Faith&Thought

In this issue:

FAITH and THOUGHT

Faith and Thought is the operating name of
The Victoria Institute or *Philosophical Society of Great Britain*
established in 1865, Charity No. 285871

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL

Contents

Editorial

As part of our contribution towards the 400th anniversary of the publication of the King James Version of the Bible we invited three speakers to address various aspects of Bible translation, both in the present and in the past, at our 2011 symposium. Edwin Arthur from the Wycliffe Bible Translators took as his subject the translation of the Old Testament into a modern language. Dr. David Instone-Brewer from Tyndale House in Cambridge investigated the variant versions of the text of the Old Testament with particular reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls. Professor Howard Marshall from the University of Aberdeen gave a lecture on the subject of how Peter 'translated' the Old Testament for his readers. These three lectures are reproduced here.

Faith and Thought Prize Essay Competition

A prize of £500 is offered for the best essay on the subject
'No educated person believes in Adam and Eve nowadays' Discuss.

Closing date 31 July 2012

Competition Conditions:

1. Faith and Thought will own the copyright of the essay, though the author will normally be permitted to embody it in a later, more comprehensive work.

2. It should not exceed 7,000 words, excluding documentation, typewritten, with double spacing and 2 cm margins.

3. It should be submitted to the Honorary Secretary's address, accompanied by a brief synopsis of 200 words setting out which parts are claimed to be original, along with a sealed envelope with a motto outside, and the author's name and address inside.

4. As an encouragement to young writers, candidates, where applicable, may add to their motto the words, 'Under 25' or state their date of birth: neither is published.

5. Entries will be professionally refereed and if the referees consider the prize should be divided between two authors, the trustees' decision will be final.

6. If no submissions are deemed worthy, the right to withhold the prize and to publicise another competition thereafter will be exercised.

7. The prize is normally announced at the subsequent AGM.

8. Officers of the Victoria Institute may not participate.

9. Submission of an entry will indicate candidates' assent to all these conditions.

Honorary Secretary: Dr. Alan Kerry. 96, Hadleigh Road, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex SS9 2LZ

OPEN SYMPOSIUM

'UNLESS YOU ...BECOME AS LITTLE CHILDREN' – CHILDRENS SPIRITUALITY MEETS CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

Saturday 20th October 2012   10.30 a.m. - 4.00 p.m.

Speakers

Keith White   (Director of Millgrove Home)

John Pridmore   (Former Rector of Hackney)

Haddon Wilmer (Director - Child Theology Movement)

Mary Hawes (National Children's Adviser –Archbishops' Council)

Kings Cross Baptist Church, Vernon Square London WC1X 9EW

**Registration fee £15.00 (Full Time Students £7.00)
including coffee and tea.**

**Lunch: there are restaurants in the area; sandwiches are obtainable
locally; a room will be available for packed lunches.**

**The registration fee will be refunded to anyone joining the Institute
(FAITH AND THOUGHT) on the day of the symposium.**

Booking
Dr. Alan Kerry 96, Hadleigh Road, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex SS9 2LZ
Tel: 01702 472710 e-mail APKerry@aol.com

Annual General Meeting: October 22nd 2011

The meeting was held on Saturday 22nd. October at 2.00 p.m. at King's Cross Baptist Church, Vernon Square, London WC1X 9EW during the annual symposium and was attended by all participants.

Council members present:	Rev R Allaway	(Chairman)
	Rev J D Buxton	(Hon. Treasurer)
	Mr T C Mitchell	
	Prof D W Vere	
	Dr A B Robins	
	Prof C J Humphreys	
Also present:	Dr A P Kerry	(Hon. Minute Secretary)
	Eleven other members and one non-member	

OPENING The Rev. Dr. R. Allaway welcomed members to the meeting

APOLOGIES Apologies had been received from Mr Reg Luhman and Rev Michael Collis

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING The minutes of the 2010 AGM were previously available in F&T journal. The chairman read a summary which was approved and the minutes were signed.

MATTERS ARISING
- Terence Mitchell has obtained a presentation copy of The English Standard Version of the Bible which Alan Kerry will present to Brian Weller in formal gratitude for his years of service to the institute.
- In response to the need for a part-time administrator, the chairman announced that Dr Alan Kerry had been appointed to the vacancy.

ELECTION
- The meeting agreed to the re-election of the President, Vice-presidents and Honorary Treasurer for the coming year.
- The meeting also agreed to the re-election of Rev R H Allaway, Prof C J Humphreys and Prof D W Vere for a further period of service on the council.

ANNUAL ACCOUNTS The annual accounts were presented by John Buxton. A summary sheet was circulated and the full accounts were available for members. The annual report for the Charity Commission has been formally submitted and accepted.
- The accounts were accepted.
- The financial situation is satisfactory. The shareholding was increased by £2900 in the year, which meant the income and expenditure summary shows a loss for the year. Excluding this there was a slight profit for the year.
- Along with Christians in Science it has been confirmed with Paternoster Press that there is no outstanding liability with or toward them with respect to printing Science and Christian Belief.
- Dividend income for the current year is already £4100 so the returns on investments remain healthy.
- Postage rates are rising and it is therefore helpful if members would provide their email address to the administrator and this can be used to reduce physical mailings.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS
- The prize essay for 2012 entitled *'No educated person believes in Adam and Eve nowadays, discuss'* was announced.
- The symposium topic for 2012 will be *'Children's Spirituality'*. It is hoped that wider publicity will lead to a greater attendance and interest in the work of the institute.

CLOSE The meeting closed with prayer and the General Grace at 4:00pm

To Translate or not to Translate: The O.T. in Missionary Bible Translation Strategy.

Edwin D. Arthur

Introduction

For the last twenty seven years I have belonged to an organisation called Wycliffe Bible Translators. During that time, I have often found myself having to explain that we do far more than translate the Bible. Wycliffe staff are involved in linguistic research, literacy teaching, adult education, advocacy for minority rights and much more besides. However, it is also true that we could be accused of doing a lot less than translate the Bible, too. This was brought home to me forcibly when I first arrived to work in Ivory Coast and was greeted by an Australian missionary with another agency, who with typical Antipodean humour called out 'here comes another Wycliffe New Testament Translator!' At the time, I was slightly offended, but over time I came to see that the jibe had more than a little truth in it. My own involvement in a translation project serves to illustrate this. The Kouya New Testament was published in 2002, at that point only one Old Testament book, Ruth had been published and since then translation work has effectively been in abeyance. In all likelihood, there will never be a complete Kouya Bible published.

Bible Translation Goals

Barnwell proposes that there are three possible goals for translation into a given language: a) New Testament and some Old Testament, b) Some Old Testament books and Some New Testament books (or selections from both – what one author calls a *"Reader's Digest type of abridged Bible"[1]*,) or c) a complete Bible. She then goes on to suggest a number of criteria to evaluate whether the whole Bible should be translated for a given language, the inevitable result of which will be that only a small minority of languages will receive a full Bible[2].

Another suggestion is that the goal of Bible translation should be to ensure that "adequate" Scriptures are available in a given language. Adequate is partly defined as having portions of the Bible sufficient to address basic spiritual needs of the community and enable motivated members of the community to use them for spiritual growth[3].

---

[1] Daniel Arichea, 'Theology and Translation: The Implications of Certain Theological Issues to the Translation Task', in *Bible Translation and the Spread of the Church: The Last 200 Years* (Brill, 1990), pp. 40-67 (p. 47).
[2] Katherine Barnwell, 'Goals for Translation: A Proposal', *Notes on Translation*, 9 (1995), 20-24 (p. 20).
[3] R. Brown, 'Selecting and Using Scripture Portions Effectively in Frontier Missions', *International Journal of Frontier Missions*, 18 (2001), 10 (p. 10).

There are two basic problems with this approach. Firstly, it is extremely difficult to describe what the "basic spiritual needs of a community" are. It is almost impossible for a missionary, or even a member of the community, to determine which parts of the Bible will speak most powerfully within a given culture. A translation consultant in West Africa told me that he was frustrated with one scheme for abridging the Bible commonly used in that part of the world. The abridgement had removed all of the genealogies from the text, despite the fact that genealogies and ancestry are extremely important in many West African cultures.

The second problem with this definition of "adequate Scripture" is that it talks purely of "spiritual needs". This reflects a post-enlightenment view of life which divides the world neatly into spiritual and physical spheres: the spiritual being the domain of religion and hence the Bible. However, Scripture is written out of a very different world-view and takes a much more holistic approach to humanity. Though preachers and commentators often attempt to spiritualise the whole of the Bible, there is a huge amount of practical, ethical and political teaching in the Scriptures. By concentrating purely on "spiritual needs" an abridgement is likely to miss out a significant amount of the message of the Bible.

Why Not Translate the Whole Bible Into Every Language?

At the most simple level, the question is related to resources. Translation organisations simply do not have enough people or money to translate the whole Bible into every language that they work in. However, this approach is not simply determined by resources. Rather than attempt to translate parts of the Scripture for a relatively large number of languages, it would have been possible to translate the whole Bible for fewer groups. Effectively, a decision has been taken to reach as many people as possible with some Scripture, rather than concentrate on translating the whole Bible. The reasons for choosing this *modus operandi* are complex and we will return to the theme at the conclusion of this paper. However, for the moment, we need to briefly mention two motivations for reaching as wide a number of people as possible which are often cited within mission organisations.

No One Has A Right to Hear The Gospel Twice

There is a quotation which is often repeated in Evangelical missionary circles, and often attributed to Oswald J. Smith:
" No one has the right to hear the Gospel twice while there remains someone who has not heard it once."
On one hand, this statement provides a helpful reminder of the imperative of taking the Gospel to all parts of the world. However, it is also open to a number of serious

criticisms[4] which we cannot fully explore here. Suffice it to say, that it is very hard to reconcile the Biblical call to make disciples with the notion of evangelism that is presented in this famous quote.

Urgency

Wycliffe Bible Translators has a vision for its work entitled Vision2025[5], which envisages a translation programme started in every language that needs one by the year 2025. This vision captures a sense of urgency which is important to many within the Bible translation fraternity.
A significant proportion of Evangelical Christians believe that Jesus will only return to earth when every people group in the world has received the Gospel. This view, taken from a literal reading of Matthew 24:14, is extrapolated by some to imply that when the Scriptures are translated into every language on the planet, the End will be ushered in. One of the implications of this approach is that it is not particularly important to translate the whole of the Scriptures, starting a project and translating 'some Scripture' is all that needs to be achieved. This sort of approach can very easily lead to an abandonment of long term thinking. Chris Wright critiques this sort of approach.
"We should not treat the Great Commission as a ticking clock, just waiting for the last people group to "hear" the gospel before the Lord is, as it were, permitted to return. That kind of thinking has transformed it into a 'job to complete', 'an unfinished task'. But with its command to disciples to make disciples it is a self-replicating mandate that we will never "complete" – not in the sense that we can never reach all the nations (we can and we should), but in the sense that the making of disciples, and the re-discipling of those who have formerly been evangelized, are tasks that go on through multiple lives and generations."[6]
These are some of the reasons which lie behind the choice to translate sections of the Bible for many people groups rather than the whole Bible for a fewer number. Though at this point, I issue a *caveat*. The Bible translation world, of which Wycliffe is a part, is incredibly diverse and is changing very rapidly. Much of what I say in this paper will consist of generalisations which, by their nature, will not be true in every specific situation.

---

[4] Edwin Arthur, 'Hearing the Gospel Once or Twice', *Kouya Chronicle*, 2011 <http://www.kouya.net/?p=4318>.
[5] "By 2025, together with partners worldwide, we aim to see a Bible translation programme begun in all the remaining languages that need one." See http://wycliffe.org.uk/wycliffe/about/vision-2025.html
[6] Christopher Wright, *The Mission of God's People : a Biblical Theology of the Church's Mission* (Grand Rapids Mich.: Zondervan, 2010), p. 285.

The Place of the Old Testament

Historically, the commonest way in which the Bible has been "abridged" in order to reach more people, is the way in which we worked in Kouya: the translation of the New Testament with only a minimum (if any) Old Testament translation. Overall, Wycliffe Bible Translators staff have been involved in translating 745 New Testaments, but only 27 complete Bibles[7]. In other words, less than 4% of these projects have led to the production of a complete Bible.

The remainder of this paper will explore why so little stress has been placed on the translation of the Old Testament and will suggest some possible avenues of work for the future. Though we shall be limiting our discussion to Bible translation, the issues raised here have a relevance to a wider range of Christian ministries.

MacDonald suggests that one of the reasons why a low priority is given to the translation of the Old Testament is the perception that it is "less applicable to Christians today than the New Testament and that some aspects of it have been superseded and annulled"[8].

In my interactions with Bible translators and, indeed, with the wider evangelical world, I have found this perception to be true. While we acknowledge that when Paul said that all Scripture is God breathed (2 Tim 3:16) he was referring to the Old Testament, there is a strong tendency to see the New Testament as somehow being more inspired and more relevant than the Old. It is, of course true that it is in the New Testament that we are introduced to the Lord Jesus Christ and learn of his death and resurrection. We rightly assign a huge importance to the New Testament, but we would be mistaken to assume that this means that we have no need of the Old.

I would suggest that there are three reasons why Bible translators should pay attention to the Old Testament as well as the New Testament.

- The Old Testament serves as a background for the New Testament.

- The Old Testament communicates some truths more effectively than the New Testament.

- The Old Testament is of particular relevance to some cultural groups.

The Old Testament as A Background for the New

The first reason for insisting on the importance of the Old Testament is that it provides the background for our understanding of the New. The Gospel accounts of prophecy and laws being fulfilled make no sense to an audience who have no experience of those prophecies and laws in the first place. One translation consultant is reported as saying that "trying to translate the New Testament without the Old

---

[7] http://www.wycliffe.net/ScriptureAccessStatistics/tabid/73/language/en-US/Default.aspx
[8] George Macdonald, 'Rethinking Our Position On Translating the Old Testament', *Notes on Translation*, 9 (1995), 1-19 (p. 1).

Testament in place is like trying to build the fourth story of a building without the three lower stories in place"[9].

Wycliffe translator Hanni Kuhn suggests that this problem can be addressed by what she terms a 'ramp approach'[10].

"As for people who have no prior knowledge of the Bible, leading them straight to the New Testament is like asking them to climb or jump to a level that is really out of their reach. They need a sort of ramp to make the ascent gradual, namely, a certain amount of Old Testament background. And it has to be made available *before* the New Testament is translated, not afterwards."

Effectively, Kuhn is suggesting that a series of Old Testament passages, which are essential for understanding the New Testament should be made available as small booklets before the New Testament is translated. She goes on to propose passages which should be included, along with a series of optional readings which could also be produced.

It is, of course, true that we cannot fully understand the New Testament without some understanding of the Old. Even John 3:16, which is famously held aloft by evangelists at major sporting events, requires a grasp of the Old Testament back-story before its sense can be fully grasped.

The Old Testament Communicates More Clearly than the New

However, I do not believe that an approach to the Old Testament which sees it purely as a supporting document – background reading, as it were – to the New Testament pays adequate respect to the Old Testament as Scripture. The Old Testament does provide background to the New Testament, but it is a valuable source of God's revelation in and of itself.

There are ways in which the Old Testament communicates some issues more clearly than does the New Testament and it is also true that there are certain audiences for whom the Old Testament is far more accessible than the New.

One of the main problems which Old Testament translators have to confront is the sheer length of the text. But this length communicates a powerful message in and of itself. The Old Testament records/ demonstrates just how long God spent teaching the nation of Israel that he is a Holy God, concerned for justice and truth in all aspects of life. The New Testament picks up on these themes, but to a much lesser extent and it always assumes background knowledge of the Old Testament.

Much of the teaching of the Old Testament comes through extended narrative which is capable of expressing a great depth of meaning. The story of Hosea, a man married to a serial adulterer, is a very powerful explanation of the love of God for his unfaithful people, expressed in the most human of terms. It is hard to read Hosea and

---

[9] Macdonald, 1-19 (p. 12).
[10] Hanni Kuhn, 'Building a Ramp To The New Testament', *Notes on Translation*, 11 (1997), 1-5 (p. 1).

not to be moved deeply, it speaks in a way that even John's great phrase "God is love" does not.

The Old Testament Speaks More Powerfully to Some Cultures

Many of the communities who currently do not have access to a complete Bible relate more closely to the Old Testament than they do to the New[11].
"Cultural affinities with the biblical world lead African and Asian Christians to a deep affection for the Old Testament as *their* story, *their* book. In Africa particularly, Christians have long been excited by the obvious cultural parallels that exist between their own societies and those of the Hebrew Bible."[12]
Examples of this affection and affinity with the Old Testament could easily be multiplied from the literature, but I will give an example from our own experience. When translating the book of Ruth, we were concerned about the Hebrew term *goel* rendered "kinsman redeemer" in the NIV. English translations struggle with expressing terms related to levirate marriage because the concept does not exist in our context. We assumed, wrongly, that it would be equally difficult to express the concept in Kouya. However, when we came to explain the issue to our Kouya colleagues, we discovered that they use more or less the same system, and the story of Ruth, Naomi and Boaz made perfect sense to them.
Western Christians, conditioned by their cultural milieu, tend to disregard some parts of Scripture. One example which has already been mentioned is the genealogies of the Old Testament; the "begats" which are generally regarded as of little interest and only important to specialists in the field. However, in much of Africa and Asia, where special reverence is given to the ancestors and family history, the genealogies are seen to have great importance and relevance. In some situations, it makes no sense for a key character such as Jesus to be introduced without an extensive genealogy explaining who he is and where he comes from.
There is one group in particular for whom the Old Testament often has a special resonance; oral learners. For many Christians around the world, the way they engage with the Bible is not by reading it, but by listening to it as someone else reads out the text. It is well worth remembering that Scripture is addressed to those who have ears to hear!
The choice between reading and listening to a text is not simply a case of preference for one medium over another. Oral learners comprise an estimated two thirds of the world's population[13] and they process information in a different way to literate learners. Oral learners tend to prefer engaging with information through stories and struggle to follow written modes of communication – even when the written

---

[11] Macdonald, 1-19 (p. 5).
[12] P. Jenkins, 'Reading the Bible in the Global South', *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, 30 (2006), 67–73 (p. 68).
[13] International Orality Network.;Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization., *Making Disciples of Oral Learners   : to Proclaim His Story Where It Has Not Been Known Before --* (Waxhaw N.C.: International Orality Network, 2005).

communication is delivered orally,[14] while written learners tend to prefer material which is presented in an argued, propositional format. So, Christians in the West tend to prefer the tightly argued material in Paul's Epistles, whereas oral learners tend to prefer the Old Testament and Gospel narratives.

The Old Testament is also of special relevance to people from an Islamic background[15]. The stories of the patriarchs have a particular resonance for people from a Muslim background who share a good deal of the background of the Hebrew Bible.

Some authorities suggest that rather than relegating its translation to an afterthought, as has sometimes been the case, Old Testament passages should be translated before the New Testament because of their powerful resonance with some communities[16].

Scripture as a Unified Narrative

Each of these reasons I have cited above is a strong motive for translating the Old Testament alongside the New. However, we have already noted that treating the Old Testament simply as an introduction to the New does not do justice to its importance as Scripture. I would further argue that though we can identify ways in which the Old Testament is relevant in and of itself, there is a more fundamental reason for translating the whole Bible. Quite simply, this is the Bible that God has given us. In the final analysis, it is invidious to set one part of the inspired Scripture up against another. One aspect of the genius of the canon of Scripture is the way in which it tells a connected narrative, from Genesis through to Revelation. This approach has enjoyed a recent resurgence, not least through a number of popular books; the best of which is the Drama of Scripture by Bartholomew and Goheen[17].

However, though Scripture forms a unified narrative, many evangelicals have a tendency to reduce the whole story of Scripture to a simple message of individual salvation. Creation is described in Genesis 1 and 2, followed immediately by the fall in Genesis 3, from there many leap straight to the Gospels, where a solution is brought to bear on the problem. This rather ambiguous attitude to the Biblical narrative is captured in the following analysis.

"It is a recurring deficiency of many Protestant evangelical readings of the biblical narrative that it can be told without the inclusion of Israel at all! An over-individualistic concentration on the Fall... results in a stunted engagement with the biblical text which almost inevitably leads to an interpretation that individual salvation was the whole purpose of God's creative act. Consequently, we quickly

---

[14] R. Brown, 'Communicating God's Message in Oral Cultures', *International Journal of Frontier Missions*, 21 (2004), 26–32 (p. 125).

[15] Brown, 10 (p. 13).

[16] Lynell Zogbo, 'Introduction to the Field Today', in *A History of Bible Translation*, ed. by Philip A. Noss (Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 2007), pp. 337-350 (p. 348).

[17] Craig Bartholomew, *The Drama of Scripture : Finding Our Place in the Biblical Story* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 2006).

jump from the Fall episode to the coming of the Messiah whose death and resurrection fixes the personal sin question – and hey presto! we're back on track!... To the contrary, it is really only when we get into the Israel story that all our interlocking overtures sound forth with a new vitality and vibrancy, mainly because this story consumes so much of the overall narrative."[18]

For the reasons we have cited above, it is difficult to justify the tendency to translate the New Testament and not the Old. "...providing the Christian community with the whole canon should be the ideal goal."[19]

Resources Revisited

To say that the whole canon of Scripture should be made available is an admirable statement, but it is also unfortunately rather idealistic. The theological ideal of translating the whole canon collides with the pragmatic reality of limited resources and we must return to this issue in more detail.

The Old Testament is three times longer than the New Testament and accordingly more time, energy and finance is required for its translation. The sheer bulk of the Old Testament makes it a daunting prospect for any team of translators. One writer suggests that OT translation teams should alternate between translating longer books and shorter books simply to avoid discouragement[20].

However, not only is the Old Testament significantly longer than the New, it is also harder to translate. There are essentially two reasons for this. The first is the availability of resources and expertise. There are more commentaries and translation guides available for the New Testament than for the Old and more people are equipped to work in NT Greek than in Hebrew (the renteresting reflection of their own). The second factor is the nature of the OT text itself. A significant percentage of the Old Testament consists of narrative, which is the most straightforward genre to translate, but equally there is a significant proportion of poetry, apocalyptic and other complex literary styles which present significant problems for the translator.

Currently Wycliffe staff are involved in 1525 translation programmes with around 500 more translations being carried out by other organisations[21]. Though a strong case can be made for translating the whole Bible into each of these languages, there are simply not enough human or financial resources available to make this possible.

---

[18] *C. Greene and M. Robison, Metavista: Bible, Church and Mission in an Age of Imaginiation, Faith in an Emerging Culture (Authentic, 2008), p. 122.*

[19] Arichea, pp. 40-67 (p. 48).

[20] Margaret Hill, 'Some Practical Considerations for Translating the Old Testament', *Notes on Translation*, 9 (1995), 34-39 (p. 35).

[21] This number accounts for roughly three quarters of all of the languages into which the Bible is currently being translated. See

http://www.wycliffe.net/ScriptureAccessStatistics/tabid/73/language/en-US/Default.aspx

Squaring the Circle

No mission agency has resources to translate the Bible into all of the languages of the world, yet we believe that the whole canon of Scripture is important. Counter-intuitively, I believe that the way to address this conundrum is to do less Bible translation, not more.

Over the past decades, Bible agencies have shifted their emphasis from translation *per se,* to envisioning, training and equipping a new generation of translators and project leaders who are able to translate the Scriptures into their own languages. The popular picture of the Bible translator as a missionary who disappears into the jungle for twenty years and reappears clutching a translated Bible is no longer true, if it ever was. Though expatriates still serve as advisors, exegetes and project coordinators; "no translation organisation worthy of its name would now claim to have expatriate translators"[22].

There are a number of reasons why native speakers should take a lead in translating the Bible. The first is the simple, pragmatic point that native speakers make better translators. A good quality translation needs to be expressed in clear, natural language requires the 'feel' of a native speaker. There are very few adults who can achieve this level of proficiency in a new language. This is even more the case when that language is only distantly related to the learner's own mother tongue, as is often the case centre of with minority languages.

It is also the case that the more that the community who speak the language are involved in and take responsibility for the translation project, the more likely it is that the translated Scriptures will be accepted and used by the community. It would be naïve to expect that every community in the world receives the Scriptures with open arms. There are many reasons why people might refuse to use a translation in their own language; they may prefer an already existing translation or they may simply be indifferent to the Scriptures. After all, the English don't make a great thing of reading the Bible, despite the easy availability of the Scriptures in our language. Local leadership of the translation programme means that the work will be done in a way which is more likely to make the final product more acceptable to the local community.[23]

However, the most important reason why it is important that native speakers are involved in the translation process is simply that it is right that they should be. Over the last fifty years the Church has undergone a huge demographic shift. In Andrew Walls' term, the Christian world has undergone a shift in its gravity[24]. Comparing trends in Uganda and the United Kingdom gives an indication of the extent of these changes. Christianity only took root in Uganda around 150 years ago yet today 75%

---

[22] Zogbo, pp. 337-350 (p. 339).
[23] Zogbo, pp. 337-350 (p. 347).
[24] A. F Walls, *The Cross-cultural Process in Christian History* : *Studies in the Transmission and Appropriation of Faith*, (Orbis Books, 2002), p. 31.

of the population would describe themselves as Christian.[25] By contrast, in 2005 a Manchester University study showed that only 50% of British Christian parents succeeded in passing on their faith to their children,[26] while a report by Peter Brierly suggests that the membership of Christian denominations in the UK will fall to under 5% by 2040, compared to just under 10% today.[27] According to Richter and Francis "For every adult in Church, four other adults used to attend regularly but have given up".[28]

Sanneh sums up the cumulative effect of these two trends:

"By 1985 there were over 16,500 conversions a day (in Africa), yielding an annual rate of over 6 million. In the same period some 4,300 people were leaving the Church on a daily basis in Europe and North America."[29]

The different experiences of the Church in the West and elsewhere have led to a change in the profile of Christians around the world. In 1800, well over 90% of Christians lived in Europe and North America, whereas in 1990 over 60% lived in Africa, South America, Asia and the Pacific, with that proportion increasing each year.[30]

In this situation where the majority of Christians are from the developing or majority world, it is appropriate that they take an increasing responsibility for the whole of the church's mission to the world, including Bible translation.

The transition from expatriate missionary-translators to projects led by local people has not always been as smooth as it should have been. Partly, this has been due to the lack of appropriate training for the translation workforce. Bible translation and the associated linguistic and literacy work require a significant level of education. Typically, team leaders or exegetes need to be educated at least to degree level in Biblical studies and translation and other team members will require some degree of specialist training too.

Over the last few decades, Wycliffe and other agencies have multiplied the number of opportunities for Bible translators to be trained to a high level in many locations around the world. Though I was directly involved in a translation programme in Ivory Coast, I believe that my most significant accomplishment in that country was to build the relationships necessary to enable the establishment of a French language MA in Bible translation at a theology seminary in Abidjan.

Returning to the theme of Old Testament translation, the shifting demographic of the Church means that there is no shortage of people with the potential to be involved in Bible translation work. Wycliffe and other agencies need to multiply, even further, the already significant resources they currently invest in promoting the need for

[25] P. Jenkins, *The Next Christendom : the Coming of Global Christianity*, (Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 91.
[26] Daily Telegraph: 17 August 2005
[27] Daily Telegraph: 3 September 2005
[28] http://www.facingthechallenge.org/forgotten.htm
[29] L. O Sanneh, *Whose Religion Is Christianity? : the Gospel Beyond the West*, (W.B. Eerdmans Pub., 2003), p. 15.
[30] Walls, p. 31.

translation and in equipping and training the next generation of translators. The translation goals for a particular language or region can no longer be limited to the production of translated texts along the lines of those mentioned earlier. Translation agencies can only consider their work complete in any situation if there are motivated people who are trained (or have access to training) and able to carry on the translation work. It is perfectly legitimate for a translation agency to only produce a limited part of the Bible, say a New Testament or mini-Bible, if there are people equipped to carry on that work should the community so desire it.

In other words, agencies need to consider passing on a vision for translation and equipping people to be involved in the work as being at least as important as actually translating the Biblical texts. This would seem to be consistent with Paul's charge to Timothy to ensure that the next generation of Christians was equipped to follow in his footsteps (2 Timothy 3:16)

One example where this sort of approach is being used comes from the Sepik area of Papua New Guinea:

"The Sepik Partnership and Engagement Strategy exists to be a catalyst for increased and ongoing transformation of communities in the Sepik through capacity building and their ownership of the development and creative use of heart-language Scriptures.

As partnerships are built with churches, NGOs, and local community leaders, the intention is to reach out together to each of these language communities with an invitation to become involved initially through oral Bible storytelling, Participatory Approaches in survey and Language Documentation. Churches will have a critical role, determining the continuation of the engagement and the mutual contributions toward goals. Initial activities will include building relationships with unreached communities and gauging their interest in vernacular Scriptures. If a community expresses interest, they will be invited to workshops where they can begin involvement in language development, starting with oral bible storytelling. Later, the communities that express interest can start to move toward limited goal written translation."[31]

This, I believe is the future of Bible translation: slowly building a consensus within a community to tell Bible stories then move on to limited translation while building the capacity for the local people to translate the whole of the Bible into their own language at the time of their choosing. This not only honours, respects and empowers communities of Christians around the world, it is also the best way to ensure that the whole of the Bible can be translated into as many languages as possible.

Some Closing Reflections

When you are involved in a clearly defined ministry, such as Bible translation, it means that many of the missiological questions you face are well defined: for example how does OT translation fit into our strategy? Churches in the UK face questions which are infinitely more complex and nuanced than these. However, it is possible

---

[31] http://www.facebook.com/SpesInPNG

that the questions that translation agencies face could help to clarify some issues which are faced by the church in the UK, for example:

- What is the role of the Old Testament in the mission and witness of the church in the UK? Do our traditional approaches to evangelism and apologetics assume an understanding of the broader narrative of Scripture which is no longer present in our post-Christian society?

- What can we learn from work among oral cultures for the mission of the Church in an increasingly post-literate society in the UK?

Though questions about the translation of the Old Testament, may appear to be arcane and of interest only to the specialist; this is an important area of missiological investigation which has significant impact in our post-Christian society.

Bibliography

Arichea, Daniel, 'Theology and Translation: The Implications of Certain Theological Issues to the Translation Task', in *Bible Translation and the Spread of the Church: The Last 200 Years* (Brill, 1990), pp. 40-67.

Arthur, Edwin, 'Hearing the Gospel Once or Twice', *Kouya Chronicle*, 2011 <http://www.kouya.net/?p=4318>.

Barnwell, Katherine, 'Goals for Translation: A Proposal', *Notes on Translation*, 9 (1995), 20-24.

Bartholomew, Craig, *The Drama of Scripture : Finding Our Place in the Biblical Story* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 2006).

Brown, R., 'Communicating God's Message in Oral Cultures', *International Journal of Frontier Missions*, 21 (2004), 26–32.

---, 'Selecting and Using Scripture Portions Effectively in Frontier Missions', *International Journal of Frontier Missions*, 18 (2001), 10.

Greene, C., and M. Robison, *Metavista: Bible, Church and Mission in an Age of Imagination*, ed. by anonymous, Faith in an Emerging Culture (Authentic, 2008).

Hill, Margaret, 'Some Practical Considerations for Translating the Old Testament', *Notes on Translation*, 9 (1995), 34-39.

International Orality Network.;Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization., *Making Disciples of Oral Learners : to Proclaim His Story Where It Has Not Been Known Before* -- (Waxhaw N.C.: International Orality Network, 2005).

Jenkins, P., 'Reading the Bible in the Global South', *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, 30 (2006), 67–73.

---, *The Next Christendom : the Coming of Global Christianity*, ed. by anonymous (Oxford University Press, 2002).

Kuhn, Hanni, 'Building a Ramp To The New Testament', *Notes on Translation*, 11 (1997), 1-5.

Macdonald, George, 'Rethinking Our Position On Translating the Old Testament', *Notes on Translation*, 9 (1995), 1-19.

Sanneh, L. O, *Whose Religion Is Christianity? : the Gospel Beyond the West*, ed. by anonymous (W.B. Eerdmans Pub., 2003).

Walls, A. F, *The Cross-cultural Process in Christian History : Studies in the Transmission and Appropriation of Faith*, ed. by anonymous (Orbis Books, 2002).

Wright, Christopher, *The Mission of God's People : a Biblical Theology of the Church's Mission* (Grand Rapids Mich.: Zondervan, 2010).

Zogbo, Lynell, 'Introduction to the Field Today', in *A History of Bible Translation*, ed. by Philip A. Noss (Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 2007), pp. 337-350.

Old Testament Text beyond Qumran

David Instone-Brewer

Summary
The discovery of the Qumran Bible manuscripts helped confirm the theory that there were many different forms of the Hebrew Bible before a Standard one was chosen to be preserved as the Masoretic text, so first century Jews had many Hebrew Bibles available to them. Subsequent discoveries have reversed that conclusion. It now appears likely that first century Jews had already decided which text form of the Hebrew text was the oldest, and that many of the variant readings were conscious paraphrases of this older text.

Introduction

Scholarly consensus is that the Hebrew text of the Old Testament was still fluid in the early first century, with many versions in circulation which are often significantly different. And yet Jesus says in Matthew and Luke that not one letter or penstroke will ever be lost from the text of the Torah (Matt.5.18; cf. Lk.16.17). Josephus claims similarly about the books of the whole Old Testament that "during so many ages as have already passed, nobody dared to add to them, to take from them, or to make changes" (C. Ap. 1.38, 42 TRANS).

If the Hebrew scriptures were still being edited at this time, so that first century readers might never come across two identical texts, they would regard these as absurd claims which discredit everything else these authors say.

With hindsight we can apply these sayings to the remarkable way in which the Hebrew text was transmitted letter-perfect by rabbis in future centuries, culminating in the amazing work of the 9th century Masoretes.

These rabbis produced our Masoretic manuscripts, the most important of which are now called Leningrad and Aleppo after the cities in Russia and Syria where they remained until Aleppo moved to Jerusalem and Leningrad reverted to St Petersberg. These comprise not only of the letters which Jesus and Josephus referred to, but also a complex system of vowel pointing which fixed their pronunciation, and an unsurpassed system of 26 levels of punctuation. Just as our periods, commas and semicolons divide our sentences into subordinate clauses, lists, and subject-verb-object groups, they used 18 differently defined symbols to create a complex hierarchy of very small units, as well as 8 different strengths of conjunction which linked words like our hyphen does. The result was a text in which almost all ambiguity was removed for both vocabulary and grammatical structure.

The accuracy with which the vowels had been orally transmitted can be confirmed by the correct pronunciation of Assyrian proper names such as Tiglath-pileser and Sargon which hadn't been outside the Hebrew Bible for more than a millenium.[32] To preserve the letters themselves they added the Massorah – a system of abbreviated marginal notes which provided checksums and warnings for the scribe copying the manuscript. For example, the middle word and letter of each book was calculated and marked, so that the scribe could count back and check that no letters had been missed, and any strange spellings which the scribe might be tempted to 'correct' were noted, along with a list of any other places where this same spelling occurred. A careful scribe could, by means of all this help, produce a letter-perfect copy of the Hebrew scriptures – a feat achieved for no other text before the invention of the printing press.

We don't know when such practices started but we do know they succeeded, because these 9th century manuscripts are letter for letter identical to 2nd century ones. These ancient copies cannot be called Masoretic texts because they use a different method for vowels – instead of adding vowel points they occasionally add vowel letters such as a *vav* for "o" or *yod* for "i" – so they are called Standard texts. The largest of these (MurXII) is a complete scroll of the twelve minor prophets, which differs from the

---

[32] Alan R. Millard, "In Praise of Ancient Scribes", (*Biblical Archeologist* 1982, 45): 143-153.

medieval Leningrad codex in only 37 details, almost all of which are variations in spelling. As Emanuel Tov summarises it: "The only differences with the medieval text pertain to orthography, a few minute details, paragraphing, and the layout of individual Psalms, and these variations resemble the internal differences between the medieval manuscripts of MT themselves".[33]

However, this tidy situation in the second century contrasts markedly with previous centuries illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls which exhibit huge variety.

So, if everything was still fluid in the first century, why did authors like Matthew, Luke and Josephus make such absurd claims which could be easily falsified? This paper will argue that the solution lies in the great Standardisation Project which was as important to first century Jews as the modern-day genome project.

The Old Testament Text found at Qumran

The Dead Sea Scrolls discovered near Qumran were a monumental addition to our knowledge of the first century world. They were immediately datable by the fact that the community was destroyed by the Romans in 68 CE, and subsequent work on palaeography established that the collection held manuscripts originating back as far as 250 BCE.

The types of biblical texts at Qumran had, in many way, been predicted by scholars. They had inferred that many of the differences between the Masoretic Hebrew text and its early translations into the Greek Septuagint, the Aramaic Targums and Samaritan Pentateuch were due to different Hebrew originals and not due to inaccurate or inventive translators. This is not to say that the translators weren't inaccurate or inventive, but when two or three of these ancient versions agreed with each other against the surviving Hebrew text, the natural conclusion is that they had known a different Hebrew original.

The discoveries at Qumran helped confirm this, though they also added new layers of complexity to the picture. Some of the Bible manuscripts appeared to have features similar to the Greek Septuagint, suggesting that they were similar to the Hebrew text which lay behind that translation. In the same way, some had features similar to the Samaritan Pentateuch and many manuscripts shared readings with the Aramaic Targums,[34] and of course many manuscripts were similar to the later Masoretic text. All this had been predicted but the surprise was that there were also a large number of manuscripts which fitted into none of these groups and which differed significantly from each other. The Old Testament text was much more fluid than expected.

Among the 25,000 fragments of 900 manuscripts found at Qumran, there are about 200 which are recognisable as Bible texts, ranging from the large Isaiah scroll to tiny fragments containing just a few letters. This represents only a fraction of the original

---

[33] Emanuel Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert" in Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov, eds. *The Bible as a Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (London: British Library; New Castle, Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 2002): 146

[34] No individual texts have been identified as possible precursors for the Targums in the way that some have been identified as similar to Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch. However, readings which are only found in the Targum can be found in the Qumran Scrolls, such as "like" in Is.29.13 later in this paper.

collection. Alongside the four manuscript fragments found in cave 8 were leather tabs belonging to 68 scrolls which had either decayed or disappeared. This indicates that we now have only a tiny sample of the original library. We have fragments from most books but also large gaps – for example there is only one fragment from the whole of Chronicles. Therefore the fact that we have no fragments from two of the smaller Bible books – Esther and Nehemiah – should not be regarded as significant.

The easiest way to evaluate this material is in the so-called *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* – a wonderfully accessible translation of all the Judean Desert Bible texts.[35] This marks differences to the Masoretic text by italics, with footnotes indicating which manuscripts the difference is found in. This useful feature exaggerates the number of variants because every variant found in any manuscript is noted. So, for example, at Genesis 1.15 it translates "*they were* for signs and for seasons", whereas the Masoretic text reads "let them be...", but the footnote points out that only one out of three manuscripts at Qumran actually has this variant. These footnotes also usefully tell you if variants agree with the Septuagint translation and Samaritan Pentateuch.[36]

Of the fragments which have been recovered, about 121 are large enough to analyse their text type. Emanuel Tov has found that 4 are similar to the Septuagint, 3 to the Samaritan Pentateuch, 57 to the Standard text, but another 57 do not fit into any known text family.[37] The larger fragments demonstrate the uncertainty of such assignments by having some features from one text family and some from another. For example, of those which are Standard text, 20 have some Samaritan features and 13 have some Septuagint features. Even more variant readings can be found among the Qumran commentaries on Bible books. These not only quote Hebrew texts which are different to the Standard text, but they also base interpretations on these different readings, so it is clear that they regard these variants as having equal value to other readings.

Scholars agree that the Bible manuscripts were largely collected from outside Qumran and only some were produced by scribes there. All this helped confirm that the Hebrew text of the Old Testament was still very fluid during the first century. However, subsequent discoveries have thrown doubt on this conclusion.

The Old Testament Text found Outside Qumran

The Dead Sea Scrolls are published in a series called *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*[38] – a title which indicates that manuscripts were found at other sites as well as Qumran. Other important texts were discovered soon after at Massada, Wadi Sdeir,

---

[35] *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* by by Martin Abegg Jr, Peter Flint and Eugen Ulrich (HarperCollins; New York: 1999)

[36] The note says that 4QGen^g has this variant but 4QGen^b and 4QGen^k agree with the MT, as does the SP. The LXX also agrees with MT though in this case the note neglects to mention it. Unfortunately these notes do not mention agreement with Targumic readings.

[37] Emanuel Tov. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (*Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah (STDJ)*; Leiden: Brill, 2004). pp. 332-335; Tov "The Biblical Texts" p.153.

[38] D. Barthélemy, J. T. Milik, P. Benoit et al, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955-).

Naḥal Se'elim, Naḥal Ḥever and Murabba'at. Among these were 23 Bible manuscripts though these have received less attention because they are all Standard texts. However, this apparently uninteresting feature has prompted a re-evaluation of the Qumran biblical texts.

We now have a situation which looks completely different. Every site in Palestine where ancient Bibles have been found contains manuscripts which are Standard texts – ie they are almost or exactly like the Masoretic text. The collection of texts at Qumran now stand out as distinct from all the others in a country which was rejecting non-Standard texts.

This throws new light on the fact that half of the manuscripts at Qumran are similar to the Standard text, because it suggests that the other half are the odd ones and were perhaps already regarded as inferior. Our view of the variety of texts at Qumran was disproportionately influenced by the great Isaiah scroll (1QIsaᵃ) – the only complete scroll found at Qumran – which receive the most attention initially and clearly diverged from the Standard text. However, in retrospect, we could regard the Standard text as the de facto majority text at Qumran. The non-Standard texts form a very disparate group, and only very few can be categorised into other families of texts. Only about 4% are close to the Septuagint and another 6% are close to the Samaritan text,[39] which means that the Standard text family is represented by more than ten times as many texts than the next largest family of texts.

Different scholars have constructed different histories to account for this which has been well surveyed by Armin Lange.[40] Some older scholars theorised that all the Standard text reflected a single ancient text from which the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Hebrew text behind the Greek Septuagint had diverged, and which Jews had rightly rejected by the time the Temple was destroyed at 70 CE.[41] More recently the Standard text has been regarded as one text among many which somehow came to prominence.[42] Some saw this process starting in the second century BC when the

---

[39] See Tov "The Biblical Texts" p.153: there are 6 texts which mirror the LXX more than MT out of 121 analysable texts, and 3 texts which mirror the SP more than MT out of 46 analysable Torah texts.

[40] Armin Lange "'They Confirmed the Reading" (y. Ta'an. 4.68a): The Textual Standardization of Jewish Scriptures in the Second Temple Period" in   Nóra Dávid and Armin Lange (eds.), *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology (CB.* Leuven: Peeters, 2010) 29-80. The following summary of scholarship is based on his survey.

[41] Some said that SP and LXX diverged separately – see E. F. C. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese,* vol. 1(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1797) esp. 244 and maintained after the Qumran discoveries by P. W. Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism," in *Volume du Congrès: Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 148-60, 148. Some explained common features between the SP and LXX by theorising that they both divergences from a common earlier divergent text – see W. Gesenius, *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, indole, et auctoritate commentatio philoligico-critica* (Halle: Rengersche Buchhandlung, 1815).

[42] See P. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863), 2 who regards it as a single text with many variant readings and P. Kahle,

Maccabean wars had destroyed all but a few scrolls which became the exemplars for future copying and created a new interest in a single text form,[43] but more recent scholars doubt that any single text was considered as a 'standard' during the first century, and regard the Standard text as the only text which survived the almost total destruction of Judaism at 70 CE.[44]

By whichever means the history of these texts is explained, all scholars recognise that during the first century a wide variety of texts were available, and variant readings were widely known through translations and manuscripts and possibly through popular preaching, as witnessed by the Gospels and Josephus.

The Bible used by Jesus

Although Josephus believed in a single unchanging Bible text, he often retells Bible stories in accordance with variants found in Targums and the Septuagint,[45] and we also find Jesus using variant readings portrayed in these versions. For example, in Matthew 15.9, Jesus cites Isaiah 29.13 in a form which reflects the Septuagint:

Matthew 15:9

μάτην δέ σέβονταί με διδάίκοντες διδασκαλίας ενταλματα άνθρωων.

they revere me in vain, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men

Isaiah 29:13 LXX

μάτην δε σέβονταί με διδασκοντες έντάλματα άνθρωπων και διδασκαλιας

"Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes," in *Opera Minora* (Leiden: Brill, 1956) 3-37. He regarded the variants as coming from many separate families of texts.

[43] See M. H. Segal, "The Promulgation of the Authoritative Text of the Hebrew Bible," *JBL* 73 (1953): 35-47 and Kreuzer, "Von der Vielfalt zur Einheitlichkeit: Wie kam es zur Vorherrschaft des masoretischen Textes?" in *Horizonte biblischer Texte: Festschrift für Josef M. Oesch zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. A. Vonach and G. Fischer; OBO 196; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2003), 117-29.

[44] Expressed most forcefully by E. C. Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls: The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*, 67-87. This was also accepted by D. Barthélemy *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, vol 3: *Ézechiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes* (OBO 50.3; Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1992), cxiii

[45] See *Louis H. Feldman. Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism; Leiden: Brill, 1998). He has several examples where Josephus follows Septuagint traditions, eg: p.536, Ant.11.247 follows the Septuagint's explanation that God stopped the king sleeping at Esther 6.1; p.505, Ant.11.202 cites the date added by the Septuagint Esther 2.16 though makes it into their marriage date. Josephus is also shown to follow Targumic traditions, eg p.405, Tg.Jonah 3.5 that the Ninevites had faith in Jonah rather than in God; p.274, Tg.1King.21.27 which is the basis for Josephus' "went barefoot" at Ant.8.362 whereas Hebrew says "softly" and LXX says "bent over"; p.325, Josephus follows Tg.2 Kings 9.20 where Jehu drives "in good order" rather than "madly" (MT & LXX).

they revere me in vain, teaching the commandments and doctrines of men

Isaiah 29:13 MT   יִרְאָתָ֣ם אֹתִ֔י מִצְוַ֥ת אֲנָשִׁ֖ים מְלֻמָּדָֽה

their reverence for me [is] a commandment taught by men

Isaiah 29:13 Tg   וַהֲוַת דַּחְלַתְהוֹן קֳדָמַי כְּתַפְקִידַת גַּבְרִין מַלְפִין

they	do	reverence	for	me	like	a	commandment	taught	by	men
Isaiah	29:13	1QIsaᵃ	מלמדה	אנשים ·	כמצות		אתי			יראתם
their	reverence	for	me	[is]	like	a	commandment	taught	by	men

The Septuagint form was not chosen simply because the Gospel was written in Greek, because Jesus' saying depends on the variant reading. Jesus claimed that the teaching of the Pharisees consisted of merely human commands. This text forms the basis of his complaint only in the version represented by the Septuagint, which says these worshippers are teachers of human commandments, whereas the Masoretic text implies they are recipients of such teaching while the Targum Pseudo Jonathan (and one text at Qumran) merely compares their worship to such teaching.

In Mark 4.12 we find an example of Jesus using a reading which is found in the later Targum of Isaiah 6.10 which ends "they may be forgiven", though in this case Matthew changes the quote to conform to the Standard Hebrew text: "I will heal them".[46]

Mark 4:12 ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αυτοῖς

they may turn and [their sins] may be forgiven them

Matthew 13:15. ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀσομαι αυτους

they may turn and I will heal them

Isaiah 6:10 Tg   ויתיבון וְיִשְׁתְּבֵיק לְהוֹן

they may turn and [their sins] be forgiven them.

Isaiah 6:10 MT 1QIsaᵃ 4QIsaᶠ   וָשָׁב וְרָפָא לֹו

they may turn and I will heal them

Isaiah 6:10 LXX ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰασομαι αυτους

they may turn and I will heal them

---

[46] Matthew appears to make up for the lost theme of "repentance" by adding the explanation of the parable of the weeds which emphasises the punishment of sin (Mt.13.36-43)

What language did Jesus quote the Bible in? This is a long and continuing debate, but on the cross Jesus clearly cites an Old Testament text in Aramaic - *elôi elôi lema sabachthani*. This is particularly noteworthy because it follows the Hebrew vocabulary rather than that found in the traditional Targum.[47]

Mark   15:34   ελωι   ελωι   λεμα   σαβαχθανι   *(elôi   elôi   lema   sabachthani)*

ὁ   θεος   μου   ὁ   θεος   μου,   εις   τι   ἐγκατελιπες   με;

My God, my God, to what [purpose] have you forsaken me?

Matthew 27:46 ηλι ηλι λεμα σαβαχθανι *(éli éli lema sabachthani)*

Θεε μου θεε μου, ἰνατι με ἐγκατελιπες;

Oh my God, oh my God, why have you me forsaken?

Psalm 22:1 LXX ὁ θεος ὁ θεος μου πρσχες μοι ἱνα τί ἐγκατελιπες με;

God, my God, listen to me; for what [purpose] have you forsaken me?

Psalm 22:2[MT]   אֵלִי אֵלִי לְמָה עֲזַבְתָּנִי *(eli eli lamah 'atzabtani)*

My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?

Psalm 22:2[Tg]   שבקתני אלי אלי מטול מה *(eli eli metul mah sabaktani)*

My God, my God, for what have you abandoned me?

The Gospels portray both a reverence for the Standard text as well as an acceptance of variants. Even when Jesus quotes in Aramaic he is portrayed as following the Standard text, and Matthew feels the need to change Jesus' citation back to the Standard text when he can, though he is willing to portray Jesus using variants when necessary. To understand this we need to look closer at processes of standardization during the early first century.

Rabbinic Evidence for the Standardisation Project

Rabbinic stories are much less reliable than rabbinic legislation. They were transmitted in a less systematic and careful way, without the rigors of courtroom methodology and testing. For this reason the following story has often been rightly treated with suspicion, but we will find that there are good reasons for regarding it as having a basis in history.

Three scrolls were found in the [Temple] courtyard: שלשה ספרים מצאו בעזרה
the "*maon*" scroll, and the "*zaatuti*" scroll,   ספר מעוני וספר זעטוטי

---

[47] The Psalms have only one Targum which is undatable but is generally regarded as relatively late, so the precise wording in the first century is impossible to determine with any certainly. However the Targum version is more typically Aramaic than the transliteration in the Gospel account based on the Hebrew vocabulary.

and the "*hi'*" scroll.   וספר היא

In one [scroll] they found written [at Deut.33.27]   באחד מצאו כתוב

"A habitation [masc. *maon*] is the eternal God";   [48]מעון אלהי קדם

and in two [scrolls it] was written,   ובשנים כתיב

"A habitation [fem. *me'onah*] is the eternal God";   מענה אלהי קדם

and they confirmed the two and abrogated the one.   וקיימו שנים וביטלו אחד

In one they found written, [at Ex.24.1]   באחד מצאו כתוב

"And he sent the young men [*zaatuti*] of the sons of Israel";   וישלח את זעטוטי בני ישראל

and in two [scrolls it] was written,   ובשנים כתוב

"And he sent the young men [*na'ari*] of the sons of Israel"   וישלח את נערי בני ישראל

and they confirmed the two and abrogated the one.   וקיימו שנים וביטלו אחד

In one [scroll] they found written   באחד מצאו כתוב

"she" [spelled as "he" corrected] nine [times]   היאתשע

and in two [scrolls it] was written   ובשנים כתיב

"she" [spelled as "he" corrected] eleven [times]   היאאחד עשר

and they confirmed the two and abrogated the one.   וקיימו שנים ובטלו אחד

(y.Taan.4.2, 20b; cf Sifre Deut. 356; ARN B 46; b.Sof.6.4)

This tells us that the Temple displayed three exemplars of the Standard text in the courtyard where they could be examined. None of them were exactly identical, so whenever one differed from the other two, they let the correct reading be decided by the majority of texts. They give three instructive examples.

First the feminine *me'onah* (מענה, which normally means "answer") was used at Deuteronomy 33.27 where the masculine *maon* (מָעוֹן, "dwelling") would be expected. The unusual majority reading was accepted, though the Masoretes pointed it as *me'onah* (מְעֹנָה) rather than the normal *ma'aneh* (מַעֲנֶה) so that it resembled the masculine form as much as possible without changing the letters.

Second, the Aramaic word *zaatut* (זאטוט), "young man", was used in one manuscript instead of the normal Hebrew *na'ar* (נער) which also means "young man" but it could possibly mean "a slave".[49] This was represented in the LXX as νεανίσκοι instead of πα δες and was regarded as one of the changes which shows these translators were inspired by God (b.Meg.9a).

Lastly, they found eleven corrections of the archaic form of the feminine or neuter pronoun *hi* (הוא corrected to the identically sounding היא) but in one manuscript it had been corrected on only nine occasions.[50]

This shows that there was no attempt to find reasons for making changes. in the first case the feminine form was clearly wrong, so a helpful scribe (ie one who wants to help the reader by modernising and tidying the text) would want to correct it to the masculine but a modern text critic would wish to keep the more difficult reading on

---

[48] Some MSS read קדש "holy" instead of קדם "ancient" ie "eternal".

[49] Marcus Jastrow, ed. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (Authorised ed; London: Choreb; New York: E. Shapiro, 1926) 407.

[50] These passages are listed at ARN A 34.5 (or .7 in some editions): Gen:14.2; 20.5 38.25; Lev.11.39; 13.10, 21; 20.17; 21.9; Num.5.13 (x2), 14 – though the MT corrects one of the instances in Num.5.13.

the assumption that this was unlikely to occur in more than on manuscript if it wasn't older than the correction. In the second case the Aramaic form has clearly been introduced for apologetic reasons, so a modern text critic would want to revert to the normal Hebrew. In the third case a helpful scribe would want to modernise all eleven instances, and a text critic would want to preserve the least amount of modernisation. However, in each case the decision was made on the basis of the numbers of manuscripts and not on the merits of the case.

This rabbinic tradition is very difficult to date. There are no clues in the context of the passage. It is simply inserted between two traditions which concern "two things and a third" – the former about rabbis (R. Hanina bar Hama and Rab, ie Abba b. Aibu, both from about 220-250 CE) and the latter about two couches and a third (quoted from t.Ber.5.5). Between these traditions which have nothing in common except their concern about "two things and a third", lies two traditions which are also linked by a common theme – documents found in the Temple. The first is this one about the two scrolls and a third found in the Temple, and the other concerns genealogies found in the Temple. The tradition about genealogies has nothing to do with twos or a third, so it is presumably included because it was already firmly attached to the tradition about the scrolls and they had been inserted as a single unit.[51] Unfortunately this tradition about genealogies has nothing to commend itself as a genuinely ancient tradition. It is transmitted late and it looks like fanciful ideas rather than real genealogies. It assigns glorious ancestors or similar-sounding ancestors to various famous rabbis, eg: Hillel descended from David, R. Yannai from Eli, Ben Kalba from Caleb, R. Nehemiah from Nehemiah the Tirshathite. This only helps to cast doubt on the attached tradition of the three scrolls in the Temple.

However, traditions in rabbinic collections are a mixed bag, and it is too easy to dismiss them. One has to ask: would anyone have invented them? With regard to these genealogies, the answer is clearly, Yes. With regard to the tradition about three scrolls, the answer is, No, because they imply something embarrassing about the state of the biblical text. They imply that at the time of the Second Temple there existed no single authoritative perfect copy of the Hebrew scriptures which could be used as an exemplar.

An invented account would say something like, "In the Temple courtyard were twenty perfect scrolls" or something more fanciful like "in the days of the Temple, no scribe ever made an error". The rabbis were perfectly capable of writing and believing such stories, as illustrated by Aristeas' story of the seventy who all produced an identical Greek translation. The rabbis not only believed this story – they even extended it by listing theologically useful changes which the translators had each independently been inspired to make:

King Ptolemy brought together seventy-two elders and placed them in seventy-two [separate] rooms, without telling them why he had brought them together, and he went in

---

[51] This is a common phenomenon in the development of Talmudic literature. However, this tradition about the genealogies has not remained attached when the tradition of the three scrolls is cited elsewhere (ie at Sif.Deut.356; b.Sof.6.4; ARN B 46).

to each one of them and said to him, Translate for me the Torah of Moses your master. God then prompted each one of them and they all conceived the same idea and wrote for him [...a list of welcome changes] (b.Meg.9a).

The story of the three scrolls is also believable because it helps to explain the references to correcting scrolls: "When you teach your son, teach him from a corrected scroll [מדהו בספר]";[52] "A scroll that is not corrected: R. Ami says it can be kept [for only] 30 days".[53] There are also references to those who "read" or "correct" scrolls in the Temple court: "they correct [his scroll by comparing it] to the scroll of the [Temple] Courtyard [ומגיהין אותו מספר עזרה]";[54] "Readers of scrolls [ספריממגיהי] in Jerusalem received their fees from the Temple funds"; "Readers of the scroll [of the Temple] court [העזרה מגיהי ספר] receive their fees from the heave-offering of the chamber".[55]

All of these are recorded late though they clearly relate to an earlier tradition about scrolls in the Temple. The likelihood that they relate to authentic traditions from the Temple period is paradoxically strengthened by a rabbinic ruling which misunderstands them. This tradition, which is likely to originate at the start of the second century, says: "They do not correct a single letter [even] in the scroll of the [Temple] court [בספר עזרא]".[56] This is a rule about how much one may write on an intermediate festival day and it is clearly referring to the traditions concerning the scrolls in the Temple Courtyard and the Temple employees concerned with them, but it assumes that these scribes were employed to correct the exemplar belonging to the Temple rather than the scrolls brought along for checking against the exemplar. The fact that these traditions about the three scrolls and the Temple employees were already being misunderstood suggests that they originated at least two generations before this misunderstanding – ie in the mid first century or earlier.

Each of these rabbinic traditions are of dubious value individually, but they tell a consistent story: that the Temple owned three manuscripts which were used as exemplars by Temple employees who corrected scrolls which were brought to them. If this story had been invented it would have referred to a single scroll which was perfect or perhaps many perfect scrolls. We can already see this kind of myth

---

[52] Attributed to R. Akiva at b.Pes.112a, but this is a biographical story about Akiva's last words, not a legal tradition, so it is likely to originate much later than Akiva.

[53] This is a legal tradition from b.Ket.19b but from a very late authority.

[54] This is a late invention at y.San.2.6 inspired by m.San.2.4 which says the ideal king will write out his own Torah.

[55] These related traditions are both parts of collections of similar traditions at b.Ket.106a and y.Sheq.4.3 contributed by various rabbis of various generations, so the final form of the list is late. In both of them one tradition is questioned because it contradicted another, so it is likely that these were being presented in a legal context in a more rigorous way than normal non-legal agadot.

[56] This undatable tradition in m.MQ.3.4 is earlier than R. Judah (b. Illai) who commented on it in the mid second century.

developing in the Jerusalem Talmud which refers to a single Temple scroll.[57] This tradition about three scrolls is believable because it implies that the Temple did not own even one perfect ancient copy, which is an admission that the prior status of the text is not as changeless as Josephus claimed or as perfectly preserved as the rabbis would have liked to have believed.

Evidence for Standardisation at Qumran

When we bring this evidence back to the texts at Qumran, it is not difficult to find examples of the Standardisation process taking place in the Dead Sea scrolls themselves.

Tov has already pointed out that the texts which were already the family of Standard texts have been corrected to align with the Standard text even more carefully.[58] This suggests that these texts had been copied from an exemplar which was close to the Standard text, and then they had been corrected according to another better exemplar (perhaps one which the scribe did not have easy access to) in order to bring it closer to the Standard text. This process continued outside Qumran till fewer and fewer corrections were needed. The early second century manuscript of the Twelve Prophets found at Murabba'at has only 11 corrections, all of which correct it towards the Standard text.[59]

However, these corrections did not only occur in manuscripts which were originally copied from Standard texts. We can find evidence for corrections towards the Standard text even in manuscripts which were copied by scribes who copied in a non-conservative way. Later scribes corrected such texts by fixing not only scribal errors but also removing variants, so that they corrected it towards the Standard text.

A good place to look for examples is Deuteronomy because several fragments of this much-loved book have survived so we can compare overlapping manuscripts. For example, in 11.8-10 the Masoretic text says:

"go in and possess the land you [plural] are crossing over to possess... (10) For the land which you [singular] are going in to possess is not like the land of Egypt from where you [pl.] came where you [sing.] sowed your [sing.] seed and watered it with your [sing.] foot like a garden of herbs".

At Qumran we find three changes which help the reader, underlined in the following:[60]

"go in and possess the land you [plural] are crossing over the Jordan to possess... (10) For the land which you [plural] are going in to possess is not like the land of Egypt from

---

[57] The idealised story concerning the Torah of the king (y.San.2.6) and the tradition about Temple employees (y.Sheq.4.3) both refer to a single scroll.

[58] See his list of examples at Tov, *Scribal Practices* p. 224

[59] Tov, *Scribal Practices* 224

[60] There are actually two additional words with variants within this section: the singular "you" alters the verb as well as the pronoun; and the pronoun for Egypt is masculine in MT but feminine (as expected) everywhere else.

where you [pl.] came where you [sing.] sowed your [sing.] seed and watered it with your [sing.] feet like a garden of herbs".

1) The phrase "crossing over" sounds clumsy without an object. The Qumran manuscript which covers this verse (4QDeut[kl]) has supplied it by adding "the Jordan". The Septuagint has this addition, but none of the Targums felt the need to add an object and both the Masoretic text and Samaritan Pentateuch lack it, so it is likely that it was originally absent. It seems that the Qumran scribe has added something useful which was traditionally added (as reflected in the Septuagint). Interestingly, the NIV added this same helpful phrase in 1984 before this manuscript was published.

2) There is a mix-up between singular and plural "you": the Masoretic text reads "you [plural] are crossing over... to the land which you [singular] are going to possess". Perhaps a scribe was confused by the mixure of the many "you" who go into the land, and the example singular "you" who had a herb garden in Egypt. The Samaritan Pentateuch, Septuagint and Targum Neofiti[61] have plural in both cases, as it undoubtedly should be and probably was originally. Two Qumran scribes have a Hebrew plural (4QDeut[kl & j]), but at some point someone has corrected one of these (4QDeut[j]) to the singular. This change makes it meaningless and the only possible reason for this 'correction' is in order to make it conform to the Standard text.

3) This herb garden in Egypt was so small it could be "watered with your foot", but this was an embarrassing phase in Hebrew, because urine was called "foot water" (2 Kings 18:27; Is 36:12). Perhaps the original picture was meant to express the idea of a garden so small that you could water it with this euphemistic "foot", but such texts were difficult to read out in a worship service. However, if you change it to "feet", it conjures a completely different picture: it now refers to digging an irrigation channel – you don't need to use a spade, but you only needed to kick a bit of dirt aside to make a small grove. Therefore everyone changed "foot" to "feet" – the Samaritan Pentateuch, Septuagint, Targum Neofiti[62] and the two Qumran scribes whose Hebrew manuscripts survive at this point (4QDeut[kl & c]). However, at some point someone has corrected one of them (4QDeut[c]) so that it reads "foot", and the only possible reason is to make it conform to the Standard text.

These examples show that even at Qumran the text is undergoing standardisation, and that the Standard text is already the clear favourite even at Qumran. But is it simply the most popular, or it is also the oldest? To answer this, we have to consider where the variant readings come from.

The origin of variant readings

The vast majority of variants consist of different styles of spelling or grammar, but the really interesting variants are those which result in a different meaning or explain an obscure reading. It is generally recognised that the Standard text has the largest number of obscure or problematic readings and that the variant manuscripts tend to

---

[61] Targums PseudoJonathan and Onkelos follow the MT with a singular.

[62] Targum PseudoJonathan had a different solution making it "by yourself". Onkelos characteristically follows the MT exactly and has "foot".

contain more intelligible and less problematic readings – as we saw in the examples above. It is a happy coincidence that modern scholars generally agree that the Standard text was probably the correct one for the rabbis to choose as an exemplar because it contains more archaic Hebrew and uncorrected corruptions. The other versions often offer solutions for these difficult passages which may well be correct, but they are probably corrections to the older more difficult text.

This suggests that one source of variants is scribes who wish to help the reader, and this theory has found support from a study aiming to show something completely different. Emanuel Tov has analysed the biblical fragments from the point of view of scribal practices used when writing the different manuscripts – such as the materials used and styles of writing – in order to identify manuscripts which were written by the scribes at Qumran and those which were collected from outside. In the process of doing this he identified a group of 'de luxe' manuscripts with features such as high quality vellum, lines drawn to guide the scribe, careful correction-free writing and wide margins. He concluded that these expensive editions were prepared for centers of worship or scholarship.[63] This was based partly on the fact that these features largely conformed to the later rabbinic regulations for preparing Bible scrolls[64] and partly on the grounds that these scrolls would be too expensive for individual use.[65] He also found that these luxury scrolls tended to follow the Standard text, whereas the cheaper copies made for individuals tended to contain more variations away from the Standard text.[66]

This means that when scribes were preparing a scroll for community worship and teaching, they chose a Standard text and copied it exactly. However, when making a copy for an individual, they made helpful changes when the Hebrew was corrupt or obscure. Tov's discovery works very well with this hypothesis but it still needs a lot of work to substantiate it.

This hypothesis is not saying that Qumran scribes invented variant readings. No variants in support of specifically Qumran doctrines have been found, and Eugene Ulrich (who has specifically searched for them) points out that they would in any case be counter-productive because they would convince no-one outside their community.[67] Neither would they need to invent ways to explain corrupt or archaic Hebrew, because these explanations would already exist. Every time someone preached on the text or translated it into Aramaic or Greek, they would need to

---

[63] Tov "The Biblical Texts" 159-160.

[64] These rules are found in the post-Talmudic tractate *Sopherim* and at y.Meg.1, 71b-72a. See Tov, *Scribal Practices* 274 for the details and analysis.

[65] Some of Tov's complex collections of correlations have been criticised, especially with regard to identifying the group of texts which were produced at Qumran – see Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 'Assessing Emanuel Tov's "Qumran Scribal Practice"' in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, ed. by Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman and Eileen Schuller (Leiden; Brill: 2010)

[66] Tov "The Biblical Texts" 151, 158-9.

[67] Eugene Ulrich "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran" in Herbert & Tov *The Bible as a Book* 179-195, p. 181

interpret the Hebrew in a meaningful way, so each obscure passage would have one or more traditional explanations. This would explain why these variants so often agree with one of these translations. It would also explain why features of Aramaic and Greek translations find their way into texts which do not on the whole fit into these families of texts.

Conclusions

The differences between the Bibles found at Qumran and in the rest of Palestine are dramatic, and the explanation is not clear. Perhaps the separatists at Qumran simply did not recognise the primacy of the Standard text and revelled in variant readings and interpretations based on those readings. Perhaps the Qumran community were avid collectors who loved variety and quirky examples of manuscripts - like a modern-day stamp collector who wants a standard copy of everything, but also loves collecting misprints and rare varieties. Or perhaps Qumran Jews were just as keen on establishing a Standard text as anyone else in Palestine, but their isolation meant that they did not have access to the best exemplars. The truth is probably a combination of these.

However, the Standard text was undoubtedly important at Qumran. There were ten times as many fragments from the Standard text family as from the next closest family of texts and all types of text show corrections towards the Standard text though not as systematically or accurately as outside Qumran. The fact that scrolls made for individuals tended to contain more variants may suggest that some were deliberate emendations to help the reader.

Jesus and Josephus were just as willing to use such variants, though they did not go so far as to introduce them into the Hebrew text. Josephus and Jesus were willing to follow easier readings when the Hebrew was problematic. But they did not attempt to change the Hebrew text because Josephus wrote in Greek and Jesus was teaching in Aramaic before being recorded in Greek.[68] No one would imagine that they were trying to suggest a different Hebrew original – this was no different than a modern preacher choosing to use a different Bible translation because it had the same emphasis as that morning's sermon. Both Jesus and Josephus expressed confidence in the Standard text project. Josephus stated that it represented a text that had never changed in the past, and although this was certainly not so, scholars agree that the Standard text probably was one of the oldest text forms surviving at the time. Jesus affirmed that this text would remain the same for ever, and the identity between the Standard text and the Masoretic text is certainly remarkable.

This paper has gathered evidence that the Standardisation project was being carried out in the early first century so although the process was not complete, the statements of Jesus and Josephus about the exact continuity of the Hebrew scriptures would not have been regarded as absurd by their first readers. They all knew that the Standard text was likely to remain unchanged, because so many people were working to

---

[68] If Jesus is presented as citing the Old Testament in Aramaic on the cross, apparently for himself, this suggests that he certainly translated the text when preaching to the common people who were unfamiliar with scholarly Hebrew.

standardise manuscripts towards this text form. What they couldn't have predicted was that Jesus' apparent hyperbole about the preservation of every single letter would turn out to be so literal.

Peter as a Translator of the Old Testament

I. Howard Marshall

For the purposes of this paper[69] I take the term 'translating' in the broadest sense to include the use of the Old Testament in such a way that what it says is expressed or re-expressed by a later writer so that it has something to say to an audience other than the original audience. This may be done by simple quotation (as in Rom 9:33, citing Isaiah 28:16), or by giving a reference to a passage (as when Mark 2:25 refers to 1 Sam 21:1-6), or by incorporating scriptural words in the writer's own composition with appropriate grammatical and other changes to make them fit, or by citing a text and adding some kind of explanation (as in Romans 10: 6-8). It is therefore appropriate to consider the uses of the Old Testament in the New Testament on the present occasion, and to use them as guidelines for our own fresh uses in our contemporary situation. However, I must leave this latter exercise to my readers.

I discovered many years ago that, if I want to illustrate as many aspects as possible of the New Testament use of the Old Testament within a single comparatively short text, there is probably no better example than the First Letter of Peter. S. Moyise says that '1 Peter is second only to Romans for its density of Old Testament quotations'.[70] The letter runs to 105 verses. In his treatment of the letter in the recent *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* D. A. Carson discusses some 35 verses where various kinds of use of the Old Testament are taking place.[71] That is an under-estimate, and my own figure is more like 40 verses, which use about 55 Old Testament passages between them, as tabulated in Table 1 on the handout. I hasten to add that such profusion is exceptional, and other parts of the NT are less fruitful.

1. Peter's working Bible

---

[69] A paper given at the Faith and Thought/Victoria Institute day conference on 'Translating the Old Testament: First Century and Now' on 22nd October, 2011.

[70] Moyise, *Old Testament*, 109.

[71] His list includes: 1 Peter 1:1, 2, 16, 19, 24-25; 2:3, 6, 7, 8, 9-10, 12, 22-25; 3:6, 10-12, 14-15, 18-22; 4:8, 14, 17-18; 5:5, 8.

Our first question concerns the extent of Peter's 'working' Bible?[72] What were its contents? Which books does he use most frequently, and which does he not use at all? My listing includes all his types of usage, from clear formal quotations and to echoes of wording. Table 2 gathers together the results of my survey, and is sufficiently accurate for our purpose. It emerges that Peter uses all three parts of the Hebrew Bible, the Law, the Prophets and the Writings. Far and away the most use is made of Isaiah with some 17 instances (some of which are very brief), followed by Psalms with 11 instances; Proverbs is a poor third, closely followed by Exodus and Leviticus; other books are used only once or twice each. Areas which are missing include the whole historical story from Joshua through to Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, 10 of the twelve so-called minor prophets, and other shorter books, whose absence is not particularly significant and does not necessarily indicate that Peter did not know them.

Is there evidence for his use of any other religious books, such as any of those in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha that were in existence by this time? There is knowledge of the kind of material in 1 Enoch in the account of Jesus' visit to the abode of the dead, but whether this simply implies knowledge of the stories there or rests on reading and use of the actual book is not clear, and it lies outside my remit.

We should perhaps also note Peter's use of early Christian traditions, especially those enshrining the teaching of Jesus and possibly those reflecting doctrinal statements and 'hymns'. These appear to be unwritten and are in a different category from the biblical sources that are used. (Nevertheless, the tests for their presence are very similar to those for scriptural allusions.) There is no clear evidence for knowledge of, and use of, early Christian writings.[73] And there is nothing that could be regarded as formal citation.

There is nothing here to create any surprise. The extent of the Old Testament Scriptures was fixed in all essentials by this time, even though we do find some New Testament authors using other books alongside them, in the same sort of way, we might add, as contemporary Christians who will freely quote as authoritative not only the Bible itself but also Christian hymnody.

2. Types of usage

Our second question concerns the different types of usage that we find.[74] There are two parts to this discussion. The first is to devise a set of categories to classify the types of usage. The second is to assign the various actual uses in 1 Peter to these categories. These two tasks belong together: the set of categories is created by examining the uses in the letter to see if there are similarities on the basis of which we can describe individual categories; these categories must be chosen in ways that will

---

[72]This could anachronistically be called his 'canon'.

[73]There has been some discussion of whether the author of 1 Peter knew Ephesians (or vice-versa) because of the various parallels found between them.

[74]For this analysis see especially Schutter, *Hermeneutic*, 35-43. His listing is: Quotations, explicit and implicit; Allusions, explicit, implicit, incipient and iterative; Biblicisms. He finds 9 citations; 17 explicit allusions, about 20 implicit allusions; biblicisms are numerous. Precision is, of course, impossible.

prove fruitful and useful. (For example, we could list Old Testament citations in terms of the letters of the alphabet with which they open, those beginning with alpha, beta, and so; but no useful purpose would be served by doing so; on the other hand it is helpful to do this kind of exercise with the letters that begin verses in somse of the Psalms, because this will reveal that these Psalms have the structure of acrostics.) A set of categories for different uses of the Old Testament has been developed on the broader basis of the NT documents, and this gives us a ready made grid for analysing 1 Peter.[75] There are five categories:

1. Formal citation
A formal citation is one that is introduced by a form of words or formula which indicates that the writer is not only consciously citing a passage but is also indicating to the readers that this is what is being done. So in 1:16 and 2:6 there is a formula referring to what is *written* or in *Scripture*; in 2:7-8 the two additional citations seem to be covered by the rubric in 2:6. My listing of formal citations covers only those where a term like 'written' or 'Scripture' is present, and where this formality may be presumed to extend to subsequent citations.

We shall need to ask what force is to be given to such identifiable quotations. What are their various possible functions? Why does Peter use Scripture at these points, and what do the quotations do?

2. Informal citation
Alongside these citations that are formally stated to be from Scripture we have a set of INFORMAL CITATIONS. These occur where the author is using sufficient wording to enable us to identify a passage that is being cited, but does not explicitly say that he is quoting. At other times there is an introductory 'For' or 'Because' which seems to be expandable to ' For Scripture says' or 'What I have just said is upheld and confirmed by what Scripture says' (cf. 1:24; 3:10; 4:8; 5:5). In 4:18 a quotation is simply linked by 'and' to the previous statement; it seems to be assumed by the author that readers will recognise that a citation is being made. The borderline between this and the first category is rather thin, and we might want to debate whether the 'and' in the instance that we have just cited is a quotation formula or simply a plain conjunction.

In 2:3 Peter slips into citing the Psalm (34:8) that instructs us to taste and see for ourselves that the Lord is good. Here is an author who knows his Bible so well that scriptural phraseology comes into his mind to give an appropriate form of words for what he wants to say. We can, therefore, speak of an implicit or informal citation, where the author uses scriptural language that is based on an identifiable passage.[76]

---

[75] See Beetham, *Echoes.*

[76]There are, of course, numerous passages where the same (or very similar) wording may be found in more than one place in the Old Testament and it is not clear which particular passage is in mind, but the extent or perhaps some peculiar feature indicates that a passage is being used.

In the present example he is encouraging the readers to crave for 'pure, spiritual milk' to feed their Christian growth, and then he reinforces the command by saying that they have already had experience of the Lord which can be likened to the intake of food, the implication perhaps being that the action not only gives spiritual stamina (and brings about growth) but is also inherently enjoyable and delightful; compare the difference between taking a bitter medicine [such as a soluble pill] which does you good but tastes dreadful and something that is sweet at the same time as being health-giving (like a pill wrapped up in jam to persuade a child to take it). The spiritual recommendation given in the Psalm provides the metaphor that is being used, and although the wording is altered (from the imperative to the past indicative),[77] it is clear that it is this particular passage that has provided it.

The usage may be simply literary and aesthetic for rhetorical effect,[78] or it may attach some authority or basis to the statement. Thus in this particular example, Peter is citing a verse which implicitly carries the message that tasting the Lord is pleasant as is confirmed by the experience of the Psalm-writer (in addition to the readers' own experience).

Again in 2:9 we have a set of descriptions of Israel which are now deemed to apply to the readers, so that if they are Gentiles they can now regard themselves as part of the ancient people of God (and there are also implications for Jews who do not believe). But they form a mosaic composed of a number of closely related Scriptures, and it might be uncertain which passages have provided the wording. The formula in 2:6 might be thought to cover this verse also.

3. Allusion

The boundary with the previous category is vague. But an allusion here is where what Peter says should remind or is at least intended to remind the reader of a passage without there being an actual quotation of a few words in the original order, but there are sufficient words reminiscent of the passage to make it clear that he is drawing on it.[79] So in 1:2 there is reference to 'sprinkling with his blood' which is an allusion to the event in Exod 24:8 where the Israelites were sprinkled with blood at the inauguration of the covenant, and thus a typology is perceived and developed. Later in the same verse there is wording similar to that in Dan 4:1 (or Dan 6:25 where the same greeting is repeated). But this could simply be a usage of a standard formula without any intention to refer to any particular occurrence of it. When Peter talks of a people for a special possession (2:9), the reference could be to either or both of Exod 19:5 and Isa 43:21; so that here we have an allusion to a concept found in more than one place rather than to a specific place as such.

Thus I consider an allusion to be present where either the wording is sufficient to indicate that a specific passage was in mind and the readers were meant to

---

[77]Peter has woven the citation into his exhortation by turning it into a conditional clause, and there is no signal that he has begun to cite Scripture. He assumes that the verse is so well known to his readers that he does not need to give a signal.

[78]So here in 2:3 (Snodgrass, '1 Peter II.1-10).

[79] Cf. Beetham, *Echoes*, 17–20.

recognise this fact and draw appropriate conclusions, or where some Old Testament concept is in mind and the reader was meant to recognise this.[80]

4. Echo
There is also the category of echo. Some want to distinguish between allusion defined as the use of phraseology as a pointer to the Old Testament that the readers are expected to pick up and follow up, and echo as phraseology which may reflect Scriptural words or phrases, but the echo is not significant and will not necessarily be recognised by the readers. Or the term may be used for a use of a scriptural word or phrase that the writer has used without himself being aware of what he is doing or its possible significance.

  For example, we may compare how non-Christians may use a scriptural phrase such as 'the skin of my teeth' (Job 19:20) or 'a multitude of sins' (1 Pet 4:8) while being totally unaware that they are quoting a scriptural source.

5. Scriptural language
A fifth category may be needed. This is the usage of what we may call scriptural language, where the writer adopts phraseology that can be traced back to the Old Testament but there is no obvious allusion to a particular instance.There are various instdances of idiomatic forms that reflect Septuagintal or Hebrew language. In 1:14 Peter speaks of 'children of obedience', rather than 'obedient people', following Hebrew idiom necessitated by the lack of an adjective for 'obedient'. Luke frequently uses the phrase *kai egeneto* ('and it came to pass') which is characteristic of Hebrew narrative.

3. Sources

Where did Peter get his material from? The obvious simple answer is 'From the Old Testament'. But it is a bit more complicated. There were no mass-produced editions of 'The Jewish Scriptures' for sale in the shops to those who could afford them. Nevertheless he may have got some material directly from his own knowledge of Scripture. But could he have had access to all of it? T. Holtz's study of the use of Scripture by the author of Luke-Acts concluded that Luke had access to some parts of the Old Testament but not to others and so worked with a limited canon.[81] As we have seen, Peter does use material from all three parts of the Hebrew canon, but their boundaries were still fluid.

        But he may have used Old Testament material that was mediated to him through its inclusion in the amorphous collections that we call early church tradition. This is the area of commonly held knowledge and ideas that was nourished by the work of people like the original disciples and early church leaders and teachers and

---

[80]For example, the standard LXX way of referring to God is as 'Lord' (*kyrios*). This is a biblical usage with theological implications that New Testament writers take over without alluding to any specific instance.
[81] Holtz, *Untersuchungen*.

obviously varied considerably from time to time and location to location. We know that Peter, James, John and Paul did actually meet together and knew each other, and as C. H. Dodd memorably put it, with regard to that crucial two week visit that Paul paid to Cephas (Peter) and James, 'we may presume that they did not spend all their time talking about the weather'. One thing that they must have done was to 'search the Scriptures', like the believers in Beroea (Acts 17:11), and from this would develop a common knowledge of passages to which they could turn. This has been explored by Dodd, who demonstrated that the early Christians seem to have found out which were the fruitful stretches, and they would then search these places more thoroughly for additional passages that were relevant to them. The list of passages discovered by Dodd was based on looking to see which Old Testament passages (and areas) were referred to by independent New Testament writers, including 1 Peter, and he established how Peter used passages cited by other writers.

Augmenting Dodd's list[82] with some non-controversial additions we have the following 'fields' utilised by Peter:

The Exodus and associated events:	Exod 24		1:2	
	Exod 19:5-6	2:9		
Isaiah, especially II-Isaiah (cf. Jas 1:10)	Isa 40:6-8		1:24-25	(cf.
	Isa 42:12; 43:21		2:9	
	Isa 53	2:22-25		
Hosea 9:25-26)	Hos 1:6-8; 2:1		2:10	(cf. Rom
'Stone' passages 3:14-15.	Ps 118; Isa 28:16; 8:14		2:6-8;	cf.
A set of Psalms including Ps 34	Ps 34:8		2:3	
	Ps 34:10-16	3:10-12		
	Ps 110:1; 8:4-6		3:22	

Peter has thus gone to the same areas of the Old Testament as other early Christian teachers and writers did.

Dodd's theory stands over against the earlier view that the early church simply compiled and shared a list of proof texts, the so-called 'testimonia', but it is not incompatible with it.[83]

---

[82]Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 107-08, lists the main 'fields':
    1. Apocalyptic-eschatological: Joel, Zechariah and Daniel; not used by Peter;
    2. Scriptures of the New Israel: parts of Hosea, Isaiah; Jeremiah;
    3. The Servant of the Lord and the Righteous Sufferer: II Isaiah and Psalms;
    4. Unclassified Scriptures: parts of Psalms; Genesis (Abraham); Deut 18. This includes the exaltation of Jesus; the faith of Abraham; Jesus as a prophet.
[83]The attempt to refute Dodd by A. C. Sundberg, Jr. is generally considered to be a failure; see my critique in Carson and Williamson, 5-8.

4. Identifying Peter's Bible

A related question is what Bible was Peter using? Was it the Hebrew Bible or the Greek Bible (and which identifiable text of these possible sources)? This is a complicated puzzle if the situation is other than eter having a single copy of the Scriptures that he consults to get the wording correct. He may have used a written text of the Scriptures (or of some of them); or used his memory of passages that were familiar to him; or taken over what other people transmitted to him; and of course the method and the materials could vary from one item to another.

It is generally recognised that he used the LXX consistently.[84] Certainly so far as the quotations are concerned, there is straight agreement with the LXX in most cases.

5. Types of usage

We have still to set out the methods that Peter uses in his Old Testament references. Some of these points will
be formal and literary. Others will be concerned with the kind of ways in which he uses the Old Testament theologically.

1. Use of biblical language
As mentioned above, this is essentially neutral as regards theology.

2 Use of biblical phraseology
This too may be purely a literary phenomenon, but nevertheless can reflect theological notions. In 5:13 'She in Babylon' used as a reference to the Christian church in Rome (cf. usage in Rev) says something about the Christian assessment of the Roman Empire.

3. Jewish (midrashic) techniques
This refers to the kind of techniques used in contemporary Judaism. Does our knowledge of Qumranic[85] and rabbinic methods throw any light on Peter's methods? I list three examples.

> *a. Strings*
> Peter *strings together citations* and allusions in the rabbinic manner (2:4-10; 3:14-15; cf. Paul in Rom 3: 9-20).

---

[84]So, for example, Best, *1 Peter*, 28-29. G. Lovell: 'Central Role', investigates possible instances where Peter is closer to the MT than to the LXX, but I do not think that he has given adequate grounds for questioning the consensus.

[85]Strictly speaking, Qumran was neither rabbinic nor midrashic, but I include it here for convenience.

In 2:4-5+6-10 Peter alludes to various Old Testament texts that provide his terms, and then proceeds to cite them more formally to back up what has been said. Bauckham analyses the whole passage as a midrash with multiple (six) texts (some with interpretation);links by catchwords (stone; elect/precious; rejected); links between texts and interpretation; note how 'people' points to both Exod 19:5 and Isa 43:21.

This passage is especially interesting in view of its identification of believers as living stones. There may be a parallel or precedent in 1QS 8:7-8;[86] 1QH 14 (6 in older enumeration):26[87]. The Qumran community is identified as the cornerstone, and its members appear to be components of the wall, whereas for Peter and the early Christians the cornerstone (or foundation stone) is identified as Christ.[88]

b. *Use of paraphrase*

The choice of wording brings out the interpretation. In 2:4-10 the text form is selected and adapted to suit the interpretation (it may be hard to differentiate between these two features in the absence of certain knowledge regarding the precise wording of the text he was using). There is a stress on the term 'elect' : Peter shows how the election of Christ leads to the election of those who believe in him. The use of *tithemi* (as in Paul and Barn 6:2-3) is natural for laying a foundation (2:6) but for Peter it carries the sense of 'appoint' (2:6 and this takes over in v. 8); the thought continues in v. 9 with the use of *kaleo*.

The whole passage forms the basis for the earlier part of letter (election) and for relation of believers to non-believers as holy people witnessing to the world.

c. *Scriptural basis for discourse structure*

Another use of Scripture is to structure a section so that it alludes to Scripture throughout: Bauckham sees this happening in 3:8-12 with its chiastic correspondences where the initial verses correspond to the parts of the Psalm that is quoted.[89] The order of vs. 8, 9a, 9b and 9c is determined by their chiastic correspondence to the Psalm as quoted in 11b, 11a, 10b and 10a. In this way dominical teaching (3:9; cf. Matt 5:44) is backed up from the Old Testament.[90]

---

[86] 'It [the community] will be the tested bulwark, the precious cornerstone that does not BLANK whose foundations do not shake or tremble in their place. BLANK It will be the most holy dwelling for Aaron....' (Translation from F. G. Martínez, *Dead Sea Scrolls*).

[87] 'For you place the foundation upon rock,... tested stone for a strong building.'

[88] See Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 2nd ed., 182-83.

[89] Bauckham, '1 Peter', 312-13.

[90] Bauckham, ibid., 313, finds further points where the Psalm is echoed: 'light' in 2:9b; 'not ashamed' = Isa 28:16; correspondencce between Ps 34:13 and Isa 53:9 quoted in 2:22.

8	11b	peacableness of character
9a	11a	evil attitudes to be avoided
		(note the 'not X but Y' structure in 9a/9b and 10-11a/11b)
9b	10b	sins of speech
9c	10a	promise of blessing to those who live in this way.

This approach is taken further by Schutter in a highly technical argument that 1:13 – 2:10 (more precisely, 1:14 – 2:9) follows the pattern of the Jewish homiletic midrash. It is said to be based on Leviticus (1:16).

4. Exegetical fields
See above on Peter's use of testimonia or 'exegetical fields' familiar to other NT writers. It may be worth exploring how far he does use fields that were used by other New Testament writers and how far he steps out on his own.

5 Historical allusions
Peter may quote or paraphrase to give a straightforward recounting of the biblical story. One purpose may be to give a precedent and backing for a particular form of behaviour. So 3:6 contains a historical allusion to Sarah: Peter assumes that the same kind of conduct is appropriate for believers. 3:20 tells part of the story of Noah which will form the basis for his comment on baptism.

6 Citing of theological and ethical principles
In 1:16 and 5:5 holiness and submissiveness (humility) are said to be commanded in Scripture, and the command is assumed to be still valid. The citations in 3:10-12; 4:18 all establish Christian behaviour.

7. Argumentative force
Opinions differ about the two previous categories. Thus Hanson refers to the citation of Prov 3:34 in 5:5, and argues that it is purely illustrative, showing that Peter's 'knowlege of Scripture is literary rather than rabbinic'.[91] Similarly, Achtemeier says he uses Scripture 'for illustrative or supporting purposes rather than as fundamental proof'.[92]

This minimalistic conclusion seems questionable to me. Peter does use Scripture for proof of theological statements or to give a basis for a command. In 3:9 he gives implicit support for a statement by paraphrasing , dominical teaching (cf. Matt 5:44) and then backing it up in 3:10-12 from the Old Testament. He assumes that Scripture contains authoritative statements that justify his own teaching and exhortation.

---

[91] Hanson, Utterances, 146.
[92] As summarised by Carson, '1 Peter', 1015.

8 *Prophecy and fulfilment*
In 2:22 a prophetic passage is quoted that gives a description in advance of what the Servant will do. It is assumed that it applies to Jesus as the person prophesied, and this could have been supported by relating stories about Jesus

9. *Pesher*
A specific format for identifying a fulfilment is known by the Hebrew term 'pesher' which is used several times in the Qumran commentaries on Old Testament passages in the form of a citation followed by the phrase: 'The interpretation of it [sc. a word or phrase in the passage] concerns....' Although the term is used broadly by some commentators to refer to any identification of something prophesied with its fulfilment,[93] it is better to retain the term for describing instances of the 'the interpretation/referent of X is Y' phraseology.

There is something akin to pesher in 1:24-25 where Peter picks up an Old Testament phrase and says 'This means (or this refers to) that, but this is the only case of this formula in the letter. The word of the Lord in Isa 40:6-8 is to be understood as a reference to the word that was preached to you. Later Jewish writers naturally applied the text differently.[94]

10. *Type and antitype*
This form of reasoning is complicated and the instances may not always work in the same way. See 1:2 where the inauguration of the covenant by the sprinkling with blood in Exod 24 provides the type for interpreting Christian initiation in terms of sprinkling with the blood of Christ; it is a nice question whether this was associated with sprinkling with water as a form of baptism. In 2:6-10 Peter may be seeing the church as the counterpart to Israel and/or seeing it as the form that Israel now takes; cross-sections on a growing tree-trunk thus combining continuity with change (see further below). And in 3:5-6 Sarah becomes a type or example to Christian wives in their attitude to their husbands.

5. Theological themes

Why does Peter use the Old Testament? There are at least two aspects to this question.

What areas of Christian faith and practice particularly take Peter back to the Old Testament, and what areas do not do so?

And what is he aiming to do by making reference to it?

R. Bauckham combines the answers to these two questions with his suggestion that 'prophetic interpretation and paraenetic application' are the two main categories. Peter is concerned to interpret events in the light of prophecy and to give a basis for Christian behaviour. We shall return to this point, but first we must ask what particular theological themes cause Peter to turn to the Scriptures.

---

[93] 3Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 180-81 notes how Peter provides a rationale for pesher in 1:10-12.
[94] Hanson, *Living Utterances*, 145.

A. Jesus Christ
Peter's direct interest is not to establish the position of Jesus for its own sake, i.e. attempting to answer the theological question: how are we to understand the nature of Jesus? He is more interested in the role of Jesus.

1. Peter interprets the role of the Messiah as the *stone* laid by God, who is the basis for his concept of the church as being composed of living stones forming a temple (2:4-8).

2. He makes a tacit application of a text about *Yahweh* to Christ, when he speaks of tasting that the Lord is good (2:3). This fits in with the common usage of the early church of *Kyrios* to refer to Jesus Christ and to the associated application of texts from the Old Testament that originally referred to God to him, without any rationale being given for so doing.

3. *Kyrios* is used in this way of Jesus Christ in 1:3; 2:3 (clear from 2:4); 3:15; hence also in 3:12a, 12b (in light of 2:3 and 3:15). In 3:15 Peter is taking Isa 8:12-13 LXX christologically. The reference is not clear in 1:25 (it could be to God in light of 1:23) and in 2:13 (could be God in light of 2:12 and 15).

4. The death of Christ is understood from the Old Testament in terms of the *sacrificial* system: He is an unblemished sacrifice (1:19), a term applicable to various sacrifices (Lev 22:17-25). His sacrificial death redeems or delivers the people at enormous cost from their futile way of life that led to death.

5. Peter especially thinks of the death of Christ in terms of *suffering*. He brings out the painfulness of the experience, which is also endured by his followers (*paschō* [verb] is used of Christ: 2:21, 23; 3:18; 4:1; noun 1:11; 4:13; 5:1; followers: 2:19, 20 ; 3:14, 17; 4:1b?, 15, 19; 5:10; noun 5:9). This is common Christian usage, which remarkably has no background in the LXX; the verb *paschō* is never actually used of the suffering Servant!
    In the description of his suffering and death Jesus is understood as fulfilling the task of the *Servant* whose manner of conduct is to be imitated by his people (2:21-25 = Isa 53); but the exemplary role soon gives way to the role of the Servant in bearing our sins and the resulting death to sins that accomplishes healing. When Peter refers to Jesus Christ as 'righteous' (3:18), it is hard to resist finding an allusion to Isa 53:11 as the source of the language. It is true that the term 'unrighteous' is not used in this passage, but the inference from the statement that Christ was bearing sins is obviously that these were the sins of unrighteous people (or sinners, or lawless; cf. Isa 53:9). But this theme is already present allusively in 1:18 where the Servant is the key to interpretation; here Isa 52:3 with its statement 'you will not be ransomed with money' lies at the basis of the imagery. Hanson finds the Servant theme in 1:19 where people are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of an unblemished and

unspotted lamb; he thinks that the reference is to the one 'like a lamb led to the slaughter' (Isa 53:7). The material in 2:22-25 shows that Peter was thinking of this passage. But a reference to the sacrifice in Exod 29:38 is also possible; this refers to the two lambs of the daily offering which the LXX says are to be unblemished, but this term is not in the MT

The thought that he died and was raised so that his people might share in his life is clear (2:24).

6. Reference to the position of Christ *at* God's *right hand* and his superiority over angels and other forces (3:22) is based on Pss 110 and 8, which were widely so used in the early church.

7. In the church the heavenly Christ is the *shepherd* (rich Old Testament background) and overseer/bishop of his people (a term not apparently used of God in the Old Testament, though he is said to 'visit' in judgment and salvation (*episkopē*).
As such he is a model and leader for church leaders (5:2-4).

B. The Church

1. The church is described as *the people of God*, using the imagery applied to Israel in the Old Testament as the model and source for the description. This could simply be typology. But this is more than typology. The church is identified as the current expression of God's people. Its members are sprinkled as the people of Israel were sprinkled with blood, as in Exod 24 at the inaugural ceremony of the covenant at Sinai, only the blood is now the blood of Jesus, and a spiritual event rather than a literal one is indicated (1:2). They are now a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's special possession (2:4-10). The varied language that brings out this position derives from the fundamental descriptions of the Israelites under the old covenant, but now it is true of those who have come to Christ with faith. No other current way to belong to this people is envisaged. In fact those who do not come to Christ are regarded as stumbling and falling, and this can only mean that they are no longer the people of God.The word 'supersession' is not a popular one, and it can have misleading implications that make it unusable in Christian language, but there is an unavoidable element in the New Testament which states that Jews who reject Jesus Christ cut themselves off from the people of God. This does not mean that God has rejected Israel from salvation in the sense that any Israelites who want to be saved and come through Christ would be rejected, although in Paul we do hear of a hardening for a period or on a portion of the people. But the implication is that the worship of the temple is no longer what God wants if it does not recognise Jesus as the Messiah.

Peter thus uses Old Testament language that identifies the church as being now to God what Israel was then, but being so through Jesus Christ. He is creative in thinking of believers as living stones. In so doing Peter is using the motif of the 'new exodus' which links together the Exodus events, the return from exile (especially in II-Isaiah) and the redemption brought about by the Messiah, and which is widely

attested in the New Testament. Like other New Testament theologians he goes back to the Pentateuch via II-Isaiah.

2. He uses the story in *Hosea* to depict the conversion of those who were not the people of God so that they are now that. Would he have said this only to Gentiles? Would he have said to pious Jews: once you were not the people of God but now you are, or perhaps to those who crucified Christ; you were not acting as God's people when you slew the Messiah, but now you have repented and are back in?

3. Consequently he can view the present situation of the church amid trials and temptations as an instantiation of the *testing* of God's people in Jer 25:29 and the principle in Prov 11:31.

4. Probably the most intriguing use of Scripture in 1 Peter is the lengthy passage where he is giving encouragement and comfort to those who are suffering as a result of persecution (3:13 − 4:6). Their suffering can be seen as arising out of their doing what is good rather than because they deserve it for doing evil and so there is an appeal to persecuted people not to yield to temptations to do what is evil (as in hostile retaliation). Here their example is Christ in his sufferings because of human sins although he was righteous. As suggested already, the thought of him as the *righteous Servant* is probably behind the statement. But Peter goes beyond it to think of the way in which God brought him through his suffering to resurrection, and then he goes still further in stating that he preached to the *disobedient spirits in prison*. I take it that this means he preached to them in prison, not that he preached at some previous time to the spirits who were subsequently imprisoned, and that the reference is to the evil spirits active in the time of Noah (or the spirits of the human beings who perished in the flood). The temptation to interpret the text to mean that Christ spoke through Noah should be resisted. The background seems to lie in the non-biblical account of Enoch visiting the abode of the dead.

But then the discourse takes another twist. Peter is reminded that some people were saved from destruction in the time of Noah through being in the ark. He sees the *flood* as the means of saving them and draws an analogy with the use of water in Christian baptism. This is a curious typology. It may be associated with the understanding of baptism as being overwhelmed with water, whether as something you are plunged into (the sea) or that streams over you (like a tsunami), that we find in Romans 6 and elsewhere, but Peter does not stop to follow this line further. The resulting salvation is effected through the resurrection of Jesus to whom all the powers are now subjected (as in Psalms 8 and 110).

We thus have a catena of thoughts brought together in a way that may seem illogical to modern readers, but is typical of some ancient thought that moves from one aspect to another of a motif and finds fresh links.

5. In 4:1 the person who has suffered has *ceased from sin* (cf. Rom 6:7).[95]

C. The Christian life in broad terms

1. We have already noted the reference to experience of God's *goodness* (2:3 = Ps 34:8).
    God's care seen in 5:7 (= Ps 55:23), which looks more like informal citation than just allusion in view of the close sequence of 4-5 words)
    The permanence of the Word of God leads to the imperishability of believers (1:24-25 = Isa 40:6-8).

2. In 4:19 their *trust* in God reflects Ps 31:5.
    The backing for belief in God reversing the position of the downtrodden may reflect Job's experience.

3. In 1:15 the call to God's people to be *holy* is based on Lev 11 which is addressed to all Israel and not just the priests, although Israel as a whole is seen to be priestly.[96]
    In 3:10-12 there is general ethical exhortation taken straight from Ps 34:12-16.
    Doing good and loving are buttressed by the statement in 4:8 (Prov 10:12).
    The behaviour expected of believers to one another (5:5) reflects Prov 3:34.

4. The command to be *ready for action* in 1:13, 'gird up your loins', may reflect the language of the Exodus (Exod 12:11; same object but different verbs. The verse is usually thought to reflect Prov 31:17, lit. 'she girds her loins with strength', but there is no obvious link to this passage, although the phraseology (noun and verb) is the same. The verb is found only here and in Judges 18:17.[97]

5. The marital relationship of Abraham and Sarah is a model for *Christian wives* (3:5-6; note the generalisation beyond Sarah). Hanson comments that the modest dress of patriarchal wives is only an assumption, and use of 'my lord' is simply conventional.

6. The promises to obedient doers of good (3:13) are based on Isa 50:9.

7. *Persecution* and suffering. In 4:14 reproach for sake of Christ may echo Ps 89:51-52 (LXX diff. MT).
    In 3:13-15 encouragement not to be fearful comes from Isa 8:12-13.
    The reference to the Holy Spirit resting on believers when they are suffering (4:14) may reflect the experience of the Messiah (Isa 11:2).

---

[95] Hanson, *Living Utterances*, 144, sees a christological interpretatiion of Ps 88; see his *New Testament Interpretation*, 122-35.
[96] Moyise, *Old Testament*, 109.
[97] See Goppelt, *Typos*, 155.

8. The Spirit who *inspires* the preachers also inspired the prophets (1:10-12. cf. 1 QpHab. 7:1-8. Hence analogies with method of pesharim.)

6. Thematic justification for use of the Old Testament

1 Peter is one of the few NT documents that reflects on the manner and justification of early Christian use of the Old Testament (elsewhere: 1 Cor 10; 2 Timothy 3; Romans 15).

1. In 1:10-12 the prophets receive messages from God that promise the gracious things that he would do in the future. They endeavour to find out more specifically what precisely he is going to do and when it will happen. In particular they were concerned with finding out more about the time and circumstances of the suffering of the Messiah and the subsequent glorious events. In the context of ch. 2 with its detailed references to Isaiah 53 it is clear that this must be the primary messianic prophecy in view; other candidates probably include those Psalms which were understood as messianic but also as prophesying suffering for the Messiah (Pss 2; 69; and?); thus the authors of the Psalms are conceived as exercising prophetic functions (2:7 quotes Ps 118:22 as if it were from a prophetic writing), though whether this applies to all their writings is not necessarily the case.. The Spirit active in them is characterised as *the Spirit of Christ*, i.e. of the Messiah who is now known to be Jesus (whether or not the prophets knew this name), the point being that the Spirit in the Old Testament period is the same Spirit as Christians experience, the Spirit who is sent by and closely associated with Christ. However, Hanson, 141, holds that the reference to the Spirit of Christ means that the pre-existent Christ was at work in the prophets. This does not seem to be a necessary inference to me.

But where do we learn of these enquiries? We occasionally hear of prophets holding conversation with God (especially Jeremiah). But the details given here may seem to be intuitions by Peter or secrets revealed to him supernaturally by the Spirit.

2. We note further that Peter *cites Scripture as a ground* for a statement and assumes that if it is 'in Scipture' (cf. 1:16; 2:6) then this is unquestionable authority that settles a matter. So in less formal character: 3:5; 3:10 Note also use as evidence for a statement, e.g. 2:22

3. Peter is also responsible for the use of the term *'antitupos'* (3:21) to refer to something in the Christian dispensation that corresponds to something in the older dispensation. Presumably he would have justified the appelation on the grounds of obvious similarities. Does he use typology see 1:2; 2:9. But here it seems to be identification

4. Although 1:10-12 refers to working out what the prophets meant (i.e. to what were they referring), the actual uses of Scripture in 1 Peter are not to explain the prophets so much as to explain the church and Christ in the light of the Old Testament. We

may *compare the pesher type of commentary* in Qumran where an extended text is cited (Habakkuk; Nahum) and the aim is to explain what the prophet is saying in terms of future events that can now be recognised as the things that he was prophesying (see below). The New Testament usage tends to be the other way round: to refer to some contemporary event and identify it as fulfilling some Scripture and therefore having a meaning that might not otherwise have been detected. There is a dialectic here between explaining what the prophecy meant in the light of later events and revelations, and explaining what the later events mean in the light of the prophecies that are taken to be applicable to them.

Conclusion

The results of Peter's use of the Old Testament are:

To shed light on the person and work of Christ by seeing him as fulfilling prophetically or typologically the role in the Old Testament.

To see wrong attitudes to him as being the same as those already described/prophesied in the Old Testament and liable to the same sanctions.

To express the nature of the church as God's people whose behaviour is already governed by the Old Testament..

To show that God is the same now to believers as to his people of old. They receive the same promises and enjoy the same experience of salvation, but now in a fuller form.

Whether this should be called 'translation' may be a moot point. What matters is that the Jewish Scriptures are identified as the church's Scriptures and found to be useful and authoritative in all kinds of ways.

Table 1. Survey of the material

(References to Psalms are to English numbering with LXX in brackets)

Verse	Formal Parallels in Quotation	Informal Citation	Allusion	Echo	Other
NT Passages					
1:2			Exod 24:8		
				Dan. 4:1=6:25	
1:7			Zech 13:9		
			Prov 17:3		
1:13				Prov 31:17	
1:16	Lev 19:2 LXX		cf. Lev 11:44-45		
			Lev 20:7		
1:17				Jer 3:19	
				Ps 89:26 (88:27)	

1:18				II-Is. 52:3	
1:19			Exod 29:38		
			Lev 22:17-25		
1:23				Dan. 6:26	
1:24-25		II-Isa 40:6-8			
1:10					Jas.
2:3		Ps 34:8 (33:9)			1 Pet
3:10-12					
2:4			Ps 118 (117):22		1
Pet 2:7					
2:6	Is. 28:16				Rom
9:33					
2:7	Ps 118 (117):22				
	Mark 12:10-11				
					Acts
4:11					
2:8	Is. 8:14				Rom
9:33					
2:9		II-Isa 43:20			
		Exod 19:6			
		Exod 19:5/II-Isa 43:21			
		II-Isa 43:21/42:12			
2:10		Hos 2:23			Rom
9:25-26					
2:11			Ps 39:12 (38:13)		
2:12			Isa 10:3		
2:17				Prov 24:21	
2:22		II-Isa 53:9			
2:23a		II-Isa 53:7c			Acts
8:32-33					
2:23b		II-Isa 53:7d			
2:23c		II-Isa 53:4a, 12			
2:23d		II-Isa 53:8a			
2:24a		II-Isa 53:12+4			Rom
4:25					
2:24a		Deut 21:23			Acts
5:30					
					Gal
3:13					
2:24b		II-Isa 53:5			
2:25a		II-Isa 53:6			
2:25b		Ezek 34:11-13 LXX			

3:6	Gen 18:12			
3:10-12	Ps 34:12-16 (33:13-17)			1
Pet 2:3				
3:13			II-Is. 50:9	
3:14-15	Isa 8:12-13			
3:20		Gen 6:1-7:24		
3:22a	Ps 110 (109):1			Mark
12:36 *et al.*				
3:22b		Ps 8:6 (7)		1 Cor
15:27				
				Heb
2:6-9				
4:8	Prov 10:12			Jas 5:20
				1 Clem
49:5				
				2 Clem
16:4				
4:14a			Ps 89:51-52 (88:50-51)	
4:14b	Isa 11:2			
4:17		Jer 25:29		
		Ezek 9:6		
4:18	Prov 11:31			
4:19		Ps 31:5 (30:6)		Luke
23:46				
				Acts
7:59				
5:5	Prov 3:34			
5:6		Job 22:29		
5:7	Ps 55 (54):23			

Table 2. Relative uses of Old Testament Books

	Formal	Informal	Allusion	Echo	Total	Rating
Gen		1	1		2	
Exod		2	2		4	4=
Lev	1		3		4	4=
Deut		1			1	
Isa	2	15	1	2	20	1
Jer			1	1	2	
Ezek			1		1	

Dan				2	2	
Hos		1			1	
Zech			1		1	
Job			1		1	
Ps	1	4	4	2	11	2
Prov		3	1	2	6	3
TOTAL		4	27	16	9	56

Bibliography

Bauckham, R., in D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (Cambridge: CUP, 1988), 309-313.

Beetham, C. A., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians* (BIS 96; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

Best, E., *1 Peter* (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1971).

Carson, D. A., '1 Peter', in G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (ed.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic/Nottingham: Apollos, 2007), 1015-45.

Dalton, W. J., *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits: A Study of 1 Peter 3:18–4:6* (Rome: Pontifical, 1965).

Dodd, C. H., *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952).

Goppelt, L. A., *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 152-58

Hanson, A. T., *The Living Utterances of God* (London: DLT, 1983), 140-6.
    The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture (London: 1980).

Holtz, T., *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentliche Zitate bei Lukas* (Berlin: Akademie, 1968).

Longenecker, R. N., *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999²), 169-72..

Lovell, G., 'The Central Role of Peter's First Letter', unpublished paper, 2010.

Marshall, I. H., 'An assessment of recent developments [sc. in study of the use of Scripture in Scripture]', in D. A. Carson and H. A. G. Williamson (ed.), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (Cambridge University Press, 1988), 1-21.

Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (Leiden: Brill/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996²).

Moyise, S., *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction* (London: Continuum, 2001), 111-13.

Schutter, W. L., *Hermeneutic and Composition in I Peter* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989).

Snodgrass, K. R., '1 Peter II.1-10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities', *NTS* 24 (1977), 97-106.

Sundberg, Jr., A. C., 'On Testimonies', *NovT* 3 (1959), 268-81.

Book Reviews

C. John Collins *Did Adam and Eve Really Exist?* 2011Nottingham IVP 192 pp. pb. £9.99 ISBN 978.1.84474.526.5

Archaeological and genetic studies in the last few decades have established beyond dispute, to most anthropologists at least, that humans share a common ancestry with the apes. In response to this a number of Christians, both scientists and biblical scholars, have started to re-examine the scriptural accounts to see if they can find any common ground between the biblical doctrines of creation and fall and the findings of science. This volume by a respected professor of the Old Testament is one of the latest attempts. He believes that the traditional view of Adam and Eve best accounts for both the biblical evidence and the everyday experience of sinfulness deriving from a primal rebellion. He claims that the author of Genesis is dealing with actual historical events but is using rhetorical (pictorial and symbolic) language to shape the reader's attitudes. Like the other stories from the ancient Near East the Bible has its own meta-narrative or over-arching worldview which tells the community where they came from and why they find themselves in their present situation. These can be called 'myths' if by that we mean the stories of god(s) and/or heroes intending to inspire the listeners and to equip them to live in the world. Collins insists that these myths are about real events that occurred in the distant past and appropriates Kitchen's distinction between prehistory (before written accounts) and proto-history (earliest written records). For the authors the creation and flood were already very old and both the biblical and the Babylonian authors expanding 'heroically' the few names of Adam's descendents or the kings that reigned before the Flood by greatly exaggerating their ages and reigns. He insists that to be a record of real happenings the accounts do not need to be complete in every detail nor be in a chronological sequence. He interprets the creation account as true but symbolic. The Garden of Eden is the pattern for the later Hebrew sanctuary (tabernacle and temple) and every Jewish man is a new 'Adam'. He follows Ireneaus by claiming that Adam and Eve were created in childlike innocence and that God's goal was for them to mature physically and spiritually.

Another chapter traces the Genesis story through the rest of the Bible where he sees the promise or covenant to Adam repeated in the story of Noah, Abraham and other biblical characters and argues that both Old and New Testament as well as the inter-

testamental (Second Temple) literature support the historicity of Adam and Eve. Collins also believes that the scientific evidence supports his thesis. He questions, for instance, the use of genetic data in both establishing and common ancestry for both humans and apes and the assertion that at the beginning the human population must have exceeded a thousand individuals. On a positive note he points to mankind's uniqueness in possessing language and having a yearning for justice and a need for God.

The author criticises concordism, that is the attempt to directly relate the biblical text to current scientific knowledge, because scientific knowledge is continually changing, but falls into the trap himself by using concordism to place Adam and Eve in a specific period of the earth's history. He examines various proposed scenarios such as the 'young earth' creationist creation *de novo*, old earth creationists with Adam being the first member of the genus *Homo* or one individual specifically created by God's miraculous intervention at a specific point in the evolution of *Homo Sapiens*, as proposed, for example, by Denis Alexander. The biblical evidence has often been used to place Adam and Eve in the Neolithic Age, but as Collins points out, the author could well be describing ancient events in the light of his own experience as Homer did in *The Iliad* and hence gives no clue as to the actual *Sitz-im-Leben*

The book concludes with three appendices, one giving a good, concise review of the Ancient Near Eastern texts that have similarities with Genesis and the others a review of James Barr's book about the Garden of Eden and a note on authorship.   Collins is prepared to see Moses as the author of Genesis with a proviso that the text was updated later with explanatory glosses as was the common practice in the ancient world.

 The book is written for the general reader and the author is convinced that the historicity of Adam and Eve and of the Fall are fundamental for our understanding of the Bible, our belief in the dignity of mankind and for our status as Christians. I do not think that the author has solved all the issues involved but commend the book as an excellent introduction to a complex issue.

Reviewed by Reg Luhman

Ilio Delio *The Emergent Christ.* 2011 Orbis Books 197 pp. hb.
£14.99 ISBN 978-1-57075-908-6

On the back cover of this book comments by R. M. Keelan Downton claim "this is a stunning book – a must read". This reviewer would agree with that. The volume is sub-titled "Exploring the meaning of catholic in an evolutionary universe". The author is in fact Senior Fellow in Science and Religion at Woodstock Theological Centre, Georgetown University and an OSF. She explains in her introduction how she understands the word "catholic", and takes the explanation from John Haughey SJ as

"openness, movement towards wholeness", a term with which most Christians would identify. The last paragraph of the book, quoted later, states "an opening of all life to the love of the God of evolution."

The author quotes from many sources, especially with Teilhard de Chardin with whom she has much in common. After the introduction, the first chapter "Book of Creation" is a wide-ranging journey through the scientific world from Newton through Darwin, Einstein, etc and from the Big Bang via evolution, quantum theory, chaos theory, and ends with Sheldrake's morphogenetic fields. A very readable account.

Chapter 2 "The Evolution of God" explores the question of "God" in our evolutionary, quantum universe. "The God of Abraham and Moses, revealed in the burning bush has been revealed in the Big Bang" (p34). This chapter challenges the Christian, thus "if God is love, love by its nature is relational and dynamic, love is energy and spirit. If God is love, then God is change" (p35). I have quoted verbatim in places since this seems the best way to express what seems often inexpressible (Ed). This chapter includes resumees of thoughts of Bonaventure, Meister Eckhart, and is a chapter which needs some digesting.

"Creative Union", chapter 3, explores the person of Jesus Christ in evolution, which will be expanded upon in a later chapter. "Jesus bursts on the evolutionary scene not because of sin, but because of love. His radical new way of life anticipates what it will take two thousand more years of science to discover" (p58).

"Jesus the whole-maker" examines what we mean by "catholic". Was Jesus catholic? The story of the Church is explored here, and the author is concerned to emphasise that if we have a relationship with Christ, this must lead to a relationship with each other.

And so to "Resurrection and Transformation" where N. T. Wright is drawn upon, and who has written much on the subject. The author asks "Could God have brought new life in the cosmos without the suffering and death of Jesus?" (p77). This leads to an interesting discussion as to the relationship between death and life, not from a human point of view, but from that of the cosmos – the exploding star exists in all of us. "Death is the harmony of our wild, creative nature with the wild love of God" (p79).

Chapter 6 is entitled "Towards cosmic wholeness" defining Christ as the new being. Christianity has focussed so much on sin and salvation that it has lost sight of Christ as the new creation, emerging from within (p90). Christianity is about future, not salvation as an end in itself, but new life. This chapter ends with the sentence "To follow Christ is to enter into a new level of consciousness, of relatedness, of wholeness. Biological evolution has not ended with us, but depends on us" (p101).

"Can the Church evolve?" Evolution is not opposed to religion, it does not contradict the God of Jesus Christ. Rather, it opens up a new window to the divine mystery (p103). This chapter leans heavily on Teilhard, but also links with the gospels (Luke and John).There is quite a discussion of where the Church stands in the modern world. "Are we on the brink of resurrection, or of revolution?" (p117)

Two chapters remain "The inner universe" and "Christ the Living One", both of these dealing with the Jesus of the gospels, and Jesus for today. The first of these is more

concerned with the inner life of the individual. One sentence is very challenging "Without the death of Jesus, evolution could not have meaning, purpose or direction"(p119). This is truly a coming together of faith and science at a deep level, and takes some assimilating. The author quotes Bonhoeffer on the powerlessness of the cross "only the suffering God can help".

The last chapter claims that Jesus' life was an open system, new relatedness, new hope and new life (p140). Perhaps that sums up this book – evolution goes on, as does the Christ of the gospels, and God Himself. Life is an open system, based on new life and new hope.

The final paragraph of this fascinating volume needs quoting: "The emergence of Christ depends on our capacity to love, to become whole-makers. The love of God is poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit, and it is always new. Whether we see the present moment as hopeful or hopeless, it is our moment to act. We need to let go of controlling God, controlling our lives, controlling the Church, and controlling the world. All is gift, and our human role is to receive the gift of life in all its diversity and to respond graciously. The God of evolution is the God of adventure, a God who loves to do new things and is always new. We are invited into this adventure of love o find our freedom in love, and to love without measure" (p156).

The book has many references to each chapter, a glossary and a comprehensive bibliography. I thoroughly recommend it.

Reviewed by Dr.A B Robins

Steven Pinker *The Better Angels of Our Nature* – 2011 Allen Lane Penguin Books 802pp. ISBN 978-1-846-14093-8

This will be a short review of a lengthy book. Steven Pinker is a professor of psychology at Harvard University. He has published a number of best-selling popular science books and gained a deserved reputation as a very fine writer. This latest book sets out to confront what Pinker regards as a commonly held myth, the belief that violence is ever-increasing. He argues instead that humans have become *less* violent over their history and suggests some reasons why. Far from having a history beginning in Edenic perfection, Pinker demonstrates that most of human history was experienced more along the lines of the famous Hobbesian descriptor; 'nasty, brutish and short'.   It was the civilising process of the Leviathan state and in particular the consequences of the Enlightenment that drove the march toward the ever increasing peace which we enjoy today.

Clearly this is controversial stuff, and the author recognises this. It is perhaps hard to believe that the level of deplorable violence that still takes place today, (and which we

are instantly made aware of via the 'net) is really less than it used to be. However he marshals a staggering amount of supporting evidence (I counted over 1,000 references, nearly 2,000 footnotes and the index runs to 30 two-column pages) to convince the reader that we do indeed live in uniquely peaceful times. The book has stimulated wide discussion and debate, which is itself enough to commend it, but I believe the book goes beyond mere agitprop and instead encourages us to take a more impartial view of the trajectory of human kind. It should be noted that at no point does Pinker invite complacency, he fully accepts that there is a long way to go to eradicate violence, and accepts that it is possible that the historical trend could be reversed in the future.

Not all of the evidence is persuasive. In particular the 'evidence' from numerous psychology 'experiments' conducted on contemporary American high-school students make for fun reading, but are open to the objection that the 'conclusions' may not be generalisable to the broader sweep of human-kind over the ages.

A word about the writing style. This reviewer was constantly reminded of Richard Dawkins, not simply because Pinker's atheism is highly prominent, but rather because his way with words is comparable to Dawkins' own very carefully crafted and highly readable language. It is a pleasure to encounter a book that is so dense with facts and ideas but which is nevertheless such a compelling page-turner.

What is the significance of this book for a subscriber to Faith&Thought? If Pinker's thesis is correct then how should Christians view this evidence? Has humankind dragged itself up unaided from a history of violence to the brink of universal peacefulness? Does this suggest a humanist eschatology? An alternative view would be that 'human progress' (including scientific advance of many kinds) may be a consequence of the efficacy of the Missio Dei. Pinker himself is, of course, dismissive of the idea that 'The Church' or 'Religion' has had more than a bit-part in the decline of violence (and reminds us of the numerous sorry historical occasions when the opposite has been true). Nevertheless, just as theistic evolutionists appreciate the hidden-ness of God's hand in creation (unobservable by scientific method), so too perhaps Christian historians, sociologists and psychologists can trace a divine narrative of redemption at work as the words of Isaiah are fulfilled - *'Of the increase of His government and peace, there shall be no end'.*

Reviewed by Dr Alan Kerry

Maire Byrne *The Names of God in Judaism, Christianity and Islam. A Basis for Interfaith Dialogue* 2011.London Continuum 171 pp. pb. £19.99 (ISBN 978 1 44115 356 2)

The aim of this book, as indicated in the title, is to foster interfaith dialogue. Other authors are quoted in support of this aim e.g. F.X.Clooney, " To examine how the juxtaposed texts of varied religions and their traditions can inform one another and transform those who engage with them"; *Journal of Comparitive Theology,* " the practice of rethinking some aspects of one's own faith tradition through the study of some aspect or aspects of another's faith tradition", and S.J. Youngs, " a religious scholar or theologian reaches out from their [sic] own tradition – without denying that tradition – in order to intentionally and sympathetically interact and exchange with other systems of theological belief in a comparative way." (p.3)

To the committed Christian who takes Acts 4.12 seriously (" there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved"), this approach is unnecessary in relation to the Old and New Testaments, which represent successive parts of a unified theology, but as far as it concerns the Qur'an, this is a misguided project. Nevertheless, it is worth considering whether, apart from this, the information collected in this volume is of any use. The approach arises to some extent from the fact that the author is a lecturer at the Pontifical University, Maynooth and the Milltown Institute of Theology and Philosophy in Ireland.

After an introductory discussion of interfaith dialogue (chap.1), and a chapter (2) on names and naming, the main part of the book, consists of three chapters: on "Divine Designations in the Old Testament"(3); on   "Divine Designations in the New Testament" (4); and on "Divine Designations in the Qur'an" (5)

In these chapters the author has collected quite useful information, in each case dealing with the names of God: Old Testament, Tetragrammaton (Yhwh) Adonai, El, Elohim etc.; New Testament, Father. Theos, Abba, Living Father etc.; Qur'an, Ar-Rahman, Ar-Rahim, Al-Malik, Al-Quddus etc., in each case with discussion of the named individually. The Islamic material is presented both in a chart of all ninety-nine names of Allah giving each name its Arabic script, a transliteration, a translation and references to the passages in the Qur'an in which it occurs and then in a separate discussion of each name.

An odd feature in the presentation is that the Old Testament names are given in the headings in the form of English translations followed in parenthesis by the Hebrew forms in the Square Script. Transliterations are provided in the end notes, but, since many of the readers are unlikely to know the Hebrew script, it would have been more sensible to have placed the transliterations in the main text. The same applies in parts of the accompanying discussion.

Reviewed by T.C.Mitchell

FAITH and THOUGHT• APPLICATION FOR ENROLMENT

Title and Surname ....

First Names ....

Address..

Profession and Qualifications ....

Area of Study or Interest..

Please enrol me as a   Member under   *Option 1
        "Option 1E; *Option2; "Option 2E (Not suitable for members of CIS)
                                *Option 3 (See concessionary terms below)

If you are resident outside Europe kindly indicate whether you wish to pay the optional airmail supplement * YES / NO

1 enclose a remittance for £   being the current year's subscription payable on 1st January and consent to my particulars being included in the record of members.

Please let me have a *Banker's Standing Order form/Gift Aid Declaration

Signature ....

Date ....

CONCESSIONARY TERMS: Option 3 offers a concessionary rate of subscription for first degree and full time theological students and requires completion of the following additional questions:

College ....

Course ....

Expected completion date..

Private/vacation address ....

*Please delete as appropriate

Mail to the Administration address: Rev. J. D. Buxton, 15 The Drive, Harlow, Essex. CM20 3QD.

Faith&Thought

The *Faith and Thought Bulletin* first appeared in 1985 under the title *Faith and Thought Newsletter*. That new title reflected a wider coverage, since it contained some short articles, notes and book reviews, in addition to the news items, which previously would not have fallen within the purview of the journal. From the April 2005 issue it will be known as *Faith & Thought*.

Faith & Thought is published by The Victoria Institute and mailed free to all Institute members, along with *Science & Christian Belief*.

The Journal *Science & Christian Belief* is published jointly for VI and CIS. It replaced the CIS (previously RSCF) *Newsletter* and the VI journal *Faith & Thought,* the final number of which was volume 114 No. 2 - October 1988.

Editorial Address:
R S Luhman, BD (Hons), MA,
110 Flemming Avenue,
Leigh-on-Sea,
Essex SS9 3AX
Tel. 01702 475110
Email: reg.luhman@talktalk.net

Administration Address:
Rev J D Buxton
15 The Drive,
Harlow,
Essex CM20 3QD
Tel. 01279 422661
Email: revjdbuxton@sky.com