, who runs the risk to love and thereby has no control at all over evil. Lastly, the "tragic view" interprets suffering as an inherent part of the human condition, meaningless and definitely pessimistic. Since none of these solutions "adequately explain" the problem of evil in God's world, Gladson turns to the book of Job, wherein the presumed solution will be reached.

Job, the victim of a "heavenly council" involving God and man, is crushed by successive trials which bereave him of all his wealth and children, and finally leave him sick and devastated. After some time of stoic submission, Job revolts and claims his innocence against God. His friends who had come to comfort him reject his view and contend that God cannot

be guilty, for suffering is interlocked with sin and cannot exist without sin. Their presentation follows a cycle. This cycle is revised by Gladson, who proposes what he considers to be a "more balanced structure": Eliphaz (chap. 22), Job (chaps. 23 and 24), Bildad (chaps. 25 and 26:5-14), Job (chaps. 26:1-4 and 27:1-12), and Zophar (chap. 27:13-23).

However alluring this new arrangement may be, it stumbles on the basis of the biblical text, which does not easily support this rearrangement. For instance, the passage in 26:5-14, which Gladson attributes to Bildad and not to Job as the MT suggests, relates to Job's discourse in 26:1-4 in terms of questions and answers. Also, the fact that 27:13-23 is a plea for the retribution of the wicked does not necessarily mean that it should come from one of the friends rather than from Job, for Job himself shares the same view in a number of passages (29:18-20; 21:5, 16, 30-31). At any rate, all the friends defend the same basic position, each with his own emphasis. Eliphaz argues on the basis of his own subjective and personal experience, Bildad appeals to tradition, and Zophar to the mystery of God.

As for Elihu, the "intruder," he also emphasizes the mysterious power he perceives in the work of Creation. Thus his discourses, instead of being artificial later additions, pave the ground to the next (and last) part of the book of Job; and they therefore belong to the literary corpus of the book.

The divine speeches include the poetic section of the book and convey the final answer to Job's problem. According to Gladson, these speeches elaborate three themes that provide the answer to human suffering: divine mystery, human limits, and divine presence. Thus, Gladson's solution to the plan of suffering is twofold. It is existential because it is disclosed from within the experience of the divine-human encounter, and it is also ethical since the ultimate answer still lies in God's hands. This tension indeed justifies the complexity of the problem. Yet, it is not certain whether Gladson has succeeded in conciliating the two apparently contradictory truths. It is also uncertain whether Gladson has really tackled the problem of suffering, since that problem remains unsolved.

Moreover, is it really certain that the need for a complete explanation for Job's plight vanishes in light of the divine presence? The question, as Gladson perceives it, is to know indeed whether God's comfort in the present life is answer enough for the problem of suffering. His thesis sounds quite theoretical, and one might also argue that on the contrary, the contact with the pure God might rather develop a perplexity towards evil in the suffering individual, thereby deepening that person's pain and revolt.

On another side, the eschatological perspective in the book of Job seems to have escaped Gladson, who only hints at it in passing or deals with it too briefly (pp. 20, 63, 124). The reference to Creation in God's discourses (chaps. 38-47), the explicit mention of Resurrection in 13:25-27, the strange heavenly scenery occurring in a special day (*hayyom* 1:6, 2:1; cf.

Rachi), and the presence of Satan in a context full of forensic terminology—all these elements may well indicate another direction in the interpretation of the book of Job.

Gladson's concern to provide an answer to suffering, already in existence, has led him to neglect the tragic dimension of suffering. Even the epilogue in the book of Job does not portray a complete restoration, for Job's former children are still dead. And the final problem of death for Job himself remains, as well, for the book ends with his death.

Gladson also ignores the philosophical contribution made by the tragic approach (p. 19). We may at least mention the after-war existentialist philosophy of Søren Kierkegaard and the philosophy of the absurd of Albert Camus and Maurice Friedman. Furthermore, it is not true that this tragic consciousness of human plight is rooted only in the "crisis of belief" proper to today's world. The Midrashim (*Baba Bathra* 14b, 17a), and the Zohar (1134a) have defended the position long before the modern movement—and this without questioning God's existence.

Indeed, the problem which Gladson engages is complex. Therefore a sharp, clear, and definitive answer would be suspect. Gladson never traps himself by using dogmatic statements. Rather, by means of simple language that is always in touch with concrete life, he follows the book of Job step by step, providing his reader with many insights along the way.

This volume is worth reading, as it appeals for humility with regard to one of the most complex issues of human life. And valuable too is the challenge that it gives to further thinking and research.

Andrews University JACQUES DOUKHAN

Holmes, C. Raymond. *Sing a New Song: Worship Renewal for Adventists Today*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1984. 190 pp. Paperback, $9.95.

*Sing a New Song* is only the second book written that deals with worship by and for Seventh-day Adventists. By the paucity of publishing on this subject, it may be concluded that the subject is unworthy of consideration, that the Adventist Church is so well informed and practices such beautiful and meaningful services of worship that writing about worship is unnecessary, or that the church and particularly the ministry lacks enough interest in the subject of worship to make it a priority or even a minor concern. A lack of concern for practical and effective worship has been obvious in a variety of ways in most Adventist worship services, at least in North America.

What is the meaning of worship? How is worship to be conducted in order to make it consequential to the congregation? What elements of

worship are the necessary integral parts for a service for Seventh-day Adventists? What constitutes the significant interrelations of Scripture, prayer, preaching, and singing? What form must worship take in order for it to be provocative and stimulating, spiritual or mystical? Are there facets of religious action that do not suffice in divine worship? Holmes' book is a noble and satisfying attempt to answer these questions among others, along with presenting a definitive, affirmative, and realistic rationale for divine worship.

Holmes begins his book by placing Adventist worship in the perspective of the liturgical revival of the past thirty years. Much excess in excitement and experimentation has characterized worship in mainline churches as evidenced by their delving into glossolalia, faith healing, and exorcism. However, amidst these extremes the Adventist Church has maintained a stability due to its adherence to the biblical message and to the strong influence of the writings of Ellen White, a co-founder of the denomination. Important factors relative to worship include people rather than ritual, variety rather than monotonous tedium, gathering together in mutual concern rather than individualistic separatism. There has been a growing interest in the arts among Adventists. Churches are being erected which relate various theological/ liturgical teachings to design and building materials. Furthermore, dedicated musicians in cooperation with the ministry of the word are endeavoring to plan worship services that touch both heart and mind, the emotions and the intellect.

In defining the liturgical mission of the church, the ultimate goal of worship is a confrontation with God as known in Christ. What is done in worship must grow out of what is believed and taught. This requires prayerful thought and careful planning, with no allowance for indifference or apathy, whim or fancy. By means of the worship service, the church has a great opportunity to proclaim God's truth through a meaningful liturgy. In the Adventist context, that liturgy should define the three distinctive doctrines of the Adventist Church: (1) the Sabbath, (2) the heavenly ministry of Christ, and (3) the second coming of Christ. How this is to be done leaves opportunity for innovation and creativity with the help of an active worship committee elected by the congregation. Holmes devotes a complete chapter to each of these distinctive concepts.

The focus of Adventist worship Holmes extracts from Rev 4 and 5. The human being's position before God is that of obeisance. There is no glorification of man; man glorifies God! Ellen White affirms that man's rightful position before God is on his knees.

What is the Adventist logic for baptism and the Lord's Supper, two sacraments which follow the traditions of early Christianity? At times, these worship offerings are accepted rather matter-of-factly or superficially, but Holmes delineates the broader, deeper significance of these services, not only as one participates and the church witnesses, but also as God interacts in declaring the consecrated to be his sons and daughters.

What should be the order of worship services? Again Holmes reiterates the three above-mentioned doctrines which reflect the unity of belief of the Adventist Church, and he indicates that unity should be apparent in an orderly progression toward a predetermined goal supported by the Holy Spirit. Within this order or form of worship, there are these timeless truths that must always speak to the times. There is also a certain freedom that may be exercised within the restraints imposed by the Holy Spirit and the Scriptures.

Music, the anthem, choral and congregational responses, the hymn—these are all means by which worship may be heightened and the congregation exhilarated in its faith in, and praise to, God. In fact, a congregation often reveals its spiritual temperature by the quality of its congregational singing, whether enthusiastic or impoverished. Music in worship is not for entertainment; rather, it is for fostering spirituality, and in so doing it provides a degree of intensity unobtainable through the spoken word alone. Therefore, congregational singing is second to no other type of music among the acts of worship. Hymn singing has a unifying effect as an expression of corporate affirmation of faith, but also teaches the doctrines of the church. For that reason the choice of hymns is crucial: not only must singability and musical excellence be considered, but theological content must be scripturally accurate.

After writing on Worship and Footwashing, Child Dedications, Preaching, Evangelism and Culture, Holmes puts to his book a grand "Amen": Worship and Human Response. When the worship service in the Lord's house is concluded, "I leave the sanctuary only to discover that I am still in the same old world. But I am not the same old man. I have had a transfusion of spiritual nourishment that provides power and life. I can face life anew, reformed, refreshed, refilled, revived, and return once again to my tasks and responsibilities while waiting for the return of my Lord. I am a new man in Christ and I sing a new song!" (p. 160).

Three appendices close the book: (1) suggested order of worship with spoken and sung responses, (2) selected comments on worship by Ellen G. White, and (3) a glossary of liturgical terms.

Every Seventh-day Adventist leader of worship should make an in-depth study of the contents of this book. Included in the volume is material that will reappoint the direction of true divine worship for the Seventh-day Adventist Church, but that can surely be instructive as well for congregations in other denominations. This material, digested and put into practice, can revitalize and energize worship services with mental and spiritual vigor. Indeed, no minister should let the message of this book go unheeded!

Andrews University C. WARREN BECKER

LaRondelle, Hans K. *Deliverance in the Psalms: Messages of Hope for Today*. Berrien Springs, MI: First Impressions, 1983. vii + 210 pp. $12.50/$8.50.

In *Deliverance in the Psalms*, Hans K. LaRondelle has accomplished what few in the spate of modern treatments of the Psalms have achieved: He has succeeded in penetrating into the inner essence of the Psalms in such a way as to lay bare the very heart-throb and animating spirit of their message. With rare artistry LaRondelle combines sound scholarship with profound spiritual and homiletical sensitivity to the Prayers and Praises of Israel.

The book is also effective and refreshing in its pedagogical approach. Four introductory chapters introduce the reader respectively to "The Religious Significance of the Psalms," "The Origin and Classification of the Psalms," "The Poetic Style and Its Meaning," and "Theological Structures of the Psalms." Then follow expositions of eighteen psalms (Pss 1, 2, 7, 11, 12, 15, 19, 22, 24, 27, 32, 46, 50, 65, 73, 103, 104, 110) which illustrate and elucidate the conclusions of the introductory chapters and which focus in particular upon the theme of deliverance—the "divine assurance of the ultimate triumph of justice on the earth and the establishment of the peaceful kingdom of God" (p. 2).

Only a few of the rich insights that emerge from this most provocative and practical guide to the Psalms can be highlighted here. In the chapter on the Psalms' religious significance, the author points out the unique role of the Psalms in Scripture as "the heartbeat of Israel's religion" (p. 3), in which "one can look into the hearts of the Hebrew saints" and also "into the heart of God" (p. 4). The Psalms, in their fivefold division regarded by Jews as "Israel's echo of faith to the five books of Moses" (p. 4), are shown to have as their purpose "teaching all men how to worship God in spirit and truth, how to pray effectual prayers, in what spirit to bring sacrifices in the Temple, how to interpret the natural world around us, and the meaning of Israel's laws and stirring history" (p. 5). LaRondelle especially points to the testimonies of praise as reflecting "the very essence of life to Israel" (p. 7) and to the "mysterious surplus value" (p. 9) finding fulfillment in the Messiah.

Chap. 2, along with providing a helpful survey of the origin and classification of the Psalms, contains what I consider the most profound and satisfying approach to the Imprecatory Psalms to be found anywhere in print. This analysis (pp. 19-23) alone is well worth the price of the book. The third chapter introduces the reader to the basic elements of Hebrew poetry, including clear examples and explanations of parallelism, chiasm, stanza division, and acrostic. Chap. 4 highlights major theological structures of the Psalms. Particularly rewarding here is the author's treatment of the Psalms' theocentric "groundplan of dividing all men into two

contrasting categories or classes: the righteous and the wicked" (p. 31). Building upon this understanding of the groundplan, LaRondelle further explores what he has treated previously in his published dissertation *Perfection and Perfectionism* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1979), pp. 109-158—namely, that the way of Israel's redemptive experience centered in the sanctuary. (The menorah pictured on the book cover appears to symbolize this sanctuary-centered, salvific orientation.)

The exposition of individual psalms that comprises the bulk of the book gives evidence of how intimately and intensely the author himself has "lived" with these psalms. The reader is ushered in, as it were, to a palace of theological treasure with each psalm, and is served a sumptuous feast of spiritual delicacies. Each psalm is not only plumbed for exegetical/theological and spiritual/homiletical riches, but compared with, and illuminated by, companion psalms and other OT and NT passages, revealing the theocentric/Christocentric focus and organic unity of Scripture as a whole.

Worthy of special attention is the author's treatment of Pss 1 and 2, the "Doorkeepers" of the Psalms. LaRondelle shows how these two psalms expound respectively the two central pillars of Israel's existence, the Torah and the Messiah—or in Christian terms, the Law and the Gospel, the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Furthermore, he clarifies how Ps 2 has a threefold Christological application in the NT, paralleling the three phases of Jesus' redemptive ministry (inauguration, rulership, final judgment).

Several striking points of emphasis in connection with other psalms may be briefly noted: The exposition of Ps 7 offers a key to the proper understanding of the so-called "Psalms of Innocence"; Ps 15 is shown to be grounded in a clear understanding of righteousness by faith and not legalistic works-righteousness, as has sometimes been suggested; Pss 11 and 50 are analyzed for their portrayal of a divine investigative judgment from the heavenly sanctuary; a balanced view of both justification and sanctification is seen to emerge from Ps 32; Ps 73 is tapped to reveal the way "from doubt to assurance" through the perspective of the sanctuary and its foreshadowing of the final judgment; Ps 103 is set forth in its revelation of "the attitude of gratitude"; and Ps 110 is analyzed as a direct Messianic prophecy, the two divine oracles which constitute (in Luther's words) "the very core and quintessence of the whole Scripture" (p. 205).

One could quibble about a few minor points in this book. There is the inconsistency of using footnotes in the introductory chapters and none in the expositions of individual psalms. In the introductory chapters it is sometimes unclear how far the author departs from modern critical scholars in the use of form criticism. Does he or does he not, for instance, accept the *Sitz im Leben* of a New Year's Festival or Annual Royal Festival (compare pp. 18-19 with p. 148)?

Moreover, what is the precise nature of the Messianic hope in the Psalms? Apart from Ps 110 (which is seen as the only direct Messianic prophecy in the Psalter), is it only a matter of "historical frustration" (p. 29) leading eventually to the longing for a future "ideal situation" (p. 39) with an ideal Messianic king, as the author suggests, or are there in the Psalms other explicit indications of direct Messianic predictions or typological foreshadowings outside of Ps 110, as many evangelical scholars maintain? As a related question, is the eschatological perspective of a psalm apparent only in the light of the NT "re-application" of an original local historical setting, or does an exegesis of the psalm indicate an inherent eschatological focus (as p. 138 seems to imply)? In other words, regarding both Messianism and eschatology, is it appropriate to equate *sensus plenior* with typology (as seems the case here; cf. pp. 310, 138, etc.), or does typology, in contradistinction to *sensus plenior*, call for explicit indications of its prospective-predictive character *before* the antitypical fulfillment occurs?

These few points aside, perhaps the greatest drawback to this book is that we do not yet have LaRondelle's insights on all 150 psalms! It is hoped that in a subsequent volume the author may stir our hearts and illumine our minds with a complete exegetical-homiletical commentary on the Psalter. In the meantime, I have chosen and recommend *Deliverance in the Psalms* as the primary introductory textbook for exegesis courses on the Psalms. Every thoughtful reader—scholar, pastor, layperson alike—will be intellectually stimulated and spiritually rejuvenated by these "Messages of Hope for Today."

Andrews University RICHARD M. DAVIDSON

Sigrist, Marcel. *Neo-Sumerian Account Texts in the Horn Archaeological Museum*. Foreword by Lawrence T. Geraty. Institute of Archaeology Publications, Assyriological Series, vol. 4; Andrews University Cuneiform Texts, vol. 1. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1984. vii + 89 pp. + 108 plates. $29.95.

The pace of Assyriological publication is all too often painstakingly slow. There are too few scholars, too many texts, and not enough funds to sustain prolonged study and expensive publication. The case of the 3200 tablets now in the Horn Archaeological Museum at Andrews University is typical. These tablets were originally purchased by the Hartford Seminary in 1913. The tablets were carefully numbered and maintained and a preliminary catalogue was begun by Lewis Patton but never completed. Not until 1951 did Ferris Stephens survey the collection, and only in 1955 was

the first tablet published by Albrecht Goetze (*JCS* 9 [1955]: 10). Indeed, until the publication of the volume under review, just over thirty tablets had been published.

When, during a period of financial uncertainty, Hartford Seminary decided to dispose of the collection to raise some funds, The Horn Archaeological Museum at Andrews University entered into negotiations to acquire the entire collection under the condition that it be published quickly. (The collection was sent to the Museum on a loan bases in 1973 and was purchased in 1977.) Shortly after the collection arrived at the Museum, it was baked and cleaned, and scholars descended on the Museum to study the texts. Yet this initial burst of enthusiasm resulted in only a single publication by Mark Cohen (*RA* 70 [1976]: 129-144) which contained copies and editions of six texts. Thus, the present volume by M. Sigrist, containing no fewer than 974 texts, stands as a milestone in the somewhat dismal record of publication associated with the collection and portends the complete publication of the 3200 texts in the immediate future.

Six text volumes are announced, and most are either in press or ready for press. Three volumes contain Ur-III administrative texts, two without seals and a third with seals. The remaining three volumes will be dedicated to the significant number of Old Babylonian tablets. Four additional volumes are announced. Three of these will contain specialized studies, and one will be a general introduction to the collection as a whole. This is indeed a remarkable achievement for a single individual who, in the meantime, has produced and continues to produce a number of other books and articles. It is also a tribute to those at Andrews University and the Horn Archaeological Museum who enthusiastically encouraged the study and publication of their newly acquired collection and provided the wherewithal to publish this and future volumes under their auspices.

*AUCT* 1 opens with an informative Foreword by Lawrence T. Geraty. It describes the history of the collection from its original purchase in 1913 to its current status at the Horn Archaeological Museum. Furthermore, it includes a bibliography of all tablets which have appeared prior to the publication of this volume, curiously omitting the pre-publication of texts by Sigrist himself and others. These texts are:

**AUAM 73.0448, P. Michalowski, *Mesopotamia* 12 (1977): 92, transliteration.**
**AUAM 73.0542, M. Sigrist, *RA* 73 (1979): 96, transliteration, = AUCT 1 37.**
**AUAM 73.0836, P. Michalowski, *Syro-Mesopotamian Studies* 2/3 (1978): 12-13, transliteration, ≒ *AUCT* 1 176.**
**AUAM 73.1425, M. Sigrist, *Acta Sumerologica* 2 (1980): 153-167, copy, photos, and transliteration of this incantation text.**
**AUAM 73.1787, M. Sigrist, *RA* 73 (1979): 96, transliteration, = *AUCT* 1 857.**
**AUAM 73.1999, P. Steinkeller, *Oriens Antiquus* 19 (1980): 84, transliteration.**
**AUAM 73.2200, M. Sigrist, *JCS* 31 (1979): 166-170, transliteration and photo, the copy to appear in *AUCT* 2.**

(It should also be pointed out that Sigrist has graciously made his copies available before publication to scholars, including this reviewer, whose research and publications have benefited from the advance knowledge of these then-unpublished texts. As a result, a number of the AUAM tablets have been quoted in articles by this reviewer [see in particular, *JCS* 33 (1981): 244-269, passim], I. J. Gelb, P. Michalowski, P. Steinkeller, and others.)

Sigrist provides a brief Introduction (p. 1), followed by extensive indexes of Personal Names (pp. 3-18); Deities (pp. 19-21); Toponyms, Temple, and Field Names (pp. 22-23); and Geographical Names (pp. 24-25). A comprehensive Catalogue (pp. 26-63), in the style of the Yale Oriental Series, contains volume and AUAM numbers, dates, subjects, transaction types, principals, sources (they are mostly from Drehem, secondarily from Umma), and brief remarks. The author then provides a reverse concordance of museum and volume numbers (pp. 64-68), and ends this section with a Sumerian word index (pp. 69-87).

The computer-generated typography is a bit harsh, but otherwise clear. The volume is concluded with copies of the 974 texts tightly arranged on 108 plates in the now-familiar Sigrist style. The book is sturdily bound and commands a most reasonable price.

Texts selected for this first volume do not contain any seal impressions. All sealed tablets, with accompanying drawings of seal inscriptions, will appear in vol. 3 in the format established by Sigrist in his recently published, *Textes economiques neo-Sumeriens de l'Université de Syracuse* (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1983). His copies are clear, generally quite accurate, and of uniform style, but somewhat devoid of scribal idiosyncrasies that characterize individual hands within the archives.

Anyone who has ever prepared a volume of cuneiform texts is aware of the pitfalls that are inevitable when copying and, particularly, when preparing indexes. This is not the place to detail differences of interpretations and corrections of numerous minor points (see T. Gomi, *JAOS* 106 [1986]: in press, for a list of additions and corrections to the volume). Suffice it to say that this is a reliable and significant contribution. Although the volume contains the usual common and repetitive documents so well known from the Ur-III period, it also contains an unusual number of important new texts that will add substantially to our understanding of the period. We look forward to the forthcoming volumes in this series and to the future detailed studies of these interesting documents by Sigrist and by all those who will surely find this publication a valuable addition to the ever-expanding corpus of economic texts from the Third Dynasty of Ur.

Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853

DAVID I. OWEN

# TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW AND ARAMAIC

## CONSONANTS

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| א | = ʾ | ד | = *d* | י | = *y* | ס | = *s* | ר | = *r* | | |
| ב | = *b* | ה | = *h* | כ | = *k* | ע | = ʿ | ש | = *ś* | | |
| ב | = *b̲* | ו | = *w* | כ | = *k̲* | פ | = *p* | ש | = *š* | | |
| ג | = *g* | ז | = *z* | ל | = *l* | פ | = *p̲* | ת | = *t* | | |
| ג | = *g̲* | ח | = *ḥ* | מ | = *m* | צ | = *ṣ* | ת | = *t̲* | | |
| ד | = *d̲* | ט | = *ṭ* | נ | = *n* | ק | = *q* | | | | |

## MASORETIC VOWEL POINTINGS

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ַ | = *a* | ְ, ֱ | (vocal shewa) | = *e* | | ֹ | = *o* | | | | |
| ָ | = *ā* | ֶ, ֵ | = *ē* | | | וֹ | = *o* | | | | |
| ַ | = *a* | ִ | = *i* | | | ֺ | = *o* | | | | |
| ֶ | = *e* | ִי | = *ī* | | | וּ | = *u* | | | | |
| ֶ | = *ē* | ֹ | = *o* | | | וּ | = *ū* | | | | |

(Dāgēš Forte is indicated by doubling the consonant.)

---

## ABBREVIATIONS OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

| | |
|---|---|
| *AASOR* | *Annual, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res.* |
| AB | Anchor Bible |
| *AcOr* | *Acta orientalia* |
| ACW | Ancient Christian Writers |
| *ADAJ* | *Annual, Dep. of Ant. of Jordan* |
| *AER* | *American Ecclesiastical Review* |
| *AfO* | *Archiv für Orientforschung* |
| *AHR* | *American Historical Review* |
| *AHW* | Von Soden, *Akkad. Handwörterb.* |
| *AJA* | *Am. Journal of Archaeology* |
| *AJBA* | *Austr. Journ. of Bibl. Arch.* |
| *AJSL* | *Am. Jrl., Sem. Lang. and Lit.* |
| *AJT* | *American Journal of Theology* |
| *ANEP* | *Anc. Near East in Pictures,* Pritchard, ed. |
| *ANESTP* | *Anc. Near East: Suppl. Texts and Pictures,* Pritchard, ed. |
| *ANET* | *Ancient Near Eastern Texts,* Pritchard, ed. |
| ANF | The Ante-Nicene Fathers |
| AnOr | Analecta Orientalia |
| AOS | American Oriental Series |
| *APOT* | *Apocr. and Pseud. of OT,* Charles, ed. |
| *ARG* | *Archiv für Reformationsgesch.* |
| ARM | Archives royales de Mari |
| *ArOr* | *Archiv Orientální* |
| *ARW* | *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* |
| ASV | American Standard Version |
| *ATR* | *Anglican Theological Review* |
| AUM | Andrews Univ. Monographs |
| *AusBR* | *Australian Biblical Review* |
| *AUSS* | *Andrews Univ. Sem. Studies* |
| *BA* | *Biblical Archaeologist* |
| *BAR* | *Biblical Archaeologist Reader* |
| *BARev* | *Biblical Archaeology Review* |
| *BASOR* | *Bulletin, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res.* |
| *BCSR* | *Bull. of Council on Study of Rel.* |
| *Bib* | *Biblica* |
| BibB | Biblische Beiträge |
| BibOr | Biblica et Orientalia |
| *BIES* | *Bull. of Isr. Explor. Society* |
| *BJRL* | *Bulletin, John Rylands Library* |
| *BK* | *Bibel und Kirche* |
| *BO* | *Bibliotheca Orientalis* |
| *BQR* | *Baptist Quarterly Review* |
| *BR* | *Biblical Research* |
| *BSac* | *Bibliotheca Sacra* |
| *BT* | *The Bible Translator* |
| *BTB* | *Biblical Theology Bulletin* |
| *BZ* | *Biblische Zeitschrift* |
| BZAW | Beihefte zur *ZAW* |
| BZNW | Beihefte zur *ZNW* |
| *CAD* | *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* |
| *CBQ* | *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* |
| *CC* | *Christian Century* |
| *CH* | *Church History* |
| *CHR* | *Catholic Historical Review* |
| CIG | Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum |
| CIJ | Corp. Inscript. Judaicarum |
| CIL | Corp. Inscript. Latinarum |
| CIS | Corp. Inscript. Semiticarum |
| *CJT* | *Canadian Journal of Theology* |
| *CQ* | *Church Quarterly* |
| *CQR* | *Church Quarterly Review* |
| CR | Corpus Reformatorum |
| *CT* | *Christianity Today* |
| *CTM* | *Concordia Theological Monthly* |
| *CurTM* | *Currents in Theol. and Mission* |
| *DACL* | *Dict. d'archéol. chrét. et de lit.* |
| *DOTT* | *Docs. from OT Times,* Thomas, ed. |
| *DTC* | *Dict. de théol. cath.* |
| *EKL* | *Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon* |
| *EncIsl* | *Encyclopedia of Islam* |
| *EncJud* | *Encyclopedia judaica* (1971) |
| *ER* | *Ecumenical Review* |
| *EvQ* | *Evangelical Quarterly* |
| *EvT* | *Evangelische Theologie* |
| *ExpTim* | *Expository Times* |
| FC | Fathers of the Church |
| *GRBS* | *Greek, Roman, and Byz. Studies* |
| *HeyJ* | *Heythrop Journal* |
| *HibJ* | *Hibbert Journal* |
| *HR* | *History of Religions* |
| HSM | Harvard Semitic Monographs |
| *HTR* | *Harvard Theological Review* |
| HTS | Harvard Theological Studies |
| *HUCA* | *Hebrew Union College Annual* |
| *IB* | *Interpreter's Bible* |
| ICC | International Critical Commentary |
| *IDB* | *Interpreter's Dict. of Bible* |
| *IEJ* | *Israel Exploration Journal* |
| *Int* | *Interpretation* |
| *ITQ* | *Irish Theological Quarterly* |

Abbreviations (cont.)

| | |
|---|---|
| *JAAR* | *Journ., Amer. Acad. of Rel.* |
| *JAC* | *Jahrb. für Ant. und Christentum* |
| *JAOS* | *Journ. of the Amer. Or. Soc.* |
| *JAS* | *Journal of Asian Studies* |
| JB | Jerusalem Bible, Jones, ed. |
| *JBL* | *Journal of Biblical Literature* |
| *JBR* | *Journal of Bible and Religion* |
| *JCS* | *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* |
| *JEA* | *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* |
| *JEH* | *Journal of Ecclesiastical Hist.* |
| *JEOL* | *Jaarbericht, Ex Oriente Lux* |
| *JES* | *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* |
| *JHS* | *Journal of Hellenic Studies* |
| *JJS* | *Journal of Jewish Studies* |
| *JMeH* | *Journal of Medieval History* |
| *JMES* | *Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* |
| *JMH* | *Journal of Modern History* |
| *JNES* | *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* |
| *JPOS* | *Journ., Palest. Or. Soc.* |
| *JQR* | *Jewish Quarterly Review* |
| *JR* | *Journal of Religion* |
| *JRAS* | *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society* |
| *JRE* | *Journal of Religious Ethics* |
| *JRelS* | *Journal of Religious Studies* |
| *JRH* | *Journal of Religious History* |
| *JRS* | *Journal of Roman Studies* |
| *JRT* | *Journal of Religious Thought* |
| *JSJ* | *Journal for the Study of Judaism* |
| *JSOT* | *Journal for the Study of OT* |
| *JSS* | *Journal of Semitic Studies* |
| *JSSR* | *Journ., Scient. Study of Religion* |
| *JTC* | *Journal for Theol. and Church* |
| *JTS* | *Journal of Theol. Studies* |
| KJV | King James Version |
| LCC | Library of Christian Classics |
| LCL | Loeb Classical Library |
| *LQ* | *Lutheran Quarterly* |
| *LTK* | *Lexikon für Theol. und Kirche* |
| *LW* | *Lutheran World* |
| *McCQ* | *McCormick Quarterly* |
| MLB | Modern Language Bible |
| *MQR* | *Mennonite Quarterly Review* |
| NAB | New American Bible |
| NASB | New American Standard Bible |
| NCB | New Century Bible |
| NEB | New English Bible |
| *Neot* | *Neotestamentica* |
| NHS | Nag Hammadi Studies |
| NICNT | New International Commentary, NT |
| NICOT | New International Commentary, OT |
| NIV | New International Version |
| *NKZ* | *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* |
| *NovT* | *Novum Testamentum* |
| NPNF | Nicene and Post. Nic. Fathers |
| *NRT* | *Nouvelle revue théologique* |
| *NTA* | *New Testament Abstracts* |
| *NTS* | *New Testament Studies* |
| NTTS | NT Tools and Studies |
| *ODCC* | *Oxford Dict. of Christian Church* |
| OIP | Oriental Institute Publications |
| *OLZ* | *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* |
| *Or* | *Orientalia* |
| *OrChr* | *Oriens Christianus* |
| *OTS* | *Oudtestamentische Studiën* |
| *PEFQS* | *Pal. Expl. Fund, Quart. Statem.* |
| *PEQ* | *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* |
| *PG* | *Patrologia graeca*, Migne, ed. |
| *PJ* | *Palästina-Jahrbuch* |
| *PL* | *Patrologia latina*, Migne, ed. |
| PW | Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyl.* |
| *QDAP* | *Quarterly, Dep. of Ant. in Pal.* |
| *RA* | *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéol.* |
| *RAC* | *Reallexikon für Antike und Chr.* |
| *RArch* | *Revue archéologique* |
| *RB* | *Revue biblique* |
| RechBib | Recherches bibliques |
| *RechSR* | *Recherches de science religieuse* |
| *REg* | *Revue d'égyptologie* |
| *RelS* | *Religious Studies* |
| *RelSoc* | *Religion and Society* |
| *RelSRev* | *Religious Studies Review* |
| *RenQ* | *Renaissance Quarterly* |
| *RevExp* | *Review and Expositor* |
| *RevQ* | *Revue de Qumrân* |
| *RevScRel* | *Revue des sciences religieuses* |
| *RevSém* | *Revue sémitique* |
| *RHE* | *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* |
| *RHPR* | *Revue d'hist. et de philos. rel.* |
| *RHR* | *Revue de l'histoire des religions* |
| *RL* | *Religion in Life* |
| *RLA* | *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* |
| *RPTK* | *Realencykl. für prot. Th. u. Kirche* |
| *RR* | *Review of Religion* |
| *RRR* | *Review of Religious Research* |
| *RS* | *Religious Studies* |
| *RSPT* | *Revue des sc. phil. et théol.* |
| RSV | Revised Standard Version |
| *RTP* | *Revue de théol. et de phil.* |
| SB | Sources bibliques |
| SBLDS | Soc. of Bibl. Lit. Dissert. Ser. |
| SBLMS | Soc. of Bibl. Lit. Monograph Ser. |
| SBLSBS | Soc. of Bibl. Lit. Sources for Bibl. Study |
| SBLTT | Soc. of Bibl. Lit. Texts and Trans. |
| SBT | Studies in Biblical Theology |
| *SCJ* | *Sixteenth Century Journal* |
| *SCR* | *Studies in Comparative Religion* |
| *Sem* | *Semitica* |
| *SJT* | *Scottish Journal of Theology* |
| SMRT | Studies in Med. and Ref. Thought |
| SOr | Studia Orientalia |
| SPB | Studia Postbiblica |
| SSS | Semitic Studies Series |
| *ST* | *Studia Theologica* |
| TAPS | Transactions of Am. Philos. Society |
| *TD* | *Theology Digest* |
| *TDNT* | *Theol. Dict. of NT*, Kittel and Friedrich, eds. |
| *TDOT* | *Theol. Dict. of OT*, Botterweck and Ringgren, eds. |
| *TEH* | *Theologische Existenz Heute* |
| *TGl* | *Theologie und Glaube* |
| *THAT* | *Theol. Handwört. z. AT*, Jenni and Westermann, eds. |
| *TLZ* | *Theologische Literaturzeitung* |
| *TP* | *Theologie und Philosophie* |
| *TQ* | *Theologische Quartalschrift* |
| *Trad* | *Traditio* |
| *TRev* | *Theologische Revue* |
| *TRu* | *Theologische Rundschau* |
| *TS* | *Theological Studies* |
| *TT* | *Teologisk Tidsskrift* |
| *TToday* | *Theology Today* |
| TU | Texte und Untersuchungen |
| *TZ* | *Theologische Zeitschrift* |
| *UBSGNT* | United Bible Societies *Greek NT* |
| *UF* | *Ugarit-Forschungen* |
| *USQR* | *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* |
| *VC* | *Vigiliae Christianae* |
| *VT* | *Vetus Testamentum* |
| *VTSup* | *VT*, Supplements |
| WA | Luther's Works, Weimar Ausgabe |
| *WO* | *Die Welt des Orients* |
| *WTJ* | *Westminster Theol. Journal* |
| *WZKM* | *Wiener Zeitsch. f. d. Kunde d. Mor.* |
| *ZA* | *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* |
| *ZÄS* | *Zeitsch. für ägyptische Sprache* |
| *ZAW* | *Zeitsch. für die alttes. Wiss.* |
| ZDMG | *Zeitsch. der deutsch. morgenl. Gesellschaft* |
| *ZDPV* | *Zeitsch. des deutsch. Pal.-Ver.* |
| *ZEE* | *Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik* |
| *ZHT* | *Zeitsch. für hist. Theologie* |
| *ZKG* | *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* |
| *ZKT* | *Zeitsch. für kath. Theologie* |
| *ZMR* | *Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft* |
| *ZNW* | *Zeitsch. für die neutes. Wiss.* |
| *ZRGG* | *Zeitsch. für Rel. u. Geistesgesch.* |
| *ZST* | *Zeitschrift für syst. Theologie* |
| *ZTK* | *Zeitsch. für Theol. und Kirche* |
| *ZWT* | *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* |