A CHALLENGE FOR
CHRISTIAN COMMUNICATORS[*]

John MacArthur
President and Professor of Pastoral Ministries

Clarity and accuracy in communicating divine truth is more important for Christian communicators than anyone else. The availability of mass communications further enhances the preacher's job in this day and time because of the vast audiences he can reach, which were not nearly as large in earlier days. Mass media opportunities can be abused, however, as they have been in so many cases. Television, for example, helped to usher out the "age of exposition" and usher in the age of "sound bites" when image became more important than substance in the message being communicated. As an entertainment medium, television has lowered appetites for serious thought as it has raised expectations for trivia and brevity. That is especially true of sermons in the mass media. Christian publishing has gone in the same direction in catering to people's "felt needs" and giving them something they want rather than the doctrinal truths of the Bible. That is the very thing that Paul warned Timothy against and that Jeremiah refrained from doing. As Christ's ambassadors, Christian communicators must make the message, not the medium, the heart of what they give their listeners, viewers, and readers.

* * * * *

Importance of Clear Communication

No preacher likes the feeling of being tongue-tied—especially when it happens in the pulpit. Those awkward moments when his brain gets stuck in neutral and his mouth continues to rev are the nightmare of every preacher. It can be especially dangerous when everything he says is taped.

A few years ago some of our radio-broadcast workers assembled a taped collection of all my verbal fumbles over the years. They collected about fifteen-years worth of out-takes and strung them together to make an entire sermon of nonsense. It was painful to listen to.

So I have nothing but extreme pity for the Reverend William Archibald Spooner, who suffered from a disability that no preacher deserves. Spooner was a brilliant man who was dean of New College, Oxford, at the turn of the twentieth century. Today he is chiefly remembered because he elevated slips of the tongue to

---

an art form. He was particularly prone to one variety of verbal blunder that has been given his name—the *spoonerism*. A spoonerism transposes the syllables or sounds of two or more words, as in "Let me sew you to your sheet."

Spooner's backward eloquence was unsurpassed. Reprimanding a wayward student, he uttered these immortal words: "You have hissed all my mystery lectures; I saw you fight a liar on the college grounds; in fact, you have tasted the whole worm!" It is easy to see how this tendency could adversely affect a preaching ministry. Spooner's tendency to transpose sounds occasionally caused him to say the very opposite of what he intended. Once when he was performing a wedding, Reverend Spooner told the bridegroom, "It is kisstomary to cuss the bride." On another occasion Spooner was preaching on Psalm 23, and he assured his congregation that "our Lord is a shoving leopard." When you realize that Spooner's ministry was primarily among students, you have to give him high marks for fortitude.

No communicator wants to mangle the message. But for *Christian* communicators the need to get the message right is elevated to the height of a sacred duty. Perhaps one can smile and pardon an affliction like William Spooner's, but he certainly cannot tolerate any distortion of divine truth that results from traits such as sloppy thinking, laziness, carelessness, apathy, or indifference. More sinister yet is the tendency to sidestep elements of truth or water down the message because of a desire to please people, a love of worldly praise, or a lack of holy courage.

New Media Opportunities

If anything, the obligation to communicate the truth of the gospel clearly and accurately weighs more heavily on our generation than on those who have gone before us, because our opportunities are so much greater. Luke 12:48 says, "From everyone who has been given much shall much be required."

No previous generation has been blessed with the means of mass communication like ours. A hundred years ago, "Christian communication" consisted almost totally of preaching sermons and writing books. The only form of *mass* communication was the press. It never occurred to men like Charles Spurgeon that the means would exist to transmit live sounds and images via satellite to every nation in the world. Spurgeon was the most listened-to preacher in history by the end of the nineteenth century. He preached to huge crowds in his church. By some estimates, four million people actually heard him preach over a remarkable lifetime of ministry.

But today, via radio, Chuck Swindoll preaches to more people than that in a typical week. J. Vernon McGee ("he being dead yet speaketh") has been broadcasting every weekday worldwide for decades. If you count the sermons that are translated and preached in other languages, McGee has undoubtedly preached to more people than any other person in history—and he continues to do so from the grave.

The staff who produce our recordings and radio broadcasts like to remind me that the sun never sets on our ministry. At any given moment of the day or night, worldwide and around the clock, someone, somewhere is listening to a sermon I preached from our church pulpit. I cannot tell you how heavily that responsibility continually weighs on me. I am constantly aware of the obligation to get the message right, to speak it clearly, and to proclaim it with authority and conviction.

New vistas in communications are constantly opening up. Future generations will be able to download from a central databank video images and sounds of today's preachers. If tomorrow's Bible students want to know what James

Boice said about Romans 7, they will not have to get his commentary and look it up. If they prefer, they will plug into the digital communications superhighway and hear or view the original sermon as he preached it from the pulpit.

Satellite technology, digital sound, high-resolution, wide-screen television are already available. Other high-tech advances suggest that a hundred years from now, communications will have advanced at least as far beyond today's technology as our world has come since Spurgeon's time. If the Lord delays His return, our great-great grandchildren may have access to forms of communication that we cannot even imagine today.

Misused Opportunities

This is a very exciting age in which to live and minister. But remember Luke 12:48: "From everyone who has been given much shall much be required." We are stewards who will be held accountable for the opportunities with which the Lord has blessed us. And if we are honest, I think we would have to confess that the church for the most part has simply squandered the rich opportunities modern communication technology has given. Our generation, with greater means than ever to reach the world with the gospel, is actually losing ground spiritually. The church's influence is actually diminishing. Our message is becoming confused—and it is confusing. We are not speaking the truth plainly for the world to hear the message.

Part of the problem is that the church has failed to see the pitfalls inherent in modern communications. The new technology has brought much more than new opportunities; it has also brought a whole new set of challenges for those whose goal is to proclaim and teach the truth of God. Most of the new media are better suited to entertainment.

Neil Postman wrote an important book some years ago, titled, *Amusing Ourselves to Death*.[1] Every Christian communicator should be familiar with this book. Postman is not a Christian. He teaches communications at New York University. He writes from the perspective of a secular academician. His book is an analysis of how modern communications technology—and television in particular—has dramatically altered our culture.

Postman points out that prior to television, society relied on printed media for most of its information. People had to be literate—not merely able to read and write, but able to think logically, able to digest information meaningfully, able to engage their minds in all kinds of rational processes. The *content* of any form of communication took priority over the *form*. Communicators were chiefly concerned with substance, not style. The message *had* to have cognitive content.

Postman refers to the age prior to the twentieth century as "the age of exposition." Human discourse in the age of exposition was significantly different. The Lincoln-Douglas debates, for example, took place in rural communities, in the open air, often in sweltering heat, without the benefit of public address systems. Yet thousands of people stood and listened for hours, carefully following the logic of the debaters, listening intently to profound dialogue, hanging on every word of two eloquent speakers.

By contrast, today's politicians compete for "sound bites." Image is more important than substance. America now selects presidential candidates the way

---

[1](New York: Penguin Books, 1986).

Hollywood auditions actors. In fact, prior to Bill Clinton, the only president in forty years to complete two terms *was* an actor (Ronald Reagan).

A major shift took place, according to Postman, "Toward the end of the nineteenth century. . . . The Age of Exposition began to pass, and the early signs of its replacement could be discerned. Its replacement was to be the Age of Show Business."

Media-Modified Message

Television has done more than anything else to define the age of show business. We tend to think of television as a significant tool in the advancement of knowledge. Through the eye of the television camera, we can witness events on the other side of the globe—or even on the moon—as they are unfolding. We see and hear things our ancestors could never have imagined. Surely we should be the best-informed and most knowledgeable generation in history.

But the effect of television has been precisely the opposite. Television has *not* made us more literate than our ancestors. Instead, it has flooded our minds with irrelevant and meaningless information. We are experts in the trivia of pop culture, but are ignorant about serious matters. The publicity surrounding the O. J. Simpson murder trial in 1995 illustrates this. During Simpson's preliminary hearing, a severe crisis over nuclear weapons was unfolding in Korea. The government of Haiti was overthrown by a coup and an entire nation thrown into chaos. Yassir Arafat returned to the Gaza strip legally for the first time in decades, marking one of the most significant modern political developments in the Middle East. The prime minister of Nepal resigned. All those things of earth-shaking importance were happening in the world, yet in spite of their significance, our local television newscasts devoted 93 percent of their coverage to the Simpson hearing.

Television is an entertainment medium. *Too much* television has fed people's appetite for entertainment and lowered their tolerance for serious thought. Now even the print media are following television's lead, and formatting their content so that it is more entertaining than informative. In England, the tabloids have all but driven serious newspapers out of business. *USA Today* was founded to achieve a similar purpose. It was consciously designed and formatted to reach the TV generation. The stories are purposely short. Only the main front-page articles are carried over to another page. It is an entire newspaper of sound-bite information, formatted for a generation whose minds have been shaped by television. And commercially it has been a tremendous success.

Book publishing is following suit. Look at a recent *New York Times* bestseller list. Seven of the top books were cartoon collections—"Garfield," "The Far Side," and similar fare. The top nonfiction books included some photographic essays and works by Dave Barry, Rush Limbaugh, and Howard Stern. Only three of the top books on the nonfiction list had any substantial non-humorous content. What does this say about our society?

Television has not only lowered tolerance for serious thought; it has also dulled minds to reality. As the O. J. Simpson drama was unfolding, one network followed the sensational freeway chase scene by helicopter but kept a small window at the bottom of the screen where the NBA playoffs were being shown. The two scenes were utterly incongruous.

But even apart from the O. J. Simpson story, network news is surreal. The evening news is a *performance*, where suave anchormen coolly read brief reports about war, murder, crime, and natural disaster. Commercials that trivialize the

stories and isolate them from any context punctuate these stories. Neil Postman recounts a news broadcast in which a Marine Corps general declared that global nuclear war is inevitable. The next segment was a commercial for Burger King.

We are not expected to respond rationally. In Postman's words, "The viewers will not be caught contaminating their responses with a sense of reality, any more than an audience at a play would go scurrying to call home because a character on stage has said that a murderer is loose in the neighborhood."[2]

Television cannot demand a sensible response. People tune in to be entertained, not to be challenged to think. If a program requires contemplation or demands too much use of the intellect, no one watches.

Television has also lowered attention spans. After fifteen minutes, we get a break for commercials. One of the cable networks even has a program called "Short-Attention-Span Theater." On every network, programs require a minimum intellectual involvement. Most television dramas are designed for an intellectual capacity of the average seven-year-old. The point is not to challenge viewers, but to amuse them. Neil Postman says we are amusing ourselves to death. He suggests that our fascination with television has sapped our culture's intellectual and spiritual stamina.

In fact, his most trenchant message is in a chapter on modern religion. Postman is Jewish, but he writes with piercing insight about the decline of preaching in the Christian church. He contrasts the ministries of Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield with the preaching of today. Those men relied on depth of content, profundity, logic, and knowledge of the Scriptures. Preaching today is superficial by comparison, with the emphasis on style and emotion. "Good" preaching by the modern definition must above all be brief and amusing. Much that passes for preaching these days is merely entertainment—devoid of any exhortation, reproof, rebuke, or instruction (cf. 2 Tim 3:16, 4:2).

The epitome of modern preaching is the slick evangelist who overstates every emotion, carries a microphone as he struts around the platform, and gets the audience clapping, stomping, and shouting while he incites them into a frenzy. The message has no meat, but who cares as long as the response is enthusiastic?

It is not only a few televangelists who fall into this category. Some of our most conservative, evangelical churches have allowed entertainment to replace the clear preaching of truth. Where preaching can be found, it is often devoid of doctrine, filled with clever anecdotes and sound-bite witticisms. Biblical preaching with real content is in a serious state of decline.

Felt-Need Communication

Christian publishing has dutifully followed the trends. A certain publishing company has been in business for nearly a hundred years, publishing very solid Christian literature. But not too long ago they completely shut down their textbook division and announced that their new focus would be on publishing books that could easily cross over into the secular market. They were looking for self-help books, humor books, and other lightweight material with a minimum of biblical references.

That is precisely the wrong direction to go. We who have access to the divinely inspired truth of God's Word should be confronting the apathy and

---

[2]Cited in George Barna, *Marketing the Church* (Colorado Springs, Colo.: NavPress, 1988) 145 (emphasis added).

foolishness of a society that is addicted to entertainment and ignorant of truth. We should be shouting truth from the rooftops, not adapting our message to the shallow and insipid amusements that have left our society morally and intellectually bankrupt.

Living in an age that has abandoned the quest for truth, the church cannot afford to be vacillating. We minister to people in desperate need of a word from the Lord, and we cannot soft-pedal our message or extenuate the gospel. If we make friends with the world, we set ourselves at enmity with God. If we trust worldly devices, we automatically relinquish the power of the Holy Spirit.

I am very concerned about the modern church's fascination with marketing methodology. I wrote a book, *Ashamed of the Gospel*,[3] which analyzed and critiqued the modern church's tendency to rely on Madison Avenue technique. Too many are trying to sell the gospel as a product rather than understanding that the gospel itself *is* the power of God to change people's hearts and minds.

My challenge to pastors and to writers is the same. The task of every Christian communicator is the same. It is not only to entertain. It is not merely to amuse. It is not just to sell a product. It is certainly not to increase audience approval ratings. *The task is to communicate God's truth as clearly, as effectively, and as accurately as possible.*

Often this is incompatible with marketing goals. Why? Have you ever noticed how many television commercials say nothing about the products they advertise? The typical jeans commercial shows a painful drama about the woes of adolescence, but does not mention jeans. A perfume ad is a collage of sensuous images with no reference to the product. Beer commercials contain some of the funniest material on television, but say very little about beer.

Those commercials are supposed to create a mood, to entertain, to appeal to emotions—not to give information. An obvious parallel exists between such commercials and some of the trends in Christian communications. Like the commercials, many Christian communicators, whether preachers or writers, aim to set a mood, to evoke an emotional response, to entertain—but not necessarily to communicate anything of substance.

Others, using the best techniques of modern marketing, purposely frame the message so that it appeals to people's desire for happiness, prosperity, and self-gratification. The goal is to give people what they want. Advocates of a market-driven communications philosophy are quite candid about this. Consumer satisfaction is the stated goal of the new philosophy. One key resource on market-driven ministry says, "This is what marketing the [Christian message] is all about: providing our product . . . as a solution to people's felt need."

"Felt needs" thus determine the road map for the modern communicator's marketing plan. The idea is a basic marketing principle: you satisfy an existing desire rather than trying to persuade people to buy something they do not want. Such trends are sheer accommodation to a society bred by television. They follow what is fashionable but reveal little concern for what is true. They cater to the very worst tendencies in modern society. They humor people whose first love is themselves. They offer people God without any disruption of their selfish lifestyles.

---

[3](Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1993).

Biblical Communication

And if *results* are what you want, here is a sure way to get them. Promise people a religion that will allow them to be comfortable in their materialism and self-love, and they will respond in droves. But that is *not* effective Christian communication. In fact, it is precisely the kind of thing Paul warned Timothy to avoid.

Paul commanded Timothy, "Preach the word; be ready in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with great patience and instruction" (2 Tim 4:2). The apostle included this prophetic warning: "The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but wanting to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires; and will turn away their ears from the truth, and will turn aside to myths" (4:3-4). The King James Version translates the passage like this: "After their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth."

Clearly Paul's philosophy of ministry had no room for the give-people-what-they-want theory of modern marketing. He did not urge Timothy to conduct a survey to find out what his people wanted. He did not suggest that he study demographic data or do research on the "felt needs" of his people. He commanded him to preach the Word—faithfully, reprovingly, patiently—and confront the spirit of the age head on.

Notice that Paul said nothing to Timothy about how people might respond. He did not lecture Timothy on how large his church was, how much money it took in, or how influential it was. He did not suggest that the world was supposed to revere, esteem, or even accept Timothy. In fact, Paul said nothing whatever about external success. Paul's emphasis was on *faithfulness*, not success.

In stark contrast, modern marketing experts are telling Christian communicators to find out what people want, then do whatever is necessary to meet the most popular demands. The audience is "sovereign" in such matters. One best-selling book on Christian marketing actually states that the audience should determine how to frame a message:

> It is . . . critical that we keep in mind a fundamental principle of Christian communication: the audience, not the message, is sovereign. If our advertising is going to stop people in the midst of hectic schedules and cause them to think about what we're saying, *our message has to be adapted to the needs of the audience.* When we produce advertising that is based on the take-it-or-leave-it proposition, rather than on a sensitivity and response to people's needs, people will invariably reject our message.[4]

What if the OT prophets had subscribed to such a philosophy? Jeremiah, for example, preached forty years without seeing any significant positive response. On the contrary, his countrymen threatened to kill him if he did not stop prophesying (Jer 11:19-23); his own family and friends plotted against him (12:6); he was not permitted to marry, and so had to suffer agonizing loneliness (16:2); plots were devised to kill him secretly (18:20-23); he was beaten and put in stocks (20:1-2); he was spied on by friends who sought revenge (20:10); he was consumed with sorrow and shame—even having the day he was born cursed (20:14-18); and falsely accused of being a traitor to the nation (37:13-14). Jeremiah was then beaten, thrown into a dungeon, and starved many days (37:15-21). If an Ethiopian Gentile had not interceded on his behalf, Jeremiah would have died there. In the end, tradition says

---

[4]Barna, *Marketing the Church* 145 (emphasis added).

he was exiled to Egypt, where he was stoned to death by his own people. He had virtually no converts to show for a lifetime of ministry.

Suppose Jeremiah had attended a modern communications seminar and learned a market-driven philosophy of communications. Do you think he would have changed his style of confrontational ministry? Can you imagine him staging a variety show or using comedy to try to win people's affections? He may have learned to gather an appreciative crowd, but he certainly would not have had the ministry to which God called him.

Contrast Jeremiah's commitment with the advice of a modern marketing expert. An author who insists that the audience is sovereign suggests that the wise communicator ought to "shape his communications according to [people's] needs in order to receive the response he [seeks]."[5] The effect of that philosophy is apparent; Christian communicators are becoming people-pleasers—precisely what Scripture forbids.

The whole strategy is backward. The *audience* is not sovereign, *God* is. And His truth is unchanging. His Word is forever settled in heaven. Though new forms of media may come and go, the message itself cannot be changed. To change the biblical message in any way is expressly forbidden. We cannot truncate it, water it down, sugar-coat it, or otherwise minimize the offense of the cross.

Someone will inevitably point out that Paul said he became all things to all men that he might by all means win some. But Paul was not proposing that the message be changed or softened. Paul refused either to amend or to abridge his message to make people happy. He wrote, "Am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God? Or am I striving to please men? *If I were still trying to please men, I would not be a bond-servant of Christ*" (Gal 1:10, emphasis added). He was utterly unwilling to try to remove the offense from the gospel (5:11). He did not use methodology that catered to the lusts of his listeners. He certainly did not follow the kind of pragmatic philosophy of modern, market-driven communicators.

What made Paul effective was not marketing savvy, but a stubborn devotion to the truth. He saw himself as Christ's ambassador, not His press secretary. Truth was something to be declared, not negotiated. Paul was not ashamed of the gospel (Rom 1:16). He willingly suffered for the truth's sake (2 Cor 11:23-28). He did not back down in the face of opposition or rejection. He did not adjust the truth to make unbelievers happy. He did not make friends with the enemies of God.

Paul's message was *always* non-negotiable. In the same chapter where he spoke of becoming all things to all men, Paul wrote, "I am under compulsion; for woe is me if I do not preach the gospel" (1 Cor 9:16). His ministry was in response to a divine mandate. God had called him and commissioned him. Paul preached the gospel exactly as he had received it directly from the Lord, and he always delivered that message "as of first importance" (1 Cor 15:3). He was not a salesman or marketer, but a divine emissary. He certainly was *not* "willing to shape his communications" to accommodate his listeners or produce a desirable response. The fact that he was stoned and left for dead (Acts 14:9), beaten, imprisoned, and finally killed for the truth's sake ought to demonstrate that he did not adapt the message to make it pleasing to his hearers! And the personal suffering he bore because of his ministry did *not* indicate that something was wrong with his approach, but that everything had been right!

As Christian communicators we must commit ourselves to being what God

---

[5]Ibid., 33.

has called us to be. We are not carnival barkers, used-car salesmen, or commercial pitchmen. We are Christ's ambassadors (2 Cor 5:20). Knowing the terror of the Lord (5:11), motivated by the love of Christ (5:14), utterly made new by Him (5:17), we implore sinners to be reconciled to God (5:20).

Use the Media Without Abusing the Message

I believe we can be innovative and creative in how we present the gospel, but we have to be careful that our methods harmonize with the profound spiritual truth we are trying to convey. It is too easy to trivialize the sacred message. We must make the *message*, not the *medium*, the heart of what we want to convey to the audience.

As Christian writers and communicators, I challenge you to forget what is fashionable and concern yourself with what is true. Do not be quick to embrace the trends of modern marketing. Certainly we should use the new media. But rather than adapting our message to suit the medium, let's use the medium to present the message as clearly, as accurately, and as fully as possible. If we are faithful in that, the soil God has prepared will bear fruit. His Word will not return void.

EXPANSION OF JERUSALEM IN JER 31:38-40:
NEVER, ALREADY OR NOT YET?

Dennis M. Swanson[*]
Seminary Librarian

Various viewpoints on the biblical teaching of the millennium deal differently with the prophecy of Jerusalem's expansion in Jer 31:38-40. Wording of the prophecy points to a fulfillment in the distant future and sets seven boundary markers for the city: the Tower of Hananel, the Corner Gate, the Hill Gareb, Goah, the Valley of Dead Bodies and Ashes, the fields as far as the Brook Kidron, and the Horse Gate. Those markers indicate an expansion of the city beyond anything yet known. Proposals about the fulfillment of the prophecy include those that say the prophecy will never be fulfilled, those contending that the prophecy has already been fulfilled, and those holding to a yet future fulfillment of the prophecy. The first option sees a spiritual rather than geographical fulfillment of the passage and falters in light of specific geographical details given therein. The "already" option points to a fulfillment either in the time of Zerubbabel and Joshua or in the New Jerusalem of eternity future. Both "already" options fall short of compliance with details of the prophecy. The "not yet" option coincides well with conditions expressed in the prophecy by placing its fulfillment in the future millennial kingdom on earth.

* * * * *

One of the most pointed differences between various millennial views is the nature and fulfillment of the "land promises" made to Israel in the OT. Typically, the discussions relate to "larger" issues of the territory as outlined in the Abrahamic

---

[*]Dennis M. Swanson is an M.Div. graduate of The Master's Seminary.

Covenant[1] and the overall national boundaries.[2]   In addition to such "macro-prophecies" are several "micro-prophecies" dealing with specific areas within the larger geographical context of the land.

Although, as Wilken states, "in the original promise of the land, Jerusalem played no part,"[3] subsequent prophecies (most notably Jeremiah 30–33; Ezekiel 35–48; Zechariah 10–14) detail predictions related to Jerusalem and its Temple. Though some of the mico-prophecies, mainly those about the Temple,[4] have received considerable discussion, a prophecy in Jer 31:38-40 which deals with the expansion of Jerusalem, has often been handled superficially or simply overlooked[5] in millennial discussions.[6]

This article seeks to enlarge the discussion by dealing with the prophecy of Jer 31:38-40 about the expansion of Jerusalem and examining details of the prophecy and three interpretative theories about its fulfillment.

I. The Prophetic Details of Jeremiah 31:38-40

In the larger context of the "Book of Consolation" portion of Jeremiah (30–33) and the prophecy of the New Covenant (Jeremiah 31) is an additional prophecy regarding Jerusalem (vv. 38-40). The prophecy, one of the "provisions of

---

[1]For a thorough discussion of the Abrahamic Covenant, see Keith Essex "The Abrahamic Covenant," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 10/2 (Fall 1999):191-212. For a discussion of the larger "land" issues and the biblical covenants see Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "The Land of Israel and the Future Return (Zechariah 10:6-12)," in *Israel the Land and the People*, ed. H. Wayne House (Grand Rapids: Kregel) 209-27; Ralph H. Alexander, "A New Covenant—An Eternal People (Jeremiah 31)," in *Israel the Land and the People*, ed. H. Wayne House (Grand Rapids: Kregel) 169-206; and John R. Master, "The New Covenant," in *Issues in Dispensationalism*, eds. Wesley R. Willis and John R. Master (Chicago: Moody, 1997) 93-112.

[2]For an excellent overview of the boundaries of the land as detailed in the Abrahamic Covenant and subsequent passages (e.g., Exod 23:31; Num 34:1-12), see Barry Beitzel, *The Moody Atlas of Bible Lands* (Chicago: Moody, 1985) 5-13. See also Walter C. Kaiser, "The Promised Land: A Biblical-Historical View," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 138 (1981):302-12.

[3]Robert L. Wilken, *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University, 1992) 9.

[4]For a thorough discussion of issues related to a "third" temple and the exegetical and theological considerations, see Ralph H. Alexander, "Ezekiel," in the *Expositor's Bible Commentary,* ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986) 6:942-52. See also John W. Schmitt and J. Carl Laney, *Messiah's Coming Temple: Ezekiel's Prophetic Vision of the Future Temple* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1997).

[5]For example, in Randall Price's otherwise fine book, *Jerusalem in Prophecy* (Eugene, Ore.: Harvest House, 1998), Jer 31:38-40 is only quoted in part once (222) and mentioned only once in passing (229), a strange oversight of a passage that W. F. Birch called, "the key to Jerusalem" ("Note on Jeremiah xxxi, 38-40," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 14/1 [January 1882]:58). Even in George Adam Smith's classic two-volume work, *Jerusalem: The Topography, Economics and History from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), the passage receives only passing mention, probably because Smith felt that the passage was an "exilic addition" not original with Jeremiah (2:261).

[6]Even in discussions about Jerusalem in general, this passage is often ignored. For example, in Meir Ben-Dov's *Historical Atlas of Jerusalem* (New York: Continuum, 2002), he offers no discussion of the Jeremiah passage at all.

the New Covenant that make it so welcome,"[7] is all the more striking since it is "the very city that Jeremiah was before long to see destroyed by the Chaldean army."[8] The English text reads as follows:

> "Behold, days are coming," declares the LORD, "when the city shall be rebuilt for the LORD from the Tower of Hananel to the Corner Gate. And the measuring line shall go out farther straight ahead to the hill Gareb; then it will turn to Goah. And the whole valley of the dead bodies and of the ashes, and all the fields as far as the brook Kidron, to the corner of the Horse Gate toward the east, shall be holy to the LORD; it shall not be plucked up, or overthrown anymore forever" (NASB).

Utilizing the same introductory formula, "behold days are coming" (הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים, *hinnēh yāmîm bāʾîm*),[9] as in 31:27 (and elsewhere), Jeremiah gives a prophecy with a future fulfillment.[10] The phrase occurs 21 times in the OT with 15 uses appearing in Jeremiah. Throughout the OT it introduces a prophetic pronouncement (e.g., 1 Sam 2:31; 2 Kgs 20:17; Isa 39:6; Jer 7:32; 9:25; 16:14; 19:6; 23:5, 7; 30:3; 31:27, 31, 28; 33:14; 48:12; 49:2; 51:47, 52; Amos 4:2; 8:11; 9:13). As Feinberg notes, the phrase "look[s] toward eschatological times. . . . Jeremiah is contemplating the distant, not near future of the nation."[11] Also commenting on the phrase at the beginning of the "Book of Consolation" section (Jer 30–33),[12] McKane states,

> But what if the future of v. 3 ["days are coming" Jer 30:3] is much vaster than this, so that the coming days stretch out for a great distance, as Kimchi supposed? The question whether a fulfillment is thought of as historical or eschatological can degenerate into a somewhat barren logomachy, but there is a significant difference between a hope for the future which attends to power constellations among the nations in the present and one which thumbs its nose at historical probabilities, its future hope more remote and defiant—a resounding 'nevertheless'. The one finds support for a radical turn-around and transformation in a present where great movements of history are interpreted as Yahweh's shaking of the nations. The other, like Kimchi's, is disengaged from a present which offers no support for it and demands nothing less than a new age—a Messianic

---

[7]Larry D. Pettegrew, "The New Covenant," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 10/2 (Fall 1999):255. A large part of the problem with this "micro-prophecy" is that it is usually overwhelmed by the promise of the New Covenant, to the point that it is not even mentioned in that discussion (e.g., Michael Dauphinais and Matthew Levering, *Holy People, Holy Land: A Theological Introduction to the Bible* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005] 125).

[8]Charles L. Feinberg, "Jeremiah," in the *Expositor's Bible Commentary* 6:579.

[9]In 31:38 the final part of the phrase, בָּאִים is omitted. However, as Thompson notes, "In the Hebrew text there is a strange gap, 'Look, days . . .'; but there can be no doubt about the missing word." (J. A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980]) 583. See also William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Chs. 26-52*, ed. Paul D. Nanson (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989) 155; William McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996) 2:832; and Benjamin Blayney, *Jeremiah and Lamentations: A New Translation with Notes Critical, Philological and Explanatory* (Edinburgh: Oliphant and Balfour, 1810) 374. Blayney states in part, "[T]he word בָּאִים is wanting; but the Masoretes have supplied it; and it is found in twenty-two, perhaps twenty-three, MSS. and in five Editions; in two MSS. a word of four letters is erased after יָמִים. All the ancient versions express it."

[10]Feinberg, *Jeremiah* 6:579.

[11]Ibid., 6:559.

[12]John Bright. *Jeremiah,* in The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1965) 269-300.

age. The coming days of v. 3 are perhaps of this latter kind.[13]

The prophecy declares that in the future "the city" (i.e., Jerusalem) will be rebuilt and enlarged,[14] sanctified,[15] and immune from future devastation.[16]

As will be shown, some have explained Jerusalem in a non-literal manner, as either symbolic or representative of a heavenly counterpart. This will not do; "the physical form of Jerusalem is clearly in mind as the prophet draws his picture of the future."[17] Further, Feinberg states, "[T]his passage will not permit an interpretation that applies it to a spiritual, heavenly, or symbolic Jerusalem."[18] The rebuilding and enlargement of the city are "an explicit reversal of the destruction decreed in 7:30-8:3."[19] The picture of the rebuilt and enlarged city "is foretold with topographical precision."[20] As McConville notes, the prophecy detailing the rebuilding and expansion of Jerusalem cannot be separated from that of the promise of the New Covenant. "The continuity with historic, geographical Judah should also be noted, since the new covenant promise is followed almost immediately by an assurance that the devastated city of Jerusalem will be rebuilt."[21]

Geographic Features of the Prophecy

Jeremiah presents seven geographic markers detailing the borders of the city in a "counterclockwise fashion,"[22] markers that "seem to describe a circuit about the city going round from north to west, then to south and ending at the east."[23] In

---

[13]McKane, *Jeremiah* 755. David Kimhi's last name has various spellings, including Kimchi and Qimhi. The preferred spelling is Kimhi.

[14]Martin Raundal Hague, "Some Aspects of the Motif 'The City Facing Death' of Ps 68,21," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 2 (1988):13,

[15]Thompson. *Jeremiah* 584.

[16]Gerald L. Keown, Pamela J. Scalise, and Thomas G. Smothers, *Jeremiah 26–52*, vol. 27 of Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, 1995) 139. Detailing this promise, they write,
Although no new fortifications are mentioned, the LORD guarantees Jerusalem's inviolability. The boundary sketched in vv. 38-40 would be a poor location for a defensive wall because the strategic valleys would be inside the city instead of outside the walls. This map illustrates that Jerusalem will not need defenses made of stone. It will be safe because it will be holy. Its people will not continue in the sin and apostasy that led to its destruction. The LORD's new building, v. 38, will be protected by the promise not to uproot or overthrow (cf. 31:28).

[17]J. Gordon McConville, "The Theology of Jeremiah," in *The New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, ed. Willem A. Van Gemeren (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997) 4:762.

[18]Feinberg, "Jeremiah" 6:579.

[19]Carolyn J. Sharp, "The Call of Jeremiah and Diaspora Politics," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119/3 (2000):427.

[20]C. Von Orelli, *The Prophecies of Jeremiah* (London: T & T Clark, 1889) 242.

[21]J. G. McConville, "The Book of Jeremiah," in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005) 355.

[22]Lawrence E. Stager, "The Archaeology of the East Slope of Jerusalem and the Terraces of the Kidron," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 41/2 (1982):117. For a contrary view, see Gabriel Barkay, "Northern and Western Jerusalem in the End of the Iron Age" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Tel Aviv University, April 1985). Barkay takes the geographic markers to move in a "clockwise direction starting on the northwestern part of the Temple Mount, embracing the large area north of town, and coming back to the northeastern corner of the Temple Mount" (II).

[23]Birch, "Notes" 58.

his classic work, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament*, Simons states, "[T]he language and the terms used are thoroughly concrete and the topographical features enumerated are mostly known also from other sources."[24] A study of markers benefits from recent archaeological work, more of which has occurred in and around Jerusalem in the last 30 years than in all the years previous. As Avigad points out,

> The reunification of Jerusalem in 1967 was not only a great historical event—well expressed in the Bible by the Psalmist: "Jerusalem, built as a city which is bound firmly together" (122:3)–but as well an event that will long be remembered as a turning point in the archaeological exploration of the city. The vast increase in archaeological excavations conducted in Jerusalem since the reunification, in locations not even dreamt of previously, has resulted in an unanticipated growth of our knowledge of the city's past.[25]

Starting on "its northern or weakest side"[26] and moving in a counterclockwise fashion, Jeremiah details the landmarks and geographic markers of the city.

Boundary Marker One: The Tower of Hananel
        The first marker is the *Tower of Hananel* which was located at the "the north-east corner of the city walls"[27] (Neh 3:1; 12:39; Zech 14:10). This tower, along with the "Tower of the Hundred" (Neh 3:1), were main fortifications protecting the city and Temple area from an attack from the north.[28] Nehemiah 2:8 mentions a "fortress which is by the temple," and it is thought that these towers were part of that fortress.[29] Eskenazi notes that "the later citadel of 1 Macc 13:52 and the Antonia Fortress of Herod may correspond to the Tower of Hananel or mark the spot

---

[24]J. Simons, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament: Researches and Theories* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1952) 231.

[25]Nahman Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem*. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1980) 13. For a recent and thorough discussion of the major archaeological work in Jerusalem and an archaeological survey of its history, see Dan Bahat, "Jerusalem," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*, ed. Eric M. Myers (New York: Oxford University, 1997) 3:224-38; also Nahman Avigad, "Jerusalem," in *The Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, ed. Michael Avi-Yonah (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976) 2:580-647. The older, and in places superceded, work of Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Jerusalem: Excavating 3000 Years of History* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967); *Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968-1974*, ed. Yigal Yadin (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University and The Israel Exploration Society, 1976); and W. Harold Mare, *The Archaeology of the Jerusalem Area* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987) should also be consulted.

[26]Birch, "Note" 58.

[27]Von Orelli, *Jeremiah* 236. See also Avigad, *Jerusalem* 13. Avigad notes that the tower was at the "north-west corner" of the Temple mount, which is essentially the same location from a different perspective in the pre-Herodian expansion era. See also, Randall Price, *The Temple and Bible Prophecy* (Eugene, Ore.: Harvest House, 2005) 222.

[28]Michael Avi-Yonah, "The Walls of Nehemiah: A Minimalist View," *Israel Exploration Journal* 4/3-4 (1954):241. Historically, Jerusalem has always been the most vulnerable from its northern flank. When Pompey laid siege to the city, he concentrated on the northern flank. When Jerusalem was taken by the Crusaders under Godfrey de Bouillon in 1099, the city walls were breached from the north. In World War I, General Allenby made his main assault to take Jerusalem from the north (Ronald Sanders, *The High Walls of Jerusalem* [New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983] 622-23).

[29]Avi-Yonah, "Walls of Nehemiah" 242.

on which it had stood earlier."[30] That conclusion is most reasonable since a wall, tower, or other important defensive feature is generally determined by a topographical or geographic factor, a feature that is probably unchangeable from one generation to another.[31]

Boundary Marker Two: The Corner Gate
        The next marker is the *Corner Gate*, which is mentioned several times in the OT (2 Kgs 14:13; 2 Chr 25:23; 26:9). The gate appears in the prophecy of Zech 14:10, which all agree relates in some way to Jer 31:38-40.[32] Although the exact location of this gate has been debated, it is reasonable to locate it approximately 250 meters south of the Tower of Hananel, near the significant "Broad Wall." Liid states, "It is at the W. end of this 8th-century wall, built along the Transversal Valley to protect the vulnerable NW approach to the city, that the Corner Gate should provisionally be located."[33] A counterclockwise direction dictates that this location can only be on the western side of the city, as Simons points out:

> That a location of the Corner Gate elsewhere than on the western ridge would cut off all possibility of reasonable suggestions for Gareb, Goah and "the valley or corpses and ashes." The initial section of Jeremiah's boundary description is intelligible only in the supposition, that he is dealing with the course of a wall substantially identical with that outlined by Josephus and containing on the northern side two sharp turns: one formed by the western temple-wall and the northern city-wall, the other at the point where this east-to-west-wall reaches its most westerly end and "the measuring line goes further, southward." This latter turn, well to the west of the Central Valley and at the north-western angle of the city's circumference, is Jeremiah's first "corner" and in this supposition the remainder of the descriptions become intelligible enough.[34]

The Upper Pool is also located near the Corner Gate. The pools were generally man-made, and they were "important to the inhabitant's livelihood, for they served as catchments and storage areas for the rainwater,"[35] but they were also significant defensive fortifications "to prevent the enemy from approaching [the city gates] with their battering rams."[36]
        Interestingly, the Tower of Hananel is mentioned in the rebuilding of the city walls under Nehemiah, but the Corner Gate is not mentioned in Nehemiah's detailed description of the construction and repair of the walls. Liid and others have speculated that this "lack of reference to the Corner Gate may be attributed to his

---

[30]Tamara C. Eskenazi, "Hananel, Tower of," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 3:45. See also Avi-Yonah, "Walls of Nehemiah" 242. Avi-Yonah notes that the Antonia Fortress, "certainly had a front of two towers and there is no reason to suppose that its predecessors were restricted to one tower only."

[31]Terry W. Eddinger, "Tower," in the *Eerdmans' Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. David Noel Freedman (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 1321-22.

[32]McKane, *Jeremiah* 834.

[33]Dale C. Liid, "Corner Gate," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 1:1156.

[34]Simons, *Jerusalem* 232.

[35]Menashe Har-El, *Landscape Nature and Man in the Bible: Sites and Events in the Old Testament* (Jerusalem: Carta, 2003) 387.

[36]Ibid., 386.

[Nehemiah's] reinforcing of the old defensive lines of the smaller City of David and the temple area."[37]

Boundary Marker Three: The Hill Gareb

Next is the *Hill Gareb*.[38] Mentioned only in this passage, this site has remained obscure. Attempts to identify it at the so-called Mt. Zion at the SW extremity of the city appear to be wrong. Jeremiah's description indicates that the location of this site is across the Hinnom Valley south and west from Jerusalem, closer to the "Shoulder of Hinnom," a well-known burial area. That would also fit the prophet's description in 31:40. Possibly named for Gareb, one of David's mighty-men (2 Sam 23:38; 1 Chr 11:40), that location is not certain. Holladay notes,

> "Gareb Hill" and "Goah" are otherwise unknown; the sequence of the landmarks in these verses suggests a movement counterclockwise around the city, so that Gareb Hill would be on the southwest and Goah on the southeast, but this is only what may be deduced from the passage itself. It may be added that Giesebrecht suggests reading the rather puzzling "opposite it" נֶגְדּוֹ as "southwards נֶגְבָּה (see BHK, BHS); if that suggestion is sound (and compare "eastwards" in v 40), then the location of Gareb Hill on the southwest is reinforced.[39]

Henderson and others have proposed that since the verb form of Gareb means "scratch or scrape" that Gareb was a "locality to which lepers were removed, as they were not allowed to remain in the city."[40] Though this is an interesting proposal and may add significance to the aspect of the prophecy indicating that a formerly unclean area would be "holy to the LORD," it adds nothing to current understanding of the location.

The "measuring line shall go out farther straight ahead to the Hill Gareb and then turn to Goah" indicates that from the Corner Gate a קָו (*qaw*) or a "measuring cord" will stretch in a straight line to the hill and then turn. This concept of the "measuring cord" in the prophets "relates to the rhetoric of judgment and restoration."[41] In the context of this passage, "God promises to stretch a line in the future for Israel's/Jerusalem's restoration."[42] The text indicates that these two sites are beyond the existing environs of the city as Jeremiah knew them.

The evidence seems clear that the site of Gareb and that of Goah are to be "sought to the west of the city."[43] Freedman sums up this consensus by stating, "Nothing is known of these [Gareb and Goah], but apparently the verse indicates an

---

[37]Liid, "Corner Gate" 1:1156. For perhaps the most thorough and detailed description of excavations related to the "Broad Wall" and the settlements of western Jerusalem, see: Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem* esp. 23-62.

[38]Dennis M. Swanson. "Gareb (place)," in the *Eerdmans' Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. David Noel Freedman, ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdman's, 2000) 483.

[39]Holladay, Jeremiah 2, 199, see also McKane, *Jeremiah* 832, who states that the idea is "attractive and is mentioned favorably by Peake, Rudolph and Weiser."

[40]Henderson, *Jeremiah*, 192; see also Laetsch, *Jeremiah* 259.

[41]A. R. Pete Diamond, "קו," in *The New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 3:892.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Von Orelli, *Jeremiah* 236.

extension of the city boundary on the western side."[44]

Boundary Marker Four: Goah

From the Hill Gareb, the next marker is *Goah*.[45] The precise location of Goah remains unknown; but in the context it must be southeast of Gareb, on the southern flank of the Hinnom Valley and west of the Kidron Valley. Some have identified Goah as referring to Golgotha,[46] but this has received little support and would violate the orderliness of the sites presented by Jeremiah. George Adam Smith equated Goah with Gibeah,[47] but this is far-fetched.[48] In translating Goah, the LXX renders the word as a descriptive ἐξ ἐκλεκτῶν λίθων (*ex eklektōn lithōn*, "stone of the elect" or "stone of the chosen") rather than as a proper name or a town location; however, this does not pinpoint an exact location. Birch concludes that "Goath seems to me to have been a place more to the west, and identical with the site of *the Assyrian camp* of Josephus; the name probably has reference to the destruction of the 185,000 men."[49] Thus it is also a location which is unclean or defiled.

Boundary Marker Five: The Valley of Dead Bodies and Ashes

From Goah the southern boundary is described as the "whole valley of the dead bodies and of the ashes." This is most certainly the well-known Hinnom Valley, which curves around the southwest and southern flank of the city. It connects with the Kidron Valley at the southeast corner of the city, below the spur of the City of David. "The Hebrew word is *geihinnom*, a contraction of the phrase *gei Ben-Hinnom*, literally, 'the valley of the son of Hinnom' (presumably, a tract named after its one-time owner)."[50] As Von Orelli notes, "[A]t least a part [of the valley] was held unclean from Josiah's days (2 Kings xxiii. 10), and whither corpses and sacrificial ashes were carried, both having their special places."[51]

The phrasing clearly refers to the "whole valley south of the city."[52] This valley was always outside the city, being accessed through the "Potsherd Gate" (Jer

---

[44]H. Freedman, *Jeremiah: Hebrew Text and English Translation with an Introduction and Commentary* (London: Socino, 1949) 213; so also: Bright, *Jeremiah* 283; Birch, "Notes" 58.

[45]Swanson, "Goah," in the *Eerdmans' Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. David Noel Freedman (Grand Rapids: Eerdman's, 2000) 510.

[46]Blayney, *Jeremiah* 375.

[47]Smith, *Jerusalem* 2:261.

[48]In our research only Smith makes this connection. See Patrick M. Arnold, "Gibeah," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 2:1007-9 for a thorough discussion of the various options regarding Gibeah.

[49]Birch, "Notes" 58 (italics in the original).

[50]Daniel Hillel, *The Natural History of the Bible: An Environmental Exploration of the Hebrew Scriptures* (New YorK Columbia University, 2006) 184.

[51]Von Orelli, *Jeremiah* 236. More recent work indicates that Van Orelli is probably not correct to conclude that the sacrificial ashes from the Temple were removed to a special place in the Hinnom (see Lev 4:12; 6:10-11). Recent work and archaeological findings now indicate the location being "north of the Temple area" (Robert J. Way, "דשׁן," in *The New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 1:1001). Way notes that the reference to the "valley of dead bodies and ashes" has reference to the "offerings to Molech."

[52]Ibid.

19:2) and is also mentioned in Jer 7:32. At least a portion of this area was also called "Tophet," a location where child sacrifice and "heathen cults" had been[53] (Jer 19:4-9). So well known in the time of Jeremiah was the area and its abominations that he refers to it simply as "the valley" (2:23). The Hinnom Valley has also been identified with Gehenna.[54] Keown, Scalise, and Smothers conclude that this area "represents the epitome of the people's unholiness."[55] The common view of the Hinnom Valley or Gehenna as a place of "perpetual fire" where unburied bodies were burned,[56] apparently originated with David Kimhi (1160-1235), the famous Jewish scholar and commentator of Narbonne, France.[57] Though calling Kimhi's view "plausible," Bailey says it has no support "in literary or archaeological data from the intertestamental or rabbinic periods."[58] He also notes that the area was a "low place" where the underworld deities such as Molech were worshiped and sacrifices made (2 Kgs 23:10; Isa 57:5). He notes, "Therefore since human sacrifice had been offered in the valley of Hinnom to the underworld deity Molech, the worshippers likely assumed that there was an entrance to the underworld at this location."[59] In the eyes of a Jew, it was perhaps the most defiled location in the immediate environs of Jerusalem.

Boundary Marker Six: All the Fields as Far as the Brook Kidron

The eastern boundary is "all the fields as far as the brook Kidron." The *Brook Kidron* lay outside of the eastern wall of the city and the Temple.[60] The fields have been identified as the "architectural terraces for buildings (and their adjacent trees and gardens)"[61] which also lay outside of the eastern defensive wall of the city. For a defensive wall, the "high ground" would normally be the location of the wall, at the top of the ridge on the west side of the Kidron or the north side of the Hinnom. This has an obvious defensive advantage in that any attack must first ascend the hill to mount an attack on the wall. The prophecy indicates that this will no longer be the case; the wall of the city will be in "a poor location for a defensive wall because the strategic valleys would be inside the city instead of outside the walls."[62] "The Kidron Valley was a garbage dump (1 Kgs 15:13; 2 Kgs 23:6) and the location of the graves of the common people, which Josiah defiled with the dust and ashes of the

---

[53]Bright, *Jeremiah* 283; see also Hauge, "The City Facing Death" 13; and Mare, *Jerusalem* 176.

[54]L. R. Bailey, "Gehenna: The Topography of Hell," *Biblical Archaeologist* 49/3 (September 1986): 187-91.

[55]Keown, Scalise, and Smothers, *Jeremiah* 138.

[56]Bailey, "Gehenna" 189.

[57]Unfortunately, Kimhi, like most of the European scholars of the Middle Ages and through the Reformation (both Jewish and Christian) had never been to Jerusalem or had the advantage of thorough geographic studies of the land.

[58]Bailey, "Gehenna" 189.

[59]Ibid., 190. Bailey also notes that the "altars were sometimes supplied with pipes so the sacrificial blood could be channeled to the underworld."

[60]Keown, Scalise, and Smothers *Jeremiah* 138.

[61]Stager, "Archaeology of the East Slope of Jerusalem" 118.

[62]Keown, Scalise, and Smothers, *Jeremiah* 139.

images he removed from the temple and destroyed (2 Kgs 23:6)."[63] Outside the historical books, the Kidron is mentioned only by Jeremiah, as Auld and Steiner note, "which anticipates an extended reconstruction of Jerusalem including 'the fields as far as the brook Kidron.'"[64] Jeremiah seeing a future where this area, "strewn with corpses (or stelae) and ashes, as far as the Horse Gate (near the Palace or the Temple Mount) will once against be 'sacred to Yahweh.'"[65]

Boundary Marker Seven: The Horse Gate
        Finally, the most specific marker, "the corner of the Horse Gate," anchors the boundary-line. Burrows points out that this gate "obviously led from the temple to the palace; it must have been near the SE corner of the temple enclosure, not far from the city wall but probably not part of it."[66] However, this conclusion is not as obvious as Burrows indicates. Two separate gates had this name. The gate identified by Burrows was an inner gate (see 2 Kgs 11:16 and 2 Chr 23:15), a minor utilitarian gate that allowed an "entrance for horses into the royal compound from the Horse Gate in the outer wall."[67] That the "Horse Gate" referred to by Jeremiah would be this strategically insignificant, interior passageway within the city is strange. Rather, Avi-Yonah is correct when he states, "The Horse Gate was a gate in the city wall, which served as the east gate of the Temple and palace quarter."[68] Simons also concludes that the reference in Jer 31:39 is a "text [which] in our view also constitutes a decisive argument"[69] that the *Horse Gate* was in the "outer defensive wall on the E. side of the city."[70]

Summary of the Geographic Markers
        Of the seven markers of Jeremiah several issues are certain. Two (*Tower of Hananel* and the *Corner Gate*) have fairly secure, although not settled, archaeological support as part of the northern wall complex. As noted above, the *Corner Gate* was certainly part of pre-exilic Jerusalem, but not afterward, at least in Nehemiah's rebuilding. Neither *Gareb* nor *Goah* are pinpointed by specific geographic or archaeological evidence, but that their locations lay outside of both pre-exilic and post-exilic Jerusalem seems certain. The *Valley of Dead Bodies* and *All the Fields to the Brook Kidron* were also outside the boundaries of the city as it was constituted in Jeremiah's time. Also, none of those locations were part of the city subsequently, from the restoration under Nehemiah and Ezra even into the

---

[63]Ibid., 138.

[64]Graeme Auld and Margreet Steiner, *Jerusalem I: From Bronze Age to the Maccabees* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University, 1996) 20. See their discussion of the Kidron being outside of Jerusalem proper during its entire history (16-20).

[65]Philip J. King and Lawrence E. Stager, *Life in Biblical Israel*, Library of Ancient Israel, ed. Douglas A. Knight (Philadelphia: Westminister/John Knox, 2001) 217.

[66]Millar Burrows, "Horse Gate," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962) 849.

[67]Dale C. Liid, "Horse Gate," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 3:209.

[68]Avi-Yonah, "Walls of Nehemiah" 247.

[69]Liid, "Horse Gate" 3:209.

[70]Ibid.

expansion of the Temple Mount by Herod the Great and to the present day. The *Horse Gate* is attested to in Nehemiah's rebuilding (Neh 3:28), but disappears by the time of Herod the Great.

Though Barkay's expansion is not large enough, he is correct in saying that this prophecy demonstrates that there will be a significant enlargement of Jerusalem where additional territory "in the future would be included within the limits of the fortified city."[71]

II. The Fulfillment of the Prophecy

Three schools of thought have developed regarding the fulfillment of this prophecy. Those interpretations can be categorized under the headings of (1) Never, (2) Already, and (3) Not Yet. The "Never" and "Already" categories are usually the options for amillennialists and non-dispensational premillennialists, and the "Not Yet" category is the option for dispensational premillennialists.

The Fulfillment Option: Never

Many interpreters, particularly those holding to the amillennial or "realized" system of eschatology, have explained this passage in a figurative or non-literal manner. Representative of that position is John Calvin. In his *Commentary on Jeremiah*, Calvin presents the following interpretation:

> At the same time when the Prophet affirms that the extent of the city would not be less than it had been, we see that this prophecy must necessarily be referred to the kingdom of Christ: for though Jerusalem before Christ's coming was eminent and surrounded by a triple wall, and though it was celebrated through all the East, as even heathen writers say that it excelled every other city, yet it was never accomplished that the city flourished as under David and Solomon. We must then necessarily come to the spiritual state of the city, and explain the promise as the grace which came through Christ.[72]

Calvin's reasoning here is fallacious at several levels, with the most obvious being an "either-or" fallacy. Though he states that the prophecy "affirms that the extent of the city would not be less," he inserts as a condition that if this prophecy were to have a literal or geographical fulfillment, it would come by the time of Christ. That condition finds no support in the text. Calvin readily admits that Jerusalem had not, to date, achieved the predicted boundaries (a literal fulfillment); therefore, the prophecy must have a figurative (non-literal) fulfillment. Calvin offers two options: (1) it refers to the "kingdom of Christ"; or (2) "the grace which came through Christ."

Among the possible considerations leading Calvin to such a conclusion was

---

[71]Barkay, "Northern and Western Jerusalem" II.

[72]John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and the Lamentations*, trans. John Owen (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.) 4:150-51. In the above quotation the editors of the text add the following footnote after the phrase "David and Solomon":

> Some think, such as *Gataker and Blayney*, that according to the description here given, the dimensions of the city are much larger than they had ever been before. The 'line' was to inclose a part at least of the hill of Gareb, the whole of Goath, supposed to be Golgotha, the valley of the carcasses, and the fields of Kidron, all which were formerly without the walls of the city.

Apparently, Calvin believed that Jerusalem had reached its territorial apex during the reigns of David and Solomon and the editors were attempting to mitigate this error in his research.

the fact that by his time Jerusalem had not been under "Christian" control since the expulsion of the Crusaders in 1187, except for a brief period from 1229-39.[73] In fact, during Calvin's lifetime (1509-1564), Jerusalem remained firmly in Islamic hands, though governmental control did move from the Mamelukes to the Ottoman Turks (in 1517). Construction of new walls and gates around the city was accomplished under the direction of Suleiman I (the Magnificent) between 1537 and 1541, but Jerusalem remained a relatively small, politically insignificant, and economically depressed city during this era, with a population of around only 10,000.[74] During Suleiman's reign and after, a small number of Jews and Eastern Christians resided in Jerusalem; however, their numbers and influence were negligible. Certainly, no reason existed to think that those circumstances would likely ever change. Also, consistent with his theology, Calvin did not give even the slightest consideration to the possibility of a more literal fulfillment subsequent to his own time.[75]

Dealing with the final portion of the prophecy, which states that the city "shall not be plucked up, or overthrown anymore forever" (31:40b), Calvin stated,

> Moreover, this passage teaches us that the Church will be perpetual, and though God may permit it to be terribly shaken and tossed here and there, there will yet ever be some seed remaining, as long as the sun and the moon shall shine in the heavens, and the order of nature shall continue; so that all the elements, everything we see with our eyes, bear evidence to the perpetuity of the Church, even that it will ever continue: for though Satan and all the world daily threaten its ruin, yet the Lord will in a wonderful manner preserve it to the end, so that it will never perish. This is the import of the passage.[76]

The problem with this interpretative approach is it implies that the words of the passage had no real meaning to the original readers and have none to readers since that time. Could any readers then or even in the NT era, possibly have read the text and concluded that its "import" was the "perpetuity of the Church"? As Wilken points out, "For the ancient Israelites *land* always referred to an actual land. Eretz Israel was not a symbol of a higher reality. It was a distinct geographical entity, a territory with assumed, if not always precise boundaries."[77]

Another example of this category is the Lutheran commentator, Theodore Laetsch. In his commentary, he tries hard to give precise information as to the geographic markers of the passage, details their location and explains the options,

---

[73]Price, *Jerusalem* 352.

[74]Philip J. King, "Jerusalem," in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 3:767. The city had been essentially without walls since 1219 when al-Malik al-Mu'azzam, the nephew of Saladin (who had retaken Jerusalem from the Crusaders) dismantled the walls he had built only seven years earlier when it appeared that a new army of Crusaders was about to retake the city and he did not want a well-fortified city to fall into their hands.

[75]John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. John T. McNeill and Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960) 3:25:5. Calvin states of chiliasts or premillennialists, "Now their fiction is too childish to need or be worth a refutation." Geerhardus Vos echos the same contempt, calling premillenialism a "naïve type of faith," achieved by means of a "reckless abuse of the fundamental principles of O.T. exegesis," a "perversion," and expresses disappointment that "premillennialism has not been psychologically studied" to discover why or how these naïve "characteristics" perpetuate themselves (*The Pauline Eschatology* [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1930) 227.

[76]Ibid., 152.

[77]Wilken, *The Land* 8 (italics in original).

but then concludes "the underlying idea of this passage (vv. 38-40) is not the enlargement of Jerusalem, but its complete sanctification. Even the areas formerly unclean 'shall be holy unto the Lord,'"[78] and equates the fulfillment with the "heavenly Jerusalem."[79] Though the sanctification or consecration of the land that would be within proper boundaries of Jerusalem is an important aspect of the prophecy, the fact remains that the geographical expansion of the city is central to its entire fulfillment. If the prophecy speaks of the "heavenly Jerusalem," what need is present to speak of its "complete sanctification"? Is there a part of heaven that is in need of sanctification or some part of it that was "formerly unclean"?

Feinberg correctly identifies the problem of this approach as he states, "[I]n the broader context of prophecy, this passage will not permit an interpretation that applies it to a spiritual, heavenly, or symbolic Jerusalem. If that were possible, why is it so full of literal detail?"[80]

The Fulfillment Option: Already

Perhaps the larger mass of interpretative conclusions rest in the prophecy being already fulfilled. Among others, this is the position of Hoekema who, though not commenting directly on the text of Jer 31:38-40, nevertheless states,

> Old Testament prophecies about the restoration of Israel may also have multiple fulfillments. In fact, they may be fulfilled in a threefold way: *literally, figuratively, or antitypically.* . . . As we have just seen, all the prophecies quoted about the restoration of Israel to its land have been literally fulfilled, either in the return from Babylonian captivity under Zerubbabel and Joshua (in 536 B.C.), or in a later return under Ezra (in 458 B.C.).[81]

Problems for Hoekema's position here are several. First, as already detailed, the boundaries of the city predicted by Jeremiah were not set by post-exilic returns. In fact, as pointed out in discussion of the Corner Gate, Jerusalem as fortified by Nehemiah was significantly smaller than it had been prior to the exile. Michael Avi-Yonah states, "In the days of Nehemiah, the city seems to have shrunk again, being limited to the eastern hill."[82] Avigad adds to this conclusion, stating, "from all the above we can conclude that the minimalist view of the settlement in Jerusalem in the period of the Return to Zion is correct—that is, that it was limited to the narrow confines of the City of David, and that the *Mishneh* on the Western Hill remained desolate and uninhabited."[83] Additionally, Kaiser brings a formidable challenge:

> While the sheer multiplicity of texts from almost every one of the prophets is staggering, a few evangelicals insist that this pledge to restore Israel to her land was fulfilled when

---

[78]Theodore Laetsch, *Bible Commentary: Jeremiah* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1952) 259.

[79]Ibid.

[80]Feinberg, "Jeremiah" 10:579.

[81]Anthony A. Hoekema, *The Bible and the Future* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979) 209 (emphasis in the original).

[82]Michael Avi-Yonah, "Jerusalem," in *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*" 2:597.

[83]Avigad, *Jerusalem* 62 (italics in the original); see also Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Digging Up Jerusalem* (London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1974) 183-86.

Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah led their respective returns from the Babylonian Exile. But if the postexilic returns to the land fulfilled this promised restoration predicted by the prophets, why then did Zechariah continue to announce a still future return (10:8–12) in words that were peppered with the phrases and formulas of such prophecies as Isaiah 11:11 and Jeremiah 50:19?[84]

To conclude that the prophecy has already been fulfilled in the manner Hoekema suggests is untenable; historical and archaeological data and the remainder of the OT will not allow for it.

Robertson has advanced a variation of this approach. Mixing a little of the "Never" approach of Calvin and the "Already" approach of Hoekema, he states,

> It must not be forgotten that Israel as a nation was actually "restored to the land" after seventy years of captivity, just as Jeremiah had predicted (Jer. 29:10). The fact that this restoration did not correspond to the projected grandeur predicted by the prophets only points to a fulfillment beyond anything that could be realized in this world as it is presently constituted. . . . The description of the restored Jerusalem in these prophecies anticipates a "New Jerusalem" coming down from heaven in the figurative perfections that will endure for eternity, not the temporal provisions of a mere one thousand years.[85]

Here Robertson attempts to have it both ways. Recognizing as Calvin did that the fulfillment of the Jeremiah's prophecy did not occur with the "projected grandeur" that the overall prophecy demands, he is unwilling to go as far as Calvin in declaring the import of the passage to be the "perpetuity of the Church."[86] He states,

> Yet the context of the prophetical message concerning the new covenant resists a pure "spiritualization" of the blessings of this covenant. The language of the prophets contains far too much in terms of materially defined benedictions. The return of Israel to the land, the rebuilding of devastated cities, the reconstitution of the nation—even resurrection from the dead—play a vital role in the prophetical formulation of new covenant expectations.[87]

However, Robertson's solution to the problem is to replace the purely "spiritualized" interpretation of Calvin and others, with what is really an allegorical interpretation; which he calls "another kind of 'literal' fulfillment."[88] He concludes,

> This historical return to a "land of promise" by a small remnant 70 years after Jeremiah's prophecy encourages hope in the final return to paradise lost by the newly constituted "Israel of God." As men from all nations had been dispossessed and alienated from the original creation, so now they may hope for restoration and peace, even to the extent of anticipating a "land of promise" sure to appear in the new creation, and sure to be enjoyed by a resurrected people.[89]

---

[84]Kaiser, "The Promised Land" 309.

[85]O. Palmer Robertson, *Understanding the Land of the Bible: A Biblical-Theological Guide* (Phillipsburg, N.J.: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1996) 142.

[86]Calvin, *Jeremiah* 151.

[87]Robertson, *The Christ of the Covenants* (Phillipsburg, N.J.: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1980) 297.

[88]Ibid., 300.

[89]Ibid.

But again, this line of exegetical reasoning renders the passage unintelligible to the original readers and equally mysterious to post-exilic Israel. As Wilken points out,

> After the calamities of the sixth century, Jewish life and institutions in the land had never been fully restored even though many Jews had returned to Judea and the temple was rebuilt. What the exilic and postexilic prophets had proclaimed with boundless confidence could hardly be identified with the condition of Palestinian Jewry during the centuries after the exile. Though Jews were living in Jerusalem they continued to hope for something grander and more glorious, "just as the prophets said" (Tob 14:5).[90]

Kaiser also reacts to Robertson's concept by stating, "To covenant theologians, we say that the inclusion of the Gentiles with Israel both throughout the history of redemption and especially after the cross may be obtained by solid grammatical-syntactical-theological exegesis without terminating God's offer to the Jews."[91]

Perhaps the decisive factor in rejecting this view is the fact that the last part of the prophecy asserts that Jerusalem "shall not be plucked up, or overthrown anymore forever" (31:40b). The simple fact is that since the rebuilding of Jerusalem under Nehemiah, the city *has been* destroyed on several occasions, the most significant being that of the Roman destruction of A.D. 70. Henderson's attempted explanation where he postulates that "forever, is here to be taken with the same limitation as it is frequently when applied to matters connected with the old dispensation,"[92] is most unsatisfactory.

Another approach in the "Already" camp is a reductionist approach to the text. In this view the passage is a later addition that served as either incentive or propaganda to spur on the rebuilding efforts of Nehemiah. According to liberal scholars, the prophecy of Jer 31:38-40 "may date to Nehemiah, governor of Jerusalem in the Persian period (538-332 B.C.E.)."[93] As already noted, George Adam Smith called the passage an "exilic addition."[94] McKane agrees with this assertion and states that the "prophecy" of 31:38-40 indicates activity that "had been planned and was taking place."[95] Somehow this passage was inserted into the text of Jeremiah to "ground it in a prediction, rich in detail, that Jerusalem would be rebuilt and extended."[96] That approach dismisses the unity of Jeremiah's text and handles a predictive prophecy that does not fit into a preconceived scheme by relegating it to non-reality.[97] And, as Thompson states, "One ought not too hastily

---

[90]Wilken, *The Land* 22.

[91]Walter C. Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985) 192.

[92]Henderson, *Jeremiah* 192.

[93]Philip J. King, *Jeremiah: An Archaeological Companion* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993) 69.

[94]Smith, *Jerusalem* 2:261.

[95]McKane, *Jeremiah* 834.

[96]Ibid.

[97]Another example of this kind of approach is that of Walter Brueggemann in his *To Build, To Plant: A Commentary on Jeremiah 26–52* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) esp. 77. Brueggemann asserts, "His oracle is not simply reflective of a single rebuilding effort, but looms as a pervasive and enduring promise that marks the life and destiny of the city of Jerusalem in every time and circumstance. This oracle assures that Jerusalem in every time is a city under the powerful promise of God for

deny such a statement to Jeremiah."[98] To this Kitchen adds, "[T]o date much (or any) of Jeremiah to distinctly later periods (e.g., fifth to third centuries) would seem impractical."[99]

Another example of the "already" position comes from those, even among premillennialists,[100] who take the 1948 reconstitution of Israel as a nation as a fulfillment of OT prophecy. In an article on his website (www.reasons.org), Hugh Ross offers this passage as "proof" of the Bible's accuracy:

> The exact location and construction sequence of Jerusalem's nine suburbs was predicted by Jeremiah about 2600 years ago. He referred to the time of this building project as "the last days," that is, the time period of Israel's second rebirth as a nation in the land of Palestine (Jeremiah 31:38-40). This rebirth became history in 1948, and the construction of the nine suburbs has gone forward precisely in the locations and in the sequence predicted.[101]

That the rebirth of Israel as a nation in 1948 is a fulfillment of any OT prophecy is dubious; beyond this, however, Ross forgets that from 1948 to 1967 Jerusalem remained under Jordanian control and that whatever building has gone on around the city since then, nothing has been done on the scale that Jeremiah's prophecy demands, either geographically (in terms of size) or spiritually (in terms of holiness).

The Fulfillment Option: Not Yet

The final option in the fulfillment of this prophecy is that it is yet to occur. Summarizing the premillennial position of dispensationalism, Hoekema correctly points out,

---

rebuilding and for well-being." Of course, this simply is an obfuscation of the fact that the prophecy asserts that Jerusalem will "not be plucked up or overthrown anymore forever." Of this approach Busenitz states, "Those who embrace the historical-grammatical approach may find the theological focus [of this commentary] less helpful than they desire" (Irvin A. Busenitz, "Review of *To Build, To Plant: A Commentary on Jeremiah 26–52*," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 3/2 [Fall 1992]:220), an observation with which this writer heartily agrees.

[98]Thompson, *Jeremiah* 585.

[99]Kenneth A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003) 381.

[100]Remarkably Walvoord (John F. Walvoord, *Every Prophecy of the Bible* [Colorado Springs, Colo.: Chariot Victor, 1999] 141) posits the notion that
This remarkable prophecy, given by Jeremiah almost 2,500 years ago, has seen modern fulfillment in the recapture of Jerusalem. Modern Jerusalem has built up this precise area, and today there are lovely apartments and streets in a location formerly used as a place for garbage heaps and dead bodies. In spite of the fact that Jerusalem has been demolished many times, God declared that this section will not be demolished but will continue to be holy to the Lord until the Second Coming.
Here Walvoord places himself in the "Already" category of interpretating this passage. However, he is clearly wrong at almost every point of fulfillment he expounds. The prophecy states that Jerusalem as a whole city will be "holy" and immune from destruction, not simply a "section" (which he fails to define). Additionally, the Hinnom and Kidron valleys on the outskirts of modern Jerusalem do not have the "lovely apartments and streets." Finally, it is difficult to see how even the temple area can currently be considered "holy to the Lord until the Second Coming," as currently it is under Islamic control.

[101]Hugh Ross, "Fulfilled Prophecy: Evidence for the Reliability of the Bible," http://www .reasons.org/resources/apologetics/prophecy.shtml, accessed on 16 Jan 2006. Ross calculates (somehow) that a "chance" fulfillment of this prophecy incurs odds of 1 in 10^{18}.

> A great many passages in the Psalms and prophets (e.g., Ps. 72:1-20; Is. 2:1-4; 11:1-9, 11-16; 65:18-25; Jer. 23:5-6; Amos 9:11-15; Mic. 4:1-4; Zech. 14:1-9, 16-21) predict that the people of Israel will at some future time once again be regathered in the land of Canaan, will enjoy a time of prosperity and blessing, will have a special place of privilege above other nations, and will live under the benevolent and perfect rule of their Messiah, the descendant of David. *Since none of these promises has yet been fulfilled, dispensationalists expect them to be fulfilled during Christ's millennial reign.*[102]

As has already been shown, Jeremiah's prophecy is too detailed to be relegated to a "spiritual" fulfillment such as Calvin's, and the details are such that a fulfillment in the return after the Babylonian Captivity is impossible. As Blayney states:

> Here follows a description of the circumference of a new city to be built on the site of Jerusalem; but that it does not mean the city which was rebuilt after the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, is evident from two principal circumstances; first, because the limits are here extended farther, so as to include a greater space than was contained within the walls at that time; and, secondly, it is here said that it should never be razed or destroyed anymore. This new city therefore must be referred to those after times, when the general restoration of Israel is appointed to take place.[103]

Again, the major parts of the prophecy are as follows: (1) the city will be rebuilt and enlarged; (2) it will be sanctified; (3) it will be immune from destruction forever. So expansive was this prophecy, McKane, in summarizing the conclusions of the famous 10th century Rabbinic commentator David Kimhi, states,

> Kimchi assumes that the rebuilding programme would include provision for a third temple which, unlike the first and second, would never suffer destruction and it is on this third temple that he focuses the final promise of the verse [31:40]. The prediction (so Rashi) looks to a far future and a final redemption and it was not fulfilled in the times of the first and second temple.[104]

This explanation fits well with the text.

Another look at the parts of the prophecy discloses that no feature of it has been fulfilled at any level. After Jeremiah's time the city was rebuilt, under Nehemiah and then later enlarged (especially the temple area) under the auspices of Herod the Great. However, it was never enlarged to the extent that Jeremiah's prophecy expects, and has not been enlarged to that extent up to the present time.

The second part of the prophecy is that this enlarged area would be "sanctified" or made "holy" by God. This part of the prophecy has no fulfillment to date, as the specific boundaries are yet to be achieved. As Von Orelli states, "[S]pecial emphasis is laid on the circumstance, then even the quarters about Jerusalem that were regarded as under a curse or impure, will share in the holiness which ensures indestructibleness to all Jerusalem."[105]

The third aspect of this prophecy is the most problematic for those who wish to see an "already" fulfillment. As Carroll notes, the prophecy assures Israel

---

[102]Hoekema, *Bible and Future* 188-89 (emphasis added).

[103]Blayney, *Jeremiah* 375.

[104]McKane, *Jeremiah* 833.

[105]Von Orelli, *Jeremiah* 242.

that "[t]he plucking up (*nts*) and the overthrowing (*hrs*) of the city in the past (587 and subsequently) will be reversed in the future building of the area, (this motif appears in Isa. 48.2; 52.1). Such sacred status will afford the city permanent protection."[106] Others note that the certain meaning of the passage is that "the sacredness of the whole district will ensure that no one can again destroy what is built."[107] "In strong language the section closes with the affirmation that the city will be invincible forever."[108] However, the historical fact is that Jerusalem has been destroyed several times, even after the rebuilding of Nehemiah.[109] Fretheim, who affirms the "already" scheme, nonetheless admits the weakness of his position at this point: "[T]he promise that it [Jerusalem] will never be uprooted or overthrown seems to have fallen short of fulfillment."[110]

Conclusion

Jeremiah, facing the destruction of Jerusalem—either an accomplished fact or an imminent threat as he received this prophecy—predicts a future time[111] when the city will be rebuilt. The city will be changed in almost every way, changed in a manner that simply renders a "Never" or "Already" fulfillment entirely implausible.

As the future capital of the Messiah's earthly kingdom, it will be rebuilt and enlarged, a necessity from the severe damage which will occur during the tribulation (e.g., Rev 11:13).[112] The city's topography will be altered so that the city is elevated (Zech 14:10). This enlarged and elevated city will be sanctified and become "holy to the Lord." The city will be inviolable, never again falling victim to the destruction of war or natural disaster.[113] Even when Satan, during his short release from the bottomless pit (Rev 20:7), rallies the nations to march against the city, the city itself will suffer no harm. Before the rebels can launch their attack, God will intervene and "fire [will come] down from heaven and devour them" (Rev 20:9). J. Barton Payne, late professor of Old Testament at Covenant Theological Seminary, was correct in assigning the fulfillment of Jer 31:38-40 to the period of the future "millennial kingdom."[114]

---

[106]Carroll, *Jeremiah* 618.

[107]Van Orelli, *Jeremiah* 237.

[108]Feinberg, "Jeremiah" 6:589.

[109]Contrary to those who see some sort of fulfillment of prophecy in 1948, nothing prophetically prevents Jerusalem from being destroyed again. Only the return of Christ and the establishment of the millennial kingdom brings fulfillment of Jer 31:38-40.

[110]Terence E. Fretheim, *Commentary on Jeremiah*, Smith and Helwys Bible Commentary (Macon, Ga.: Smith and Helwys, 2002) 287. His explanation that "This is not unusual for Hebrew prophecy, not least because changing situations regularly occasion adjustments of one kind or another," is anemic and self-defeating.

[111]See Colin Brown's excellent discussion of "time" as it relates to the futuristic aspect of prophecy in *The Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975) 2:888-92, esp. 890.

[112]Robert L. Thomas, *Revelation 8–22: An Exegetical Commentary* (Chicago: Moody, 1995) 98.

[113]Randall Price, *The Coming Last Days Temple* (Eugene, Ore.: Harvest House, 1999) 190.

[114]J. Barton Payne, *Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy: The Complete Guide to Scriptural Predictions and Their Fulfillment* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973) 329.

A HARMONIZATION OF
MATT 8:5-13 AND LUKE 7:1-10

Jack Russell Shaffer[*]

A strict harmonization of Matt 8:5-13 and Luke 7:1-10 has been considered impossible by many recent biblical scholars because of seeming discrepancies between the two accounts. Matthew locates the encounter between Jesus and the centurion almost immediately after the Sermon on the Mount; Luke puts it soon after the Sermon on the Plain. The illness that had come to the centurion's servant—not his son—was some type of lameness that kept the centurion from bringing or sending him to Jesus. Various authors have proposed three options for solving the problem of harmonizing the two accounts. The first says that Matthew and Luke adapted a common source called Q, but a lack of verbal agreement and an impugning of biblical inspiration rule this option out. The second option holds that Matthew used literary rhetoric to describe the encounter, but Matthew plainly supports the personal coming of the centurion—not his servants in his place as the view holds—to Jesus. The third option states that Matthew and Luke faithfully recorded the events and dialogue of the encounter. This option is feasible as an alignment of the texts according to a strict harmonization shows, and is the best option because it acknowledges the integrity of the human authors and the integrity of the Holy Spirit who inspired the accounts.

* * * * *

Introduction

For approximately seventeen hundred years—after the last drop of ink had dried and the canon of Scripture had closed—there was little debate to speak of within Christianity regarding the accuracy of Scripture. Though the Bible, particularly in the parallel Gospel accounts, had apparent discrepancies, these were almost always explained through the process of strict harmonization.[1] Not until the Enlightenment period did the question of the integrity of Scripture come to have

---

[*]Jack Shaffer, an M.Div. graduate of The Master's Seminary and a current Th.M. candidate at TMS, is Associate Pastor of Roosevelt Community Church near Lancaster, California.

[1]Robert L. Thomas and F. David Farnell, eds., *The Jesus Crisis* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1998) 66. For the purposes of this article, the term "harmonization" refers to the process of taking parallel accounts in Scripture and reconciling the apparent discrepancies under the assumption that each account is historically accurate, having been faithfully recorded by each author as moved by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet 1:19-21). This precludes the accommodation of form, source, redaction, or any other literary-critical theories as valid explanations of the product of any of the authors of Scripture.

prominence in academic circles.[2] The underlying disbelief in the supernatural led liberal scholars to attack the inspiration, and thus, the veracity of the Bible. Scripture began to be analyzed as any other classic piece of literature—devoid of any divine oversight. The skepticism of the times was the seedbed for what is now called the "Synoptic Problem."[3] For about the past two hundred years, a reversal has taken place in how those apparent discrepancies in the Synoptic Gospels are reconciled. Today, except in a pejorative sense, harmonization is rarely mentioned as a means for resolving the most difficult passages. Such is to be expected from liberal theologians who hold a low view of Scripture. However, the philosophical roots of the so-called Synoptic Problem have made major inroads into evangelical scholarship. Rare is the contemporary evangelical who does not in some way impugn the integrity of the authors of Scripture or of the Word of God itself in attempts to explain difficult passages.[4]

The goal of this article is to produce a strict harmonization of two seemingly irreconcilable records of the miraculous healing of the centurion's servant recorded in Matt 8:5-13 and Luke 7:1-10.[5] The present writer believes such a harmonization to be possible without impugning the integrity of Holy Writ or of the authors who penned it, and at the same time, without resorting to a theory which "strains credulity," as one author put it.[6] What is at stake in such a discussion is nothing less than the verbal, plenary inspiration of Scripture.[7]

The Problem of Apparent Discrepancy

While reading through the Gospels in linear fashion, one might not perceive any discrepancy between Matthew and Luke in the recounting of Jesus' healing of the centurion's servant. However, when the two accounts are placed side-by-side (Table 1), the difficulty in reconciling them becomes obvious.[8]

---

[2]Ibid., 86.

[3]The phrase given to the so-called problem of agreements and apparent discrepancies in the Gospel accounts of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

[4]As is evidenced in the number of scholars researched for this project who attempt a strict harmonization of the accounts in question: in commentaries, two; in journal articles, one (and these only as recently as 1951 and 1964, respectively). Zane Hodges' article, "The Centurion's Faith in Matthew and Luke" (*Bibliotheca Sacra* 121/484 [Oct 1964]:321-32) is important and is the latest attempt at strict harmonization this writer could locate. The present article may be considered an update and advancement upon his excellent work.

[5]This writer holds that John's account of Jesus' healing a royal official's son in 4:46-54 is a wholly different incident in the life and ministry of Jesus. The setting in Cana, the title of the man (official in Herod's kingdom), his desire for Jesus to come and heal his son, and other significant differences make it unlikely that these are the same. See Darrell L. Bock, *Jesus According to Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002) 439; and W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Matthew,* ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991) 2:17. At the same time, believing that the pericope of the Syro-Phonecian woman is related is also without a basis (contra Rudolph Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh [Oxford: Basil Blackford, 1963] 38-39).

[6]I. H. Marshall, "Historical Criticism," *New Testament Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977) 133.

[7]Hodges, "The Centurion's Faith" 322.

[8]Ibid.

Table 1. Passages paralleled in English[9]

Matthew 8:5-13	Luke 7:1-10
5 And when Jesus entered Capernaum, a centurion came to Him, imploring Him,	1 When He had completed all His discourse in the hearing of the people, He went to Capernaum.
6 and saying, "Lord, my servant is lying paralyzed at home, fearfully tormented."	2 And a centurion's slave, who was highly regarded by him, was sick and about to die.
7 Jesus said to him, "I will come and heal him."	3 When he heard about Jesus, he sent some Jewish elders asking Him to come and save the life of his slave.
8 But the centurion said, "Lord, I am not worthy for You to come under my roof, but just say the word, and my servant will be healed.	4 When they came to Jesus, they earnestly implored Him, saying, "He is worthy for You to grant this to him;
9 "For I also am a man under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to this one, 'Go!' and he goes, and to another, 'Come!' and he comes, and to my slave, 'Do this!' and he does it."	5 for he loves our nation and it was he who built us our synagogue."
10 Now when Jesus heard this, He marveled and said to those who were following, "Truly I say to you, I have not found such great faith with anyone in Israel.	6 Now Jesus started on His way with them; and when He was not far from the house, the centurion sent friends, saying to Him, "Lord, do not trouble Yourself further, for I am not worthy for You to come under my roof;
11 "I say to you that many will come from east and west, and recline at the table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven;	7 for this reason I did not even consider myself worthy to come to You, but just say the word, and my servant will be healed.
12 but the sons of the kingdom will be cast out into the outer darkness; in that place there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth."	8 "For I also am a man placed under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to this one, 'Go!' and he goes, and to another, 'Come!' and he comes, and to my slave, 'Do this!' and he does it."
13 And Jesus said to the centurion, "Go; it shall be done for you as you have believed." And the servant was healed that very moment.	9 Now when Jesus heard this, He marveled at him, and turned and said to the crowd that was following Him, "I say to you, not even in Israel have I found such great faith."
	10 When those who had been sent returned to the house, they found the slave in good health.

For readers of the original Greek or of the English translation, the most obvious difficulty lies in the fact that Matthew records the event as though the centurion came directly to Jesus while Luke records two sets of intermediaries coming to Jesus on behalf of the centurion. In addition, in Luke 7:7 the centurion

---

[9]All Scripture references in English are from the New American Standard Bible Update.

states (through his friends) that he is not worthy to come to Jesus, seemingly ruling out the possibility of a personal exchange between the Lord and the officer.

In addition to the difficulty which is plain in English, several issues surface when one reads the accounts in the Greek text. Those must also be addressed so as to resolve all issues with regard to harmonization. Items such as the relationship of the one healed, the nature of his illness, and some syntactical constructions which bear on the problem must be handled. Others, such as questions about the centurion—whether he is a Roman soldier or a Gentile of some other nationality in the employ of Herod Anitpas, his exact meaning when saying that he is a man under authority, and whether Jesus' response in Matthew 8:7 is a statement or a question—are interesting and perhaps helpful to exposition but not pertinent to the topic at hand and are therefore not treated here.

All this presents a challenging problem for the biblical interpreter. The crux of the issue for one who believes in the inerrancy and infallibility of the Scriptures then is to answer the question, "How can these two accounts be reconciled without impugning the verbal inspiration of Scripture?" Did the centurion interact directly with Jesus, or did he not? Or, is this proof positive that the Bible should not be elevated above other literature in terms of its historical accuracy?

The present writer in no way claims that this is an easily resolved problem. It is not. Much research, study, and meditation on the text has been necessary to reach a viable solution—one that upholds the integrity of the authors and that is within the bounds of reason. Too often the hypotheses for resolving apparent conflicts in Scripture are so contrived that they are harder to believe than to accept non-historical reporting in the Scripture.[10] However, one needs only to show the plausibility of harmonization in order to cast doubt upon other less orthodox methods of reconciling the accounts.

Exegetical Considerations

Background and Context of the Pericope

Before resolving the lexical and syntactical difficulties, understanding the setting of the story will be helpful. A look at any harmony of the Gospels will show that chronologically this event followed the Sermon on the Mount.[11]

For Matthew, the Sermon has set the backdrop for this section of his Gospel. One of the main characteristics of that sermon was that Jesus' preaching was authoritative.[12] In the present section, Matthew presents that authority in action. Chapters eight and nine consist of three distinct groupings of ten miracles performed, called "miracle narratives,"[13] which demonstrated His authority over disease,

---

[10]Marshall, "Historical Criticism" 133.

[11]E.g., Robert L. Thomas and Stanley N. Gundry, *A Harmony of the Gospels* (Chicago: Moody, 1978; reprint, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991) 71; Ernest De Witt Burton and Edgar Johnson Goodspeed, *A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels in Greek* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1920) 43. That holds true whether one takes Luke's Sermon on the Plain to be one and the same with Matthew's Sermon on the Mount.

[12]As evidenced by His manifold statements, "You have heard that it was said . . . but I say to you," and the final verses of chapter 7, "When Jesus had finished these words, the crowds were amazed at His teaching; for He was teaching them as *one* having authority, and not as their scribes."

[13]William Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew*, New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973) 387.

demonic powers, and nature. The healing of the centurion's slave appears in the middle of the first group of miracles. Here Matthew emphasizes that the reach of Jesus' ministry extended to the outcasts of Jewish society—lepers, Gentiles, and women—who were excluded from full participation in Jewish religious life (Matt 8:1-17).[14]

Every commentator consulted agreed that Matthew has not presented these stories in a strictly chronological order. Again, a look at any harmony will reveal this.[15] Also concord prevails among those who offer divergent solutions to the harmonization problem with regard to the Gospel writers' selecting which material they would include in their document and which they would omit. This form of editing ("redaction," if it pleases, although the term has negative connotations with regard to plenary inspiration) is alluded to at least indirectly in the Scriptures themselves (John 20:30-31; 21:25) and is not in question. Matthew, then, is not chronological but topical in his description of the facts of the healing.[16]

Luke, on the other hand, presents the events in a more chronological fashion. In v. 1, he has a temporal marker (ενπειδην, *epeid*ē, "when") to show that Jesus' going to Capernaum followed not too long after the conclusion of the Sermon on the Plain. Verse 11 also has a temporal clause (και; εγενετο εν τω'/ εJxh'", *kai egeneto en t*ō *exēs*, "and it came to pass soon afterwards") which follows the pericope and connects the next event to the present one.[17] The healing of the leper is excluded since it was not in chronological sequence and did not fit the emphasis Luke wished to maintain. According to Liefeld, this event marks a pivotal point in the progress of the word of the Lord from its original Jewish context to the Gentile world. A theme important to Luke and to his audience is to show the compatibility of early Christianity with Judaism and to justify the prominence of Gentiles in the church.[18] At the end of Luke 6, Jesus taught that unwavering faith in Him was required of a Kingdom citizen. On the heels of such teaching, Luke exhibited a prize example of such faith on display, and that found in no less than a Gentile.[19]

Within the story itself, Matthew has three major emphases: the faith of the centurion, the authority of Jesus to heal, and the eschatological plan of God that includes believing Gentiles in His kingdom and excludes unbelieving Jews from it. Luke, on the other hand, focuses on the humility and faith of the centurion, as well as the fact that he is a Gentile well-esteemed by Jewish leaders and commended by Jesus.

---

[14]Douglas R. A. Hare, *Matthew*, in Interpretation (Louisville: John Knox, 1993) 90.

[15]Thomas & Gundry, *Harmony* 50-53; Burton & Goodspeed, *Harmony* 30-37; A. T. Robertson, *A Harmony of the Gospels* (New York: Harper & Row, 1922) 55-56. All place the stories of the healings of the leper (Matt 8:2-4) and of Peter's mother-in-law (vv. 14-17) prior to the Sermon on the Mount.

[16]Hendriksen, *Matthew* 387.

[17]Matthew's use of genitive-absolute clauses (8:1, 5) is more indefinite than Luke's choice of temporal conjunctions. Luke allows room for a time lag between the Sermon on the Plain and the expression of the centurion's faith, but not much.

[18]Walter L. Liefeld, "Luke," in *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984) 8:897.

[19]William Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to Luke*, New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978) 374.

A Son or a Servant?

In the original language, a question arises regarding the relationship to the centurion of the one whom Jesus heals. Is the one healed a son or a servant? Matthew uses the term παῖς (*pais)* to describe him (vv. 6, 8, 13),but Luke uses the term δοῦλο" (*doulos*, vv. 2, 3, and 10). The former term can mean "servant" or "son," while the latter means only "servant" or "slave."

In favor of "son" is the argument that the centurion would not have had the kind of concern for a mere slave that he would have had for his own son.[20] Luke indicates that he was "highly regarded" by him (v. 2). Another argument is based upon the so-called parallel passage in John 4:46-54, where the one healed is clearly the son of the royal official.[21] There παῖς (*pais*) is also used (v. 51) along with υἱόν" (*huios*, "son"), a definite reference to one's male offspring.

The first argument is rather spurious, not based on any fact. All centurions mentioned in the NT appear to be upstanding men (and some very religious as here and in Acts 10). This man appears to be exceptionally compassionate as he is said to "love" the Jewish nation and to have built their synagogue at his own expense (Luke 7:5). Assuming that he would not have had some emotional attachment is unfounded, particularly if this was his only servant.[22]

The second argument cannot prevail, for it assumes that a common story existed which was taken and adapted by the authors to accommodate their own *Sitz im Leben*. This theory, however, must compromise the integrity of Scripture to be valid. If the John 4 passage is parallel, the many discrepancies between the accounts require that one or two authors must have altered the story.[23]

Several reasons show why the term should be understood as "servant." First, the term παῖς is ambiguous and can mean either. Second, it occurs twenty-four times in the NT and in only one verse does it obviously mean "son" (John 4:51);[24] in eight other cases, it means "child," though without implying any relationship to the speaker or to a character in the narrative. Four times it means the "servant" of a man, and eight times a "servant" of God. Thus, if παῖς in Matt 8:6, 8, 13 means the centurion's "son," it would be agreeing only with the one use of the word by John against all the other NT uses, all of which are in Matthew and Luke-Acts.[25]

Finally, the term παῖς occurs in Luke 7:7 to describe the same person, who is clearly referred to as a slave (δοῦλο"). So no redaction theory is required and Luke and Matthew do not contradict each other. The centurion is concerned for his

---

[20]Randolph O. Yeager, *Matthew 8–18*, The Renaissance New Testament (Gretna, La.: Pelican, 1998) 2:9.

[21]Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, vol. 33A of Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, 1998) 204.

[22]Meyer reasons that the use of the term δοῦλο" in the discourse of Matthew 8:9 and Luke 7:8 refers to this individual and that the singular indicates that the centurion had only one servant—the one who was near death. See Heinrich A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Gospel of Matthew*, trans. Peter Christie, vol. 1 in *Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament* (n.p.: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884; reprint, Winona Lake, Ind.: Alpha, 1979) 179.

[23]See n. 5 above.

[24]Here the context makes it clear—the term υἱόν" is used in reference to the same person in vv. 46, 47, and 50.

[25]R. T. France, "Exegesis in Practice: Two Samples," in *New Testament Interpretation* 256.

slave who is probably a young man—too young to die.

The Nature of the Servant's Illness

Luke indicates that the servant had an illness and was about to die. Matthew indicates that he was lying paralyzed and fearfully tormented.[26] The apparent conflict is in the way one thinks of paralysis. In Luke, it sounds as though a disease is overtaking the young man. Yet contemporary understanding of paralysis does not seem to fit that description.[27] In addition, one usually associates lack of feeling with paralysis, not "grievous torment."[28]   The text, however, indicates that he was tormented greatly.

The difficulty is easily resolved. The term translated "paralyzed" means simply "lame."[29] The servant has been laid in the house lame—incapacitated due to severe illness, and that is the condition in which he remains when Jesus hears of it. Plumptre suggests perhaps a form of rheumatic fever or tetanus.[30] The term βασανιζω (*basanizō*) means to "vex with grievous pains."[31] This affliction is magnified by the use of δεινω'" (*deipnōs*, "severely, vehemently"), which signifies an extreme point on a scale, underlining the disease's severity and also to magnifying the healing miracle.[32] That is why he had not been brought to Jesus.[33]

Simply put, Luke is giving his own description and does not elaborate on the illness, choosing rather to focus upon the character of the centurion. Matthew, on the other hand, is recording the direct speech of the centurion, who elaborates on the condition of the servant.

At this point, all further difficulties are on a macro level, specifically the issues related to reconciling the two accounts.

Proposed Solutions

Upon surveying the landscape, one discovers that three options exist for resolving the problem of harmonizing the two accounts. A popular position among both evangelicals and non-evangelicals is that a common document, usually the

---

[26]βεβλhται . . . παραλυτικov" and δεινω'" βασανιζoμενo", respectively.

[27]Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 21.

[28]E. H. Plumptre, "The Gospel According to Matthew," in *Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible*, ed. Charles J. Ellicott (reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970) 6:45.

[29]Walter Bauer, William Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, "παραλυτικov"*, hv, ovn*," *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3d ed., rev. and ed. Frederick W. Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000) 620; Johannes P. Louw and Eugene Albert Nida, "23.171 παραλυτικov"*, hv, ovn*," *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*, 2d ed., 2 vols. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989) 1:272.

[30]Plumptre, *Gospel According to Matthew* 45.

[31]Joseph Henry Thayer, *The New Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1979), 96. Though used in the NT for the tormenting of demons (Matt 8:29; Mark 5:7), it is used for human physical suffering by strain (Mark 6:48), by demons (Rev 9:5), or through birth pangs (Rev 12:2 [metaphor]).

[32]Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 21.

[33]A. B. Bruce, "The Synoptic Gospels," in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, 5 vols., ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (n.p.; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976) 1:138.

elusive Q-document, was the source from which Matthew and Luke (and John if one believes the healing of the royal official's son is parallel) drew. A second position, which is also popular among evangelicals and is a variation of the first, is that Luke records what actually happened and Matthew abbreviates it without impugning his own integrity or the integrity of Scripture. A last position, one which is rare and not widely held, is that each of the two accounts faithfully records what happened and can be strictly harmonized with the other without compromising either the divine Author or His human counterparts.

Matthew and Luke Adapted a Common Source

This view embraces the notion that Matthew and Luke drew from a common written document, which most identify as Q. Thus, no attempt to harmonize the accounts is needed. Once the premise is accepted, the only need is to "discover" the method each used to arrive at his final product.[34] Conspicuously, Q has yet to be discovered, but that stops few from referring to it as a likely source. Modern scholarship has no lack of supporters for this view.[35]

The purpose of this study is not to develop all the arguments for or against the use of Historical Criticism in analyzing the Gospels. As Hodges boldly stated,

> It would scarcely be worth-while [*sic*] in the present discussion to become mired in the ever shifting morass of theories which occupy present-day source criticism. New Testament studies are not advanced by an infatuation with processes we did not witness and with documents we do not, and cannot, possess.[36]

However, problems with the "Common Source" view are serious. First, comparing the two accounts in Greek leads to two significant observations.

First, in Table 2, the words common to both accounts are underlined.[37] Such a comparison reveals that out of 353 words, only 126 (36%) are common to both. That is not a mark of common source. Also, a high percentage of words common to both occurs in sections of direct or indirect discourse. Those facts combined indicate a scenario which would fit a theory of independence—each author formulating the narrative account in his own way, but more accurately citing those whom he quotes directly or indirectly—rather than their dependence upon a tertiary source.

---

[34]Rudolf Bultmann, who holds an extreme form of this view, simply relegates the stories as fiction of the church, a view not entertained in this article. While he is able to discern that these are mythical variants of the Syro-Phoenician woman pericope, 1,900 years after the fact, Bultmann states "Further, hardly anybody will support the historicity of telepathic healing" (*History* 39). To which Hodges smugly notes, "We, for our part, will hardly support telepathic criticism!" ("The Centurion's Faith" 323).

[35]E.g., Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8–20: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Crouch, in *Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible*, ed. Helmut Koester (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 8-9; Werner Stenger, *Introduction to New Testament Exegesis*, trans Douglas W. Stott (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 99; Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 17; Hagner, *Matthew* 202; Darrell Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994) 632, 641, 643.

[36]"The Centurion's Faith" 323.

[37]The statistics were obtained from an unpublished copy of Thomas, "Microsoft Word - #45 BG.doc," *Thomas Synoptic Gospel Comparison Study*, The Master's Seminary [CD-ROM] (April 28, 2005). The study uses Burton and Goodspeed's *Harmony* as a base.

Table 2. Harmony of Matt 8:5-13 and Luke 7:1-10[38]

Matt 8:5-13	Luke 7:1-10
	[1] jEpeidh; ejplhvrwsen pavnta ta; rJhvmata aujtou' eij" ta;" ajkoa;" tou' laou', eijsh'lqen <u>eij" Kafarnaouvm</u>.
Eijselqovnto" de; aujtou' <u>eij" Kafarnaou;m</u> prosh'lqen aujtw'/ eJkatovntarco"	
	[2] JEkatontavrcou dev tino" dou'lo" kakw'" e[cwn h[mellen teleuta'n, o}" h\n aujtw'/ e[ntimo".
parakalw'n <u>aujto;n</u> [6] kai; levgwn: kuvrie, oJ pai'" mou bevblhtai ejn th'/ oijkiva/ paralutikov", deinw'" basanizovmeno"	[3] ajkouvsa" de; peri; tou' jIhsou' ajpevsteilen pro;" aujto;n presbutevrou" tw'n jIoudaivwn ejrwtw'n <u>aujto;n</u> o{pw" ejlqw;n diaswvsh/ to;n dou'lon aujtou'.
	[4] oiJ de; paragenovmenoi pro;" to;n jIhsou'n parekavloun aujto;n spoudaivw" levgonte" o{ti a[xio" ejstin w|/ parevxh/ tou'to:
	[5] ajgapa'/ ga;r to; e[qno" hJmw'n kai; th;n sunagwgh;n aujto;" wj/kodovmhsen hJmi'n
[7] kai; levgei aujtw'/: ejgw; ejlqw;n qerapeuvsw aujtovn.	[6] oJ de; jIhsou'" ejporeuveto su;n aujtoi'". h[dh de; aujtou' ouj makra;n ajpevconto" ajpo; th'" oijkiva" e[pemyen fivlou" oJ eJkatontavrch" levgwn aujtw'/:
[8] kai; ajpokriqei;" oJ eJkatovntarco" e[fh: <u>kuvrie,</u> oujk <u>eijmi; iJkano;"</u> <u>i{na mou uJpo; th;n stevghn</u> <u>eijsevlqh/",</u>	<u>kuvrie,</u> mh; skuvllou, ouj ga;r <u>iJkanov" eijmi</u> <u>i{na uJpo; th;n stevghn mou</u> <u>eijsevlqh/":</u>
<u>ajlla; movnon eijpe; lovgw/,</u> <u>kai; ijaqhvsetai oJ pai'"</u> <u>mou.</u>	[7] dio; oujde; ejmauto;n hjxivwsa pro;" se; ejlqei'n: <u>ajlla; eijpe; lovgw/,</u> <u>kai; ijaqhvtw oJ pai'" mou.</u>

[38]Text arranged as in Burton and Goodspeed, *Harmony* 68-71.

⁹ kai; ga;r ejgw; a[nqrwpov"
eijmi uJpo; ejxousivan, e[cwn
uJp j
ejmauto;n stratiwvta", kai;
levgw touvtw/: poreuvqhti,
kai; poreuvetai,
kai; a[llw/: e[rcou, kai;
e[rcetai,
kai; tw'/ douvlw/ mou:
poivhson tou'to, kai; poiei'.

⁸ kai; ga;r ejgw; a[nqrwpov"
eijmi uJpo; ejxousivan
tassovmeno" e[cwn uJp j
ejmauto;n stratiwvta", kai;
levgw touvtw/: poreuvqhti,
kai; poreuvetai,
kai; a[llw/: e[rcou, kai;
e[rcetai,
kai; tw'/ douvlw/ mou:
poivhson tou'to, kai; poiei'.

¹⁰ ajkouvsa" de;
oJ jIhsou'" ejqauvmasen
kai; ei\pen toi'"
ajkolouqou'sin:

ajmh;n levgw uJmi'n,
par j oujdeni; tosauvthn
pivstin ejn tw'/ jIsrah;l
eu|ron.

⁹ ajkouvsa" de; tau'ta
oJ jIhsou'" ejqauvmasen
aujto;n
kai; strafei;" tw'/
ajkolouqou'nti aujtw'/ o[clw/
ei\pen:
levgw uJmi'n,
oujde; ejn tw'/ jIsrah;l
tosauvthn pivstin eu|ron.

¹¹ levgw de; uJmi'n o{ti
polloi; ajpo; ajnatolw'n kai;
dusmw'n h{xousin kai;
ajnakliqhvsontai meta;
jAbraa;m kai; jIsaa;k kai;
jIakw;b ejn th'/ basileiva/
tw'n oujranw'n,
¹² oiJ de; uiJoi; th'"
basileiva" ejkblhqhvsontai
eij" to; skovto" to;
ejxwvteron: ejkei' e[stai oJ
klauqmo;" kai; oJ brugmo;"
tw'n ojdovntwn.
¹³ kai; ei\pen oJ jIhsou'"
tw'/ eJkatontavrch/: u{page,
wJ" ejpivsteusa" genhqhvtw
soi.

[At this point, Burton and Goodspeed insert
Luke 13:28-29 (in a small font) because its
language is similar to Matt 8:11-13. A common
explanation of why Matthew has the text here
and Luke does not is that Matthew took it from
Q and placed it here and Luke put it in his
chapter 13. See Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 26,
for an elaborate redactional scheme. To keep the
focus on the issue at hand, the present
discussion excludes the section from this
exhibit.]

kai; ijavqh oJ pai'"
ᵃaujtou'° ejn th'/ w{ra/
ejkeivnh/.

¹⁰ Kai; uJpostrevyante" eij"
to;n oi\kon oiJ pemfqevnte"
eu|ron to;n dou'lon
uJgiaivnonta.

Second, and more important, if either of the authors simply borrowed from a common source and made changes as he saw fit, then the trustworthiness of the Scriptures is in jeopardy and the author's meaning is anyone's guess. Anyone with an elementary education who reads Matthew and Luke together can see that Matthew records the event *as if the centurion came and spoke directly to Jesus* and that Luke makes no mention of his coming. If the centurion did not actually come, then Matthew has misrepresented the account. That this was inspired mis-representation does not assuage the fact that it would be a lie.

Therefore, anyone who in honesty holds to an inspired, inerrant Scripture cannot retain this view.

Matthew Used Literary Rhetoric to Express the Account

Those who have not pursued a strict harmonization or who desire to hold to Literary Criticism and an inspired text seem to use this as a default position. The idea is as old as Augustine who wrote, "*qui facit per alium facit per se*."[39] Others have attempted variations on the same theme. Stein uses the following example:

> If a conversation between the President of the United States and the Premier of Russia [*sic*], were reported, it could be described in at least two ways. First, the President says in English to his interpreter, "A." The interpreter then says in Russian to the premier, "A." The premier says in Russian to his interpreter, "B," and the interpreter says in English to the President, "B." Second, the president says to the premier, "A," [*sic*] The premier responds, "B."
>
> Both descriptions are correct! The last account, which every newspaper report follows, chooses to omit for brevity's sake the role of the interpreter. The other account includes it.[40]

Another variation is, when the President of the United States says something through his press secretary and it is reported by the press that he said it, no one accuses the press of an inaccuracy.[41]

In earnest, these are often valid explanations of Scripture when direct agency is implied—the most notable being Pilate's scourging of Jesus (John 19:1). However, that kind of superficial explanation will not do here.[42]

First, as stated before, Matthew does not leave open the possibility of whether or not the centurion came—v. 5 expressly states that he did. Throughout Matthew's account, he uses the singular to indicate that the centurion's dialogue was from an individual and Jesus' dialogue was to an individual.[43] One could argue that Luke's account uses the singular for a plurality of emissaries who speak on behalf of the centurion (vv. 3, 6-8) and that Matthew simply did the same but did not mention the envoys. Yet in Luke 7:2 and 7:6, the centurion is the subject. Therefore, the corresponding verbs must also be singular. The context is clear that Luke reports what the centurion told them to say as indirect speech.[44] Not so in Matthew.

Second, even if one ceded the argument about Luke's singular, two insurmountable problems remain with the text that simply will not permit the literary-rhetoric theory to hold. One is the use of the term u{page (*hypage*, "go") by Jesus. Rationalizing that Jesus, standing with a group of the centurion's friends would use the singular imperative to dismiss them, followed by the second-person

---

[39]Translated, "He who acts by another acts himself" (cited in D. A. Carson, "Matthew," in *Expositor's Bible Commentary,* ed. Frank E. Gaebelein [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984] 8:200).

[40]Robert L. Stein, *Difficult Passages in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990) 36.

[41]Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1987) 134.

[42]Many well-known, conservative commentators opt for this view, e.g., Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament,* 7th ed., 4 vols. (London: Rivingtons, 1868) 1:78-79; John A. Broadus, *Commentary on Matthew* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1886; reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1990) 177; Carson, *Matthew* 200; Hendriksen, *Matthew* 395; R. C. H. Lenski, *Interpretation of Saint Matthew's Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1964) 332.

[43]In v. 5, parakalw'n; v. 6, levgwn; v. 7, aujtw'/; v.8, e[fh; v. 13, eJkatontavrch/.

[44]In v. 3, for example, the direct speech from the centurion to the elders would have been something like, "Go and ask Jesus to come that He might heal my servant."

singular indicative—indicating that the healing would take place as the centurion asked—will in no way hold. One writer states that this was, "a current term for saying: The matter is settled; do not let it be your concern any longer."[45] Such language is not explainable unless the centurion was personally present.

Another is a syntactical issue related to the recording of direct speech. As Jesus was approaching his home, the centurion is cited, either directly (Matthew) or indirectly (Luke), as saying that he was not worthy for Jesus to come "under [his] roof." There is a question as to the placement of the personal pronoun μου (*mou*, "my"). In Matt 8:8, it is forward for emphasis. In Luke 7:6, it follows the prepositional phrase. If one holds to an inerrant text, and if both are either direct or indirect quotations, one of the authors has changed the word order, precision is lost, and inspiration is impugned.

Given the difficulties with the common source and the literary-rhetoric proposals, only one choice is viable, and that is to harmonize the two accounts.

Matthew and Luke Faithfully Recorded the Account

The best solution to handling the Scriptures is to take them at face value. If one author indicates a hesitancy for the centurion to come and another says that he did come, then one must strive to understand how they can both be true without denigrating the reliability of God's Word or resorting to intellectually unsatisfying proposals. The Scriptures are not given so that every aspect of every encounter must be present and accounted for and fit neatly together to form a comprehensive whole.[46] The emphasis of each author will dictate what material is included and what is omitted. If one divorces oneself from the sterile, unemotional environment of academia for a moment and delves into the realm of everyday life, harmonizing these accounts is no problem.

First, the following will explain the harmonization, then defend it. Table 3 displays visually a proposed harmony of these two passages. The table is coded as follows: the elders' words have underlining; the centurion's words are in italics; Jesus' words are in bold-face type.

Table 3. Proposed Harmony

---

[45]William Arndt, *Does the Bible Contradict Itself?* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1955) 61.

[46]One need only consider any 10-minute slice of time at the shopping mall or the sports arena to realize the number of variables that could be recounted in any given encounter.

5a Eijselqovnto" de; aujtou' eij" Kafarnaou;m	**1** jEpeidh; ejplhvrwsen pavnta ta; rJhvmata aujtou' eij" ta;" ajkoa;" tou' laou', eijsh'lqen eij" Kafarnaouvm. **2** JEkatontavrcou dev tino" dou'lo" kakw'" e[cwn h[mellen teleuta'n, o}" h\n aujtw'/ e[ntimo". **3** ajkouvsa" de; peri; tou' jIhsou' ajpevsteilen pro;" aujto;n presbutevrou" tw'n jIoudaivwn ejrwtw'n aujto;n o{pw" ejlqw;n diaswvsh/ to;n dou'lon aujtou'. **4** oiJ de; paragenovmenoi pro;" to;n jIhsou'n parekavloun aujto;n spoudaivw" levgonte" o{ti <u>a[xio" ejstin w|/ parevxh/ tou'to:</u> **5** <u>ajgapa'/ ga;r to; e[qno" hJmw'n kai; th;n sunagwgh;n aujto;" wj/kodovmhsen hJmi'n.</u> **6** oJ de; jIhsou'" ejporeuveto su;n aujtoi'". h[dh de; aujtou' ouj makra;n ajpevconto" ajpo; th'" oijkiva" e[pemyen fivlou" oJ eJkatontavrch" levgwn aujtw'/: *kuvrie, mh; skuvllou, ouj ga;r iJkanov" eijmi i{na uJpo; th;n stevghn mou eijsevlqh/":* **7** *dio; oujde; ejmauto;n hjxivwsa pro;" se; ejlqei'n: ajlla; eijpe; lovgw/, kai; ijaqhvtw oJ pai'" mou.* **8** *kai; ga;r ejgw; a[nqrwpov" eijmi uJpo; ejxousivan tassovmeno" e[cwn uJp j ejmauto;n stratiwvta", kai; levgw touvtw/: poreuvqhti, kai; poreuvetai, kai; a[llw/: e[rcou, kai; e[rcetai, kai; tw'/ douvlw/ mou: poivhson tou'to, kai; poiei'.*

5b prosh'lqen aujtw'/
eJkatovntarco" parakalw'n
aujto;n
6 kai; levgwn: *kuvrie, oJ
pai'" mou bevblhtai ejn th'/
oijkiva/ paralutikov",
deinw'" basanizovmeno".*
7 kai; levgei aujtw'/: **ejgw;
ejlqw;n qerapeuvsw aujtovn.**
8 kai; ajpokriqei;" oJ
eJkatovntarco" e[fh: *kuvrie,
oujk eijmi; iJkano;" i{na mou
uJpo; th;n stevghn
eijsevlqh/", ajlla; movnon
eijpe; lovgw/, kai;
ijaqhvsetai oJ pai'" mou.*
9 kai; ga;r ejgw; a[nqrwpov"
eijmi uJpo; ejxousivan, e[cwn
uJp j ejmauto;n stratiwvta",
kai; levgw touvtw/:
poreuvqhti, kai; poreuvetai,
kai; a[llw/: e[rcou, kai;
e[rcetai, kai; tw'/ douvlw/
mou: poivhson tou'to, kai;
poiei'.*

10 ajkouvsa" de; oJ jIhsou'" ejqauvmasen kai; ei\pen toi'" ajkolouqou'sin:	**9** ajkouvsa" de; tau'ta oJ jIhsou'" ejqauvmasen aujto;n kai; strafei;" tw'/ ajkolouqou'nti aujtw'/ o[clw/ ei\pen: **levgw uJmi'n, oujde; ejn tw'/ jIsrah;l tosauvthn pivstin eu|ron.**

**ajmh;n levgw uJmi'n, par j
oujdeni; tosauvthn pivstin
ejn tw'/ jIsrah;l eu|ron.**
**11levgw de; uJmi'n o{ti
polloi; ajpo; ajnatolw'n kai;
dusmw'n h{xousin kai;
ajnakliqhvsontai meta;
jAbraa;m kai; jIsaa;k kai;
jIakw;b ejn th'/ basileiva/
tw'n oujranw'n,**
**12oiJ de; uiJoi; th'"
basileiva" ejkblhqhvsontai
eij" to; skovto" to;
ejxwvteron: ejkei' e[stai oJ
klauqmo;" kai; oJ brugmo;"
tw'n ojdovntwn.**
13 kai; ei\pen oJ jIhsou'"
tw'/ eJkatontavrch/: **u{page,
wJ" ejpivsteusa" genhqhvtw
soi.**

```
                                  ¹⁰ Kai; uJpostrevyante" eij"
                                  to;n oi\kon oiJ pemfqevnte"
kai; ijavqh oJ pai'"             eu|ron to;n dou'lon
ªaujtou'° ejn th'/ w{ra/          uJgiaivnonta.
ejkeivnh/.
```

Harmonization Explained

The narratives of Matthew and Luke introducing the scenario present no difficulty. Each in its own style indicates that Jesus entered Capernaum. From this point Luke's narrative should be followed all the way through v. 8.[47] Emphasizing the character of the Gentile centurion, Luke contrasts the works-oriented focus of the Jews (he is deemed worthy, in part because he built their synagogue) with the centurion's amazing faith and his own humble assessment of himself.[48]

The perceived difficulty is in Luke 7:7a where the centurion's friends cite him as saying that he did not consider himself worthy to come. However, no problem exists if one allows that he came anyway out of his great concern for his servant. Both facts are true. Luke does not mention the centurion's coming because it did not fit with his purpose—the contrast between the Jews' conception of the centurion and his own view of himself compared to Christ.

Matthew's account picks up with the faith of the centurion contrasted with that of Israel. His purpose is to show that even a Gentile recognized the authority of the King of the Jews while His own people rejected Him. As Morris says:

> Perhaps we can discern something of the differing purposes of the Evangelists in their treatment of the messengers. Matthew was concerned primarily with the centurion's faith and nationality; to him the messengers were irrelevant, even a distraction. But Luke was interested in the man's character and specifically in his humility; to him the messengers were a vital part of the story.[49]

Faith in Christ, not heritage, admits one into the kingdom of heaven. Thus, Matthew includes the additional statement in vv. 11-12.

Seeing Jesus near his home and having already sent the second delegation, the centurion came personally to meet Jesus and restates the problem in more detail,[50] to which Jesus responds that He will come and heal the servant. This elicits directly from the centurion a statement made earlier through the friends—"Lord, I am not worthy for You to come under my roof, but just say the word, and my servant will be healed" (Matt 8:8).

At a glance, it appears that Matthew 8:9 and Luke 7:8 should be taken as parallel. Except for the word tassovmeno" (*tassomenos*, "placed under authority") in Luke, the verbage is word-for-word in the two. However, it is possible for Luke to have learned what was said by the centurion to his friends and to have

---

[47]Hodges, "The Centurion's Faith" 328.

[48]Ibid.

[49]Leon J. Morris, *Luke,* Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Leicester: InterVarsity, 1974; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) 151.

[50]Hodges ("The Centurion's Faith" 328) indicates that this fits Matthew's Gospel since it is he who gives us the *ipsissima verba* of the centurion.

recorded it under the inspiration of the Spirit.[51]

Matthew 8:10a and Luke 7:9a should be taken as parallel. However, the remaining portion of each verse should be taken as consecutive. In other words, Jesus turned once to the crowd that was following Him, but made two distinct statements. The first is a broad statement about Israel as a nation. He had found such faith "not even" in Israel. His second statement is even stronger and more specific. He begins with the asseverative particle, ajmhvn (*amēn*, "truly"), and adds the prepositional phrase, par j oujdeniv (*par' oudeni*, "with no one"), in place of oujdev (*oude*, "not even"), and forward for emphasis. He is saying first, "not in all of Israel," and second, "from not even one in all of Israel."

Next, Matthew includes Jesus' statement in vv. 11-12 about who will enter the kingdom and who will be excluded. It is the faith of this Gentile centurion that provides the opportunity for this teaching. Matthew found it essential to his message. Luke did not.

Finally, in Matt 8:13 Jesus turns back to the centurion and tells him to go away,[52] that the healing will take place in the manner in which he believed it would. Jesus will not come farther, but the servant will be healed. By harmonizing the accounts and realizing the actual presence of the centurion, the dilemma of how to explain u{page is resolved. Matthew further states only that the healing took place. Luke informs the reader that the delegation(s) returned to the house (not to the centurion) to find the servant healed.

Harmonization Defended

As stated earlier, only a *plausible* explanation of how the events can be reconciled should be necessary to satisfy any reasonable inquiry into the apparent discrepancies in these accounts. The objection to this harmonization might be predicated upon the expression of the centurion that he was unworthy to come to Jesus. But one must consider all of the human emotions that were involved.

Luke expressed that the servant was dear to the centurion. If pai'" were instead uiJov" and the matter settled that it was his son, hardly any but the most hardened in heart would have any difficulty in seeing the man in a distraught emotional state. So is it so far a stretch to think that this man, away from home, might have established a close relationship with a young servant with whom he would have close contact on a daily basis? Any number of scenarios is possible that would lead to the development of this kind of relationship. Such is not vain imagining but recognition that Scripture records the real lives of real people.

At the same time, the centurion was apparently devout. Though not a proselyte, he presumably was a God-fearer, having built the Jewish synagogue at his own expense and being highly commended by the Jewish leaders. His exemplary faith is the capstone for his integrity and character. Yes, he is a soldier—battle-hardened, a leader. Yet, Scripture seems to shine a favorable light on the character of men in this position (Mark 15:39; Luke 23:47; Acts 10:22; 22:26; 27:43).

The scene could have unfolded as follows: The centurion had a dying servant who was dear to him. Having heard of Jesus' healing ministry (this was not His first entry into the city—Luke 4:31) and having believed in Him, he knew that

---

[51]The text contains no record of how the friends relayed it. Luke records what the centurion said (levgwn).

[52]This is typical of Jesus after a healing has taken place, per Davies and Allison (*Matthew*, 31). See Matt 8:4, 32; 9:6 (all addressed by Jesus to people he has healed).

the Master could heal the boy. Yet, the boy was paralyzed by illness and great agony and unable to be moved. The centurion, being a Gentile and understanding that Jesus was from God, could not see himself going directly to Jesus to ask on behalf of this servant nor having Jesus come to his home.[53] He could, however, summon some Jewish leaders of the synagogue which he built at his own expense, to go on his behalf. They did and Jesus began to return to the house with them.

As Jesus came near, the centurion was horrified that Jesus might actually come under his roof. So he sent some friends to explain the case. As they went and engaged Jesus, the centurion while watching could contain himself no longer. He overrode his conviction about not being worthy to go and went anyway.[54] When he reached Jesus, he stated directly the seriousness of the matter, perhaps to justify his coming against his conviction. Jesus, having heard once already that He need not be present to heal the boy, elicited the response directly from the lips of the man himself. Now, having heard it twice, once indirectly and once directly, He turned to those who had been following Him and made the statement comparing the centurion's faith to any that He had seen thus far among the people of Israel—His people who should have recognized Him. He made it once and then emphatically restated it. The unabashed faith of this Gentile centurion prompted Jesus to teach about the nature of those who will enter the kingdom and those who will be left out. People of faith will be included, people who depend on heritage and works will be excluded.

Finally, He responded directly to the centurion that he could return home, assured that what he had requested had been accomplished, just as he believed it would. Whether or not he tarried or went home is not stated. But, his messengers did return to find that the boy had, in fact, been healed that very hour.

Conclusion

The story of the faith of the centurion is one that has puzzled theologians for centuries. Attempts to harmonize the two accounts have left many without an intellectually satisfying answer. Others have produced explanations that denigrate the integrity of the human authors and therefore the integrity of the Holy Spirit who inspired the text. Both such results are unacceptable. However, as the present writer hopes he has shown, a way to reconcile the two accounts does exist without jettisoning inspiration or doing linguistic calisthentics to make it work. The answer is to begin with the assumption that, regardless of how details may appear on the surface, both accounts were given by God to man and are true. One must proceed from there to think "outside of the box" of unemotional scholarship, and consider human behavior of the persons involved in the real-life accounts recorded for posterity in the pages of sacred Scripture. Only then can one fully appreciate the greatness of how God has delivered His Word and the teaching contained therein.

---

[53]Many commentators see the problem of a Jew going to a Gentile's home as the reason for him not being worthy for Jesus to come under his roof. This may or may not be accurate. The text is silent on the matter.

[54]One need only refer to Luke 8:43-48 to find another individual who was apprehensive of going to Jesus. Yet, overriding her fear, she went.

NT TEXT CRITICISM AND INERRANCY

Jason Sexton[*]

Some contemporary, evangelical academicians and leaders are questioning the plausibility of the doctrine of biblical inerrancy because of the unavailability of the autographs of NT books. New Testament textual criticism is a vital discipline in responding to doubts of this type. One who undervalues textual criticism's importance in defending an evangelical doctrine of the Bible's inerrancy has a serious problem of one sort or another, because that field seeks to discover and correct copyist errors that through the centuries have crept into the text. The field is vital because inerrancy pertains to the manuscripts of Scripture as they came from the original authors. Establishing a relationship between textual criticism and inerrancy is not a new endeavor. Princeton theologians such as Charles Hodge and B. B. Warfield continued a long tradition of tying inerrancy to the autographs of Scripture. Their response to doubters of their day is quite appropriate to give to contemporary evangelicals who have surrendered a high view of inspiration.

* * * * *

Current Milieu of Evangelicals, Inerrancy, and Textual Criticism

A recent theological meeting attended by numerous evangelical professors was the scene of a perplexing conversation around one dinner table. A professor from a noted evangelical institution, who earlier had addressed the attendees, raised the question to members at his table: "Why do you even believe in inerrancy?" After receiving clarification of certain points from the affirmations of "The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy,"[1] among which was that inerrancy relates to the autographs as they came from the hands of the original writers (cf. article 10 of the Chicago Statement), the speaker stressed, "But we don't even have the autographs."

Another telling conversation with a prominent leader of Emergent and the emerging church movement stated that his approach to the biblical text had nothing to do with seeking to determine what the original author meant. He deemed, in fact, that this would be impossible and that *even if* one could get to the original meaning of a first-century text, it would not be very "helpful" for the community confronted by the text in the twenty-first century. The first argument to support his case was

---

[*]Jason Sexton, an M.Div. graduate of The Master's Seminary and a current Th.M. candidate at TMS, is the church planter and pastor of Sovereign Grace Christian Fellowship in Shafter, California.

[1]See this historic evangelical document in its entirety reprinted in *TMSJ* 15/2 (Fall 2004):141-49.

posed this way: "We don't even have the autographs, right?"[2]

The difficulty some have in accepting inerrancy is no new trend in evangelicalism, nor is disregard for the the original text. But to dismiss a belief in inerrancy or to attack the original text because God's people today do not possess the original papyri on which the biblical writers wrote shows a great lack of confidence in the God who has given His written Word. Such doubters show distrust in the God who inspired and gave the text for His people's benefit, to be used in various settings besides that of the original audience (cf. Col 4:16; 2 Tim 2:2). They may be ill-informed or simply uninformed. But ignorance is not always bliss, especially when it leads one to disregard the text of sacred Scripture or question the veracity of the Bible by doubting its inerrancy. The field of textual criticism is crucial for the life of the church, both for ascertaining the original text and for affirming the inerrancy of that text.[3]

The Approach of This Study

This article will examine current NT textual criticism and its relationship to the evangelical doctrine of the inerrancy of Scripture. With the lack of certainty that textual criticism generates for a given passage in the Bible due to variant readings, one who holds to the doctrine of inerrancy must defend the coherence of his view, particularly as inerrancy relates specifically to the *autographa* (i.e., the

---

[2]I responded at length to this individual's assertion, noting its profound implications for the field of textual criticism and for the ascertaining of what the *autographa* said. One may be thankful that those who hold such a view of the text are not actively practicing textual criticism. Their bent toward philosophy, scholarly ambiguity, and apathy toward the *autographa* could seriously hamper textual critical efforts. Certainly they cannot think that their English translations (which they assert are necessary for ministry and are able to "confront a community of faith") appeared "ex nihilo" and that they have no connection at all to the original text as preserved in ancient manuscripts.

[3]NT textual criticism has progressed much since the time of Johann Jakob Griesbach in the late 18th century (cf. Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrnman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 4th ed. [New York: Oxford University, 2005] 167-94; and James A. Borland, "Re-Examining New Testament Textual-Critical Principles and Practices Used to Negate Inerrancy," *JETS* 25/4 [December 1982]:499; the latter attempts to show that although textual criticism has continued, it has not changed much since the 19th century, nor were or are all of the practices and principles good). The field continues to flourish. Scholars who either defend or dismiss the reasoned eclectic method have generated critical editions of the NT and of the Byzantine text-type, the dominant text-type throughout most of church history. A sample of proponents of the eclectic method favoring the Alexandrian text-type include Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edition, rev. and enl., trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989); Daniel B. Wallace, "Some Second Thoughts on the Majority Text," *BSac* 146/583 (July 1989):270-90. Sample supporters for a Byzantine priority are Wilbur N. Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, rev. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, n.d.); Zane Hodges and Art Farstad, *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1982); Maurice A. Robinson and William G. Pierpoint, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform* (Southborough, Mass.: Chilton Book, 2005). New discoveries continue as research and debates provide a better understanding of the accuracy of variant readings in extant manuscripts. Recent work includes that from Maurice A. Robinson of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. In a recent presentation at the Annual Meeting of the ETS entitled "Incomplete Truth and Its Consequences: A Clarification of the Manuscript Evidence Regarding 2 Corinthians 1:6-7," Nov. 17, 2004, Robinson gave proof that an editor of the UBS[4] and NA[27], Kurt Aland, had not been forthright in providing full information supporting the BYZ ms. tradition for this reading. Robinson also had a recent debate with Barbara Aland for the Bingham Colloquium Lectures at McMaster Divinity School, Hamilton, Ontario, May 25-26, 2005. Robinson intends to continue his work promoting the priority of the BYZ text-type.

original inspired text[4]) which contained the reading the critic attempts to discover, albeit always with a temporary hesitancy regarding a reading's certainty. But some may say, if textual criticism breeds ambiguity upon a passage's clear reading, why would one who holds to inerrancy look to textual criticism at all? Further, why would a textual critic be an inerrantist, knowing the problems that exist with establishing the original reading of the ancient biblical text? Is not holding to inerrancy in the *autographa* simply circular reasoning, allowing naïve evangelicals to feel confident in a text that they will never fully discover? Those are questions that this article will attempt to answer.

The inerrantist case for engaging in textual criticism will be defended, along with why inerrancy should be a prerequisite for all textual critics who seek the original text. The limits of this study are as follows. First, it will limit itself to the field of textual criticism in the NT.[5] Second, since the discussion is not a new one, a historical sketch of previous discussions and their major proponents is appropriate, which will allow the reader to recognize ideas that have already been formulated on the matter. It will show that fruitful conclusions of previous controversies argue for the inerrantist's serious involvement in textual criticism and the textual critic's serious consideration of inerrancy.

To achieve these goals the relationship between textual criticism and inerrancy will first be explained, by exploring the definitions of each. After this, a historical survey will develop the discussion of textual criticism and its relationship to inerrancy. In each questioning of the relationship between inerrancy and textual criticism, various arguments will be considered and responses given from an inerrantist position. Finally, a plea for textual criticism's continued dependence on the doctrine of inerrancy will come, including reasons why that is necessary for further fruitful work in textual criticism and inerrancy.

Relationship Between Textual Criticism and Inerrancy

Textual criticism and inerrancy possess an intimate relationship to each other.[6] Though one may engage in textual criticism without holding to the doctrine of inerrancy, and one may believe in inerrancy while knowing nothing about or even

---

[4]William R. Eichhorst, "The Issue of Biblical Inerrancy in Definition and Defense," *Grace Theological Journal* 10/1 (Winter 1969):11-12.

[5]Cf. Abidan Paul Shah, "Inerrancy and Textual Criticism," unpublished paper presented at the Southeast Regional meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, March 19, 1999, 12. Shah states, "Since the basic principles of textual transmission differ between the two Testaments, the approaches [to doing textual criticism] should follow suit." This paper does not seek to identify methods and principles of performing NT textual criticism (whether by internal or external evidence), but the distinction between OT and NT textual criticism is upheld. The fields should be treated as separate fields of study. Furthermore, the burden to respond to issues that arise in the relationship between OT textual criticism and inerrancy do need more serious consideration from evangelical inerrantists. Hopefully, such a work will be forthcoming from someone.

[6]This has been pointed out very well by Greg L. Bahnsen, "The Inerrancy of the Autographa," in *Inerrancy*, ed. Norman L. Geisler (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980) 149-93; Douglas Stuart, "Inerrancy and Textual Criticism," in *Inerrancy and Common Sense*, eds. Roger R. Nicole and J. Ramsey Michaels (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980) 97-117; and more recently by James A. Borland, "The Preservation of the New Testament Text: A Common Sense Approach," *TMSJ* 10/1 (Spring 1999):50-51; and Shah, "Inerrancy and Textual Criticism" 1-4.

despising the field of textual criticism,[7] an intimate relationship still exists. The relationship is seen when one realizes that although someone may not hold to inerrancy, if and when he engages in textual criticism, he will certainly believe *something* about the doctrine of inerrancy (either accepting or rejecting it). On the other hand, the person who believes strongly in inerrancy owes a great debt to the field of textual criticism (whether he wants to admit it or not), which has provided the textual basis for the translation which he believes is inerrant.[8]

Conversely, one who thinks that the two have no bearing upon one another is in a difficult position, especially if he is a self-proclaimed evangelical. He may view the two as mutually exclusive, but will probably find himself in one of the following categories: (1) he is not an inerrantist or he is in favor of seriously modifying the doctrine of inerrancy;[9] (2) he does not care about textual criticism;[10] (3) he has never performed textual criticism and does not see problems with determining the autographic reading (i.e., he is ignorant of the difficulties that one is confronted with when practicing textual criticism);[11] (4) he is unaware of the problems that have been historically posed to inerrantists by textual critics; (5) he is unaware of recent problems posed to inerrantists by textual critics; (6) he does not truly desire to uncover the readings of the original text that were given by God and therefore has no pure motive for doing textual criticism at all.[12]

Definitions of Textual Criticism and Inerrancy

Next, it is necessary to state clear definitions of the expressions being dealt with in this article. All do not agree on a clear definition for each of the two expressions, neither are the practices implied by each clear to all. Therefore conventional definitions will be given in this paper to guide the reader through the remainder of the discussion.

---

[7]Numerous fundamentalists find themselves having a phobia of anything with the title "criticism" when it comes to the study of Scripture. For this reason, B. B. Warfield penned the chapter, "Inspiration and Criticism," in *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, vol. 1 (New York: Oxford University, 1932; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003) 395-425. He gives three essential characteristics for the investigative work of "criticism" (ibid., 409).

[8]It is no surprise to discover that many evangelical lay-people who hold the doctrine of inerrancy have no idea that the doctrine is most precisely related to the autographs only.

[9]E.g., John J. Brogan, "Can I Have Your Autograph?," in *Evangelicals and Scripture*, eds. Vincent Bacote, Laura C. Miguelez, and Dennis L. Okholm (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2004) 107-11.

[10]Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics*, 2d ed. (n.p.: Phillips and Hunt, 1890; reprint, Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock, 2003) 129 refers to this individual as "an untrustworthy guide" and suggests that any "competent interpreter of Scripture is supposed to be thoroughly versed in the history and principles of textual criticism."

[11]Prior to my recent visit to the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center at Claremont School of Theology, a current graduate student working in the Center revealed a line of thinking of those involved in textual criticism. He joshed that many pastors and seminary students have never moved beyond the UBS or NA texts when doing textual criticism and are therefore ignorant of the true work of textual criticism. A further inquiry into his thoughts led him to say, "After you begin to work with some manuscripts, you realize that it is not as simple as the critical textual apparatuses make it seem. You realize that this field of study is pretty messy." His strain toward ambiguity and away from objectivity is a current trend pointed out by Zane C. Hodges, "Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Textual Criticism," *BSac* 129/509 (January 1971):31-32.

[12]Borland, "The Preservation of the New Testament Text" 50.

Textual Criticism

The necessity of textual criticism becomes obvious when one realizes that the original manuscripts of the NT no longer exist and that the existing manuscripts have numerous errors.[13] Textual criticism seeks to discover and correct errors that have crept into the text through transmission, in order to come as close as possible to the original. It is "the art and science of recovering the original text of a document."[14] A more precise definition is offered by Philip Comfort: "The task of textual criticism is to determine which variant readings in the ancient manuscripts most likely preserve the original wording and then reconstruct a text that best represents the autographs."[15] This field of study provides a methodology to discover what the biblical writers wrote when God inspired the original text.

In this field, once called "lower criticism" but hardly referred to by that title any longer,[16] the textual critic has a tremendous task before him. His job is threefold:

> (1) the gathering and organization of evidence, including especially the collation (comparison) of manuscripts (=MSS) with one another to ascertain where errors and alterations have produced variations in the text, and the study of how and why these variations happened; (2) the evaluation and assessment of the significance and implications of the evidence with a view to determining which of the variant readings most likely represent the original text; and (3) the reconstruction of the history of the transmission of the text, to the extent allowed by the available evidence.[17]

Some have concluded that the practice of textual criticism is irrelevant and unnecessary to Bible study and also threatens the doctrine of the inspiration. However, it is most appropriate to embrace the necessity of textual criticism so as to come as close as possible to the autographs.[18] In principle, errors that occurred in transmission are correctable by this field of study. Its result, then, is that "we possess a biblical text that is substantially identical with the autographa."[19]

Inerrancy

Inerrancy is not as simple to define as textual criticism. Space does not allow an exhaustive treatment of this term's meaning.[20] The term can be traced back

---

[13]David Alan Black, "Textual Criticism of the New Testament," in *Foundations for Biblical Interpretation*, eds. David S. Dockery, Kenneth A. Matthews, and Robert B. Sloan (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994) 396.

[14]Michael W. Holmes, "Textual Criticism," in *New Testament Criticism and Interpretation*, eds. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991) 101.

[15]Philip W. Comfort, "Textual Criticism and Theology," in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, 2d ed., ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001) 1178.

[16]Eldon Jay Epp, "Textual Criticism in the Exegesis of the New Testament, with an Excursus on Canon," in *A Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament*, ed. Stanley Porter (Boston: Brill, 2002) 45.

[17]Holmes, "Textual Criticism" 102.

[18]Stuart, "Inerrancy and Textual Criticism" 97-98.

[19]Bahnsen, "The Inerrancy of the Autographa" 183, 193.

[20]There are a number of people desiring to modify this term's plain meaning. Most notably, the Evangelical Theological Society has passed a resolution on inerrancy that will clarify the position of a majority of its members. Every year ETS members must sign a document stating that they believe in the Trinity and in this following statement regarding Holy Scripture: "The Bible alone and the Bible in its entirety, is the Word of God written, and therefore inerrant in the autographs." At the November 2003

to the 1930s, 1880s and even further.[21] However, because of the current direction of the Evangelical Theological Society, the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy seems to be the best place to start. Specifically, inerrancy means that "Scripture is without fault in all its teaching."[22] It is based on the trustworthiness of God, His Word, and its absolute authority. Former ETS President Wayne Grudem gives a similar definition: "*The inerrancy of Scripture means that Scripture in the original manuscripts does not affirm anything that is contrary to fact.*"[23] Here Grudem shows that inerrancy is linked to the autographs. The Chicago Statement goes further. The article that is most pertinent to this article's topic is Article 10:

> We affirm that inspiration, strictly speaking, applies only to the autographic text of Scripture, which in the providence of God can be ascertained from available manuscripts with great accuracy. We further affirm that copies and translations of Scripture are the Word of God to the extent that they represent the original. We deny that any essential element of the Christian faith is affected by the absence of the autographs. We further deny that this absence renders the assertion of Biblical inerrancy invalid or irrelevant.[24]

Each of the nineteen articles goes into further detail about inerrancy and lists affirmations and denials. But here is the clear affirmation of inerrant status being given to the *autographa* alone. Roger Nicole gives the rationale behind this simply because "manuscripts differ" as a result of the frailty of copyists and because "God's veracity applies to the wording of the Bible."[25] And since that wording has been established as inerrant, to be discovered through the work of textual criticism, the historical plane upon which these issues may be discussed may now be explored.

The Historical Plane

The relationship between textual criticism and inerrancy has been a matter

---

meeting, L. Rush Bush moved that the Executive Committee of ETS propose a resolution to refine and clarify the society's position on inerrancy, since many seemed confused about the meaning of this term. With a further three sentence caveat at the end of the resolution that was passed at the 56th Annual Meeting of the ETS, November 19, 2004, this resolution states, "For the purpose of advising members regarding the intent and meaning of the reference to biblical inerrancy in the ETS Doctrinal Basis, the Society refers members to the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy (1978)."

Unfortunately, a number of the scholars on hand were unfamiliar with the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy, prompting the Society to print copies for members present who desired to become familiar with *what they are supposed to believe already* regarding inerrancy. It was shocking to see that a number of scholars appeared to be unfamiliar with the Chicago Statement. Forget about *defining* inerrancy, apparently many evangelical scholars do not even care about it. These evangelical professors (with Th.M., Th.D., and Ph.D. degrees) remain incredibly uninformed. So much for doctrinal statements and scholarly precision regarding a beloved doctrine which once defined conservative evangelicalism.

[21]Richard J. Coleman, "Reconsidering 'Limited Inerrancy,'" *JETS* 17/4 (Fall 1974):208; John D. Woodbridge, *Biblical Authority* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982); Robert D. Preus, "The View of the Bible Held by the Church: The Early Church Through Luther," in *Inerrancy*, 357-84; John H. Gerstner, "The View of the Bible Held by the Church: Calvin and the Westminster Divines," in *Inerrancy*, 385-412.

[22]"Appendix," in *Inerrancy* 494.

[23]Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994) 90 (emphasis in the original).

[24]"Appendix," in *Inerrancy* 496.

[25]Roger Nicole, "The Nature of Inerrancy," in *Inerrancy and Common Sense* 73, 75.

of discussion more than just recently. When discussing the two, one must look at previous conversation between textual critics, churchmen, and scholars among both inerrantists and errantists. That is significant, especially if the same arguments previously dealt with decisively continue to surface.

Late 19th- and Early 20th-Century Inerrantists

In the 1800s, Princetonians Charles Hodge and B. B. Warfield were powerful biblical theologians championing the doctrine of the Bible's inspiration and inerrancy. Hodge stood in the Reformed tradition of men who held that the "Sacred Scriptures filled with the highest truths . . . [were] so miraculously free from the soiling touch of human fingers." In 1872, Hodge published his three-volume systematic theology. His view of inspiration and inerrancy extended only to the autographs because "there may be some things about [the Bible] in its present state which the Christian cannot account for."[26] Rejecting theories of partial inspiration, he declared, "The whole Bible was written under such an influence as preserved its human authors from all error."[27]

Charles A. Briggs and Other Errantists

On January 20, 1891, Charles Briggs delivered the Inaugural Address of Union Theological Seminary, New York. The address was an outright attack on the views of inerrantists Hodge and Warfield. Among six barriers keeping men from the Bible, Briggs mentioned "the dogma of verbal inspiration." He then noted errors of transmission and stated, "There is nothing Divine in the text—in its letters, words, or clauses."[28] He further labeled "inerrancy" as a barrier erected by theologians to keep men away from the Bible. Admittedly inclined toward destroying the authority of the Bible with Historical Criticism, Briggs saw errors in the Bible he claimed no one is able to dismiss. He stated, "[T]he theory that they [i.e., errors] were not in the original text is sheer assumption, upon which no mind can rest with certainty."[29]

Llewellyn J. Evans dismissed the Princetonian's views as "dangerous, rationalistic, or worse."[30] Henry Preserved Smith of Lane Theological Seminary also espoused the view of Briggs and was suspended from the Presbytery of Cincinnati in 1892 after challenging Hodge's view of the biblical authors and their assertions in Scripture having been kept free from all error.[31]

Benjamin B. Warfield

In January 1894 Warfield responded to the views of Henry Preserved Smith about limited inspiration and an errant Bible.[32] The issues were not new to

---

[26]Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.; reprint, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001) 1:170.

[27]Ibid., 182.

[28]C. A. Briggs, ed., *Inspiration and Inerrancy* (London: James Clarke and Co., 1891) 50.

[29]Ibid., 55.

[30]Llewellyn J. Evans, "Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration," in *Inspiration and Inerrancy* 113.

[31]Henry Preserved Smith, "Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration," in *Inspiration and Inerrancy* 235.

[32]David B. Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, vol. 2: *The Majestic Testimony*, 1869-1929 (Carlisle, Pa.: Banner of Truth, 1996) 142.

Warfield's day.[33] His response was firmly grounded in the Westminister Confession of Faith and its distinction between translations of Scripture and the original text. He saw the debate as being more than just a fight over the bare "inerrancy" of copies or the autographs. He saw it as an attack on the trustworthiness of the Bible.[34] He did not dodge the difficulties posed against his view of inspiration.[35] He acknowledged the views of his opponents,[36] but was driven to a view of verbal inspiration that fueled his "presupposed" view of the truthfulness and inerrancy of the autographs.[37] Consistent with his view of inerrancy, he elsewhere gave support to a genuine criticism of the biblical text[38] and later even published his own work on textual criticism.[39]

Warfield's view of inerrancy belonged "only to the genuine text of Scripture." He was criticized for holding this evasive view as one retreating to something that was unverifiable. Yet he decisively defended his position:

> [W]e affirm that we have the autographic text; and not only we but all men may see it if they will; and that God has not permitted the Bible to become so hopelessly corrupt that its restoration to its original text is impossible. As a matter of fact, the great body of the Bible is, in its autographical text, in the worst copies of the original texts in circulation; practically the whole of it is in its autographic text in the best texts in circulation; and he who will may today read the autographic text in large stretches of Scripture without legitimate doubt.[40]

Warfield's statement must not be taken lightly. It is an overwhelming refutation of any claim about inerrancy's irrelevance because of not having the original documents. Here Warfield's confidence in God's trustworthiness emerges, along with his sound view of the relationship between textual criticism and inerrancy. Warfield affirms "the text," but not "the codex." He later contends that "defenders of the trustworthiness of the Scriptures have constantly asserted, together, that God gave the Bible as the errorless record of his will to men, and that he has, in his superabounding grace, preserved them to this hour—yea, and will preserve it for them to the end of time."[41] He amplifies later the need for textual criticism of the far from perfect copies of the inerrant originals with these statements held up by the Presbyterian Church in his day: "'that the original Scriptures . . . being immediately

---

[33]Hoffman shows how S. T. Coleridge advocated a modified view of inspiration in the early 1800s. He did not hold to inerrancy in the Bible's technical matters and set the stage for later critical theories to come upon the scene (Daniel Hoffman, "S. T. Coleridge and the Attack on Inerrancy," *TrinJ* 7/2 [Fall 1986]:55-68).

[34]Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, *Selected Shorter Writings*, ed. John E. Meeter (Phillipsburg, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1973; reprint, 2001) 2:580-81.

[35]Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, ed. John E. Meeter (New York: Oxford University, 1932; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003) 1:73.

[36]Ibid., 171. Here Warfield acknowledges that Briggs thought that criticism had completely destroyed the theory of inerrancy.

[37]Ibid., 173.

[38]Ibid., 409.

[39]Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London: n.p., 1886).

[40]Warfield, *Selected Shorter Writings* 2:583-84.

[41]Ibid., 2:589.

inspired of God, were without error,' and 'that the Bible, as we now have it, in its various translations and versions, when freed from all errors and mistakes of translators, copyists, and printers, is the very Word of God, and consequently wholly without error.'"[42]

Strong Ties Inevitable

A careful implementation of textual criticism is the answer to those who would question the value, plausibility, or practicality of a doctrine of an inerrant New Testament. Warfield's handling of the issue many years ago pointed out that God's role in the inspiration of Scripture guaranteed its errorless content. That factor should be more than sufficient to erase doubts that any evangelical might have regarding the issue. Historical critical concerns over whether God has chosen to preserve His inerrant Word should not shake the confidence of a Bible scholar in the Bible's accuracy. Through application of text critical principles, one may retrieve the original text in spite of errors in its transmission.

---

[42]Ibid.

THE GIFT OF TONGUES:
COMPARING THE CHURCH FATHERS
WITH CONTEMPORARY PENTECOSTALISM

Nathan Busenitz[*]

Though the church fathers, who lived shortly after the apostles, said relatively little about the gift of tongues, what they did say furnishes a helpful comparison with what contemporary Pentecostalism says about the gift. They did not believe that every Christian received the gift, but they believed that the Holy Spirit, not the human spirit, chose who would have the gift. They held that the gift's ideal use was to benefit the entire community, not the speaker. For them, benefitting others enhanced the importance of interpretation so that others could be edified. In contrast to early views of the gift, Pentecostal writers of the twentieth-century have given a high profile to the gift. In further contrast, modern writers have not limited the gift to messages in actual human languages as did early writers. They further differ with the early fathers in teaching that all Christians should have the gift as evidence of progress in their Christian lives. The Pentecostal view is that speaking in tongues can be a learned human behavior rather than a genuine gift of the Holy Spirit—a further difference from the early fathers. Relief from personal stress and self-edification of the tongues-speaker is the primary purpose of tongues in the eyes of Pentecostals, not the edification of others through interpretation of the tongues message as it was with the fathers. Contemporary Pentecostalism thus differs from ancient Christianity in fundamental aspects in its view of the gift of tongues.

* * * * *

A question that has been the center of heated debate in the last century of evangelical scholarship is, "When did the gift of tongues cease?" On the one hand, cessationists argue that tongues ceased somewhere after the first century. Pentecostal scholars disagree, contending that the charismatic gifts only declined (or continued sporadically) throughout church history, finally and fully resurfacing in the early twentieth century.

The Perspective of Patristic Writers

To support their views, both sides turn to the church fathers. In citing

---

[*]Nathan Busenitz, an M.Div. and Th.M. graduate of The Master's Seminary and a current Th.D. candidate at TMS, is Research Assistant to the Pastor-Teacher of Grace Community Church.

patristic literature, they attempt to demonstrate either the cessation or the continuation of the charismatic gifts (depending on their perspective). Yet, because the emphasis is so often placed on *when* the fathers thought tongues ceased, inadequate attention has been given to *what* the fathers thought tongues were. The purpose of this study is to discover what the church fathers understood the nature and function of tongues-speaking to be, and then to compare that understanding with the contemporary Pentecostal viewpoint.

Did the church fathers understand tongues-speaking to consist primarily of ecstatic, spiritual (non-human) speech for the purpose of self-edification (as Pentecostals would typically understand tongues today)? Or did they define the gift as the supernatural ability to speak previously unstudied foreign languages for the purpose of evangelism and for the edification of others (as cessationists would generally define the gift)? In other words, how did the earliest Christians, those living soon after the apostles, describe the proper operation of the gift as they understood it. And, once identified, how does this patristic definition of tongues compare with the modern Pentecostal position? If the two are complementary, then it seems appropriate (as a subsequent study) to determine if and when tongues ceased in church history. On the other hand, if the two are mutually exclusive, then the timing discussion becomes somewhat unnecessary in the debate, since the modern phenomenon does not match the apostolic gift anyway.[1]

Regarding the Nature of Tongues-Speaking

In spite of a relative de-emphasis placed on tongues-speaking by the church fathers (who speak of prophecy much more than they do of tongues), they are not altogether silent on the issue. In fact, their collective writings overwhelmingly suggest that they associate tongues-speaking with a supernatural ability to speak rational, authentic foreign languages. That proposition is directly supported by Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Hegemonius, Gregory of Nazianzen, Ambrosiaster, Chrysostom, Augustine, Leo the Great, and implied by others (such as Tertullian and Origen).[2] Such a position is further strengthened by the fathers' equation of the Acts 2 use of the gift with the Corinthian phenomenon[3] (as well as their allusions to Isaiah

---

[1]A comparison of modern-day tongues-speaking with the NT data is beyond the scope of this study. Many cessationists have argued that the Pentecostal understanding of tongues does not match the biblical description of the gift (cf. John MacArthur, *Charismatic Chaos* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992] 270-79, or Thomas Edgar, *Satisfied by the Promise of the Spirit* [Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1996]) 165-200. Others disagree (cf. Larry Christenson, "Bypassing the Mind," in *The Holy Spirit in Today's Church*, ed. Erling Jornstad [Nashville: Abingdon, 1973] 87; Don Basham, "The Value of Speaking in Tongues," in *The Holy Spirit in Today's Church*, ed. Erling Jornstad [Nashville: Abingdon, 1973] 79; or Wayne Grudem, "Should Christians Expect Miracles Today," in *The Kingdom and the Power*, eds. Gary S. Greig and Kevin N. Springer [Ventura, Calif.: Regal, 1993] 71).

[2]Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 5.6.1; Hippolytus, *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.1; Hegemonius, *The Acts of Archelaus* 37; Gregory of Nazianzen, *The Oration on Pentecost* 15-17; Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on Paul's Epistles*, see his comments on 1 Cor 13:1; John Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians* 35.1; Augustine, *The Letters of Petilian, the Donatist* 2.32.74; Leo the Great, *Sermons* 75.2; Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 5.8; Origen, "Preface," *Origen de Principiis* 3.1.

[3]Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Hegemonius, Ambrose, and Chrysostom closely associate the work of the apostles on Pentecost with the gift as described in 1 Corinthians 12–14. Regarding 1 Cor 12:7, Theodoret of Cyrus is especially clear: "Paul chooses speaking in tongues as his example because the Corinthians thought that it was the greatest of the gifts. This was because it had been given to the apostles on the day of Pentecost, before any of the others" (*Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* 243, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, Ancient Christian Commentary Series (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1999) [hereafter "ACCS"] 121).

28:11 when discussing the NT gift). In several instances, they import their understanding of Acts 2 and Isaiah 28:11 (both of which speak of human foreign languages) into their interpretation of 1 Corinthians 12–14. Yet, they never suggest that the tongues experienced by the apostles at Pentecost were different from the tongues experienced by the Corinthian believers.

Moreover, the patristic writers never hint at the possibility of two types of tongues-speaking.[4] Rather, they consistently present the gift as a solitary ability—both in its nature and function. In their minds, the only difference between public and private tongues-speaking is that the latter is not interpreted.[5]

Thus, the patristic evidence supports a rational foreign language as the proper and normal manifestation of tongues.[6] Conversely, unintelligible babblings and irrational gibberish are never associated with the gift.[7]

---

[4] John Chrysostom (*Homilies on First Corinthians* 29.1) recognized that everyone who was baptized in Acts 10 and 19 spoke in tongues. He also recognized that, according to 1 Cor 12:30, not every Christian was expected to speak in tongues (see *Homilies on 1 Corinthians* 32.4). Yet, this apparent incongruity did not lead Chrysostom to argue for two kinds of tongues-speaking (one devotional and the other public). Instead, he saw the phenomenon in Acts (in both its nature and function) as identical with that in Corinthians.

[5] Ideally, of course, all tongues-speech was to be interpreted for the edification of the church (see discussion below). If, however, no interpretation was possible, the message was to be kept private since, without an interpretation, it was of no value to the rest of the congregation.

[6] Occasional references are also made to the tongues of angels (usually in the context of commenting on 1 Cor 13:1). The implication, however, is that the ability to converse in an angelic tongue is the exception (not the rule); and that the angelic languages (like human languages) consist of rational messages that can be interpreted. Even the apocrypha of the second century supports tongues as foreign languages. Cf. Harold Hunter, "Tongues-Speech: A Patristic Analysis," *JETS* 23/2 (June 1980):126. The second-century apocrypha also contains one instance in which a human converses in rational language with an angel.

[7] Some Pentecostals attempt to identify the ecstatic behavior of the Montanists with the gift of tongues. Cf. Ronald A. N. Kydd, *Charismatic Gifts in the Early Church* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendricksen, 1984) 34-36. But not only are there different ways to understand the passages that discuss Montanist behavior (as to whether or not their behavior actually corresponds to contemporary Pentecostal glossolalia), the Montanists themselves were considered a heretical sect by the orthodox Christians of that time. The testimony of the Montanists, then, is highly suspect.

Pentecostals also cite Celsus to argue that the gift of tongues included "strange, fanatical, and quite unintelligible words, of which no rational person can find the meaning: for so dark are they, as to have no meaning at all; but they give occasion to every fool or impostor to apply them to suit his own purposes" (Origen, *Against Celsus* 7.9, cited from Roberts, *Ante-Nicene Fathers* 4:614). At first glance, Celsus is apparently accusing Christian prophets of nonsensical gibberish and irrational mutterings (possibly glossolalia?). Yet, Origen's response to those accusations suggests that it is the *content* of the messages that Celsus finds unintelligible (and not the *utterances* themselves). Origen says,

The prophets have therefore, as God commanded them, declared with all plainness those things which it was desirable that the hearers should understand at once for the regulation of their conduct; while in regard to deeper and more mysterious subjects, which lay beyond the reach of the common understanding, they set them forth in the form of enigmas and allegories, or of what are called dark sayings, parables, or similitudes. And this plan they have followed, that those who are ready to shun no labor and spare no pains in their endeavors after truth and virtue might search into their meaning, and having found it, might apply it as reason requires. But Celsus, ever vigorous in his denunciations, as though he were angry at his inability to understand the language of the prophets, scoffs at them (Origen, *Against Celsus* 7.10, cited from Roberts, *ANF* 4:614).

Celsus's complaint, then, is not that the prophets utter nonhuman gibberish. But rather that the *content* of their messages was "in the form of enigmas and allegories" (meaning riddles and stories) and "parables and similitudes." Thus, the meaning of their words (and not the words themselves) were difficult for the outside observer to understand. Origen even implies that with some diligent effort, the outside observer could "search into their meaning," find that meaning, and "apply it as reason requires." Such would only be possible if the sayings themselves were given in intelligible language. From Origen's

Regarding the Extent of Tongues-Speaking

The patristic writings further evidence that all Christians did not speak in tongues. Not only did none of the church fathers claim to speak in tongues personally, they consistently expressed their belief that not every Christian receives that gift (or any one gift, for that matter). Clement of Alexandria explains that "each [believer] has his own proper gift of God—one in one way, another in another."[8] Hippolytus is even more explicit: "It is not necessary that every one of the faithful should cast out demons, raise the dead, or speak with tongues. But only such a one who has been graciously given this gift—for the purpose that it may be advantageous to the salvation of unbelievers."[9] Ambrose echoes, "Not all, says he, have the gift of healings, nor do all, says he, speak with tongues. For the whole of the divine gifts cannot exist in each several man."[10] And Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, and Theodoret of Cyrus agree.[11] The chorus of evidence is overwhelming. The church fathers did not believe that every believer received the same spiritual endowment from the Holy Spirit.[12] Some were gifted with tongues while others were gifted in other ways.

Regarding the Acquisition of Tongues-Speaking

The church fathers also viewed tongues-speaking as a supernatural gift. No amount of human exertion, initiation, or training could aid in acquiring what was endowed only by the Holy Spirit.

Irenaeus makes it clear that those who "speak in all languages" do so only "through the Spirit of God."[13] True signs are done in "the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" rather than "by means of angelic invocations, incantations, or any other wicked curious art."[14] Origen even argues that the same Spirit who gives the gift can also take it away.[15] After all, the "substance of the gifts . . . owes its actual existence

---

response, then, it is clear that an incoherent form of gibberish is not in view. As Christopher Forbes (*Prophecy and Inspired Speech* [Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997] 168) says, "There are major objections against the view that Celsus's report of prophetic utterance at the end of the second century in Palestine provides us with a parallel for early Christian glossolalia."

[8]Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 4.21, cited from David Bercot, ed., *A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999) 300.

[9]*Apostolic Consitutions* 7.479, cited from Bercot, *Dictionary* 303.

[10]Ambrose, *Of the Holy Spirit* 2.13.149-152, cited from Schaff, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, 10:134.

[11]John Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians* 32.4 in reference to 1 Cor 12:30; Jerome, *Against the Pelagians* 1.16; Jerome makes a similar argument in 2.23; Augustine, *The Confessions of Saint Augustine* 13.18.23. Also see *On the Trinity*, 15; Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* 240, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 117 (regarding 1 Cor 12:1).

[12]Stuart D. Currie ("Speaking in Tongues: Early Evidence Outside the New Testament," in *Speaking in Tongues*, ed. Watson E. Mills [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986]" 105) notes that there is "no early, firsthand account of the use of such a gift by a Christian"; see also John Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians* 32.4 in reference to 1 Cor 12:30; Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* 240, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 117 (regarding 1 Cor 12:1); Augustine, *The Confessions of Saint Augustine* 13.18.23; see also *On the Trinity* 15; and Jerome, *Against the Pelagians* 1.16; Jerome makes a similar argument in 2.23.

[13]Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 5.6.1, cited from Bercot, *Dictionary* 300.

[14]Ibid., 2.32.5.

[15]Origen, *Origen de Principiis* 2.10.7.

in men to the Holy Spirit."[16] Novatian and Hilary[17] agree, and the words of Ambrosiaster are equally unmistakable: "Paul is emphatic in asserting that the distribution of gifts is not to be attributed to human causes as if they were achievable by men. The varied gifts of the Holy Spirit and the grace of the Lord Jesus are the work of one and the same God."[18]

Thus, the gifts (including tongues) did not involve any prior human effort or ability to attain. That is not to say that speaking in tongues results in a lack of self-control,[19] but rather that it truly was a gift given by the grace of God to whomever He willed.[20] No training, education, or personal achievement was necessary—"some spoke in tongues which they did not know and which nobody had taught them."[21] As Arnobius says,

> By His own Power, He not only performed those miraculous deeds, . . . but He has permitted many others to attempt them and to perform them by the use of His name. . . . He chose fisherman, artisans, peasants, and unskilled persons of a similar kind, so that they, being sent through various nations, would perform all those miracles without any fraud and without any material aids.[22]

Of course, Origen, Eusebius, Basil, Ambrose, and others[23] are quick to point out that the Spirit works only through those who are living holy lives. Nevertheless, the fathers are unanimous in affirming that it is the Holy Spirit, not the human spirit, that bestows and directs each of the gifts. After all, "To be pious is from any one's good disposition; but to work wonders is from the power of Him that works them by us: the first of which respects ourselves; but the second respects God that works them, for the reasons which we have already mentioned."[24]

Human experience, effort, and education are irrelevant—the Spirit grants supernatural power to those, and only those, whom He chooses.

Regarding the Purpose of Tongues-Speaking

The early church fathers also understood tongues-speaking to be primarily other-oriented, rather than self-oriented. Its main purpose was to edify, encourage, and evangelize other people (both inside and outside the church). Self-edification was never viewed as the gift's goal.

Thus, Irenaeus mentions that those who prophesy and speak in tongues do

---

[16]Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 2.6, cited from Bercot, *Dictionary* 301.

[17]Novatian, *On the Trinity* 29, cited from Roberts, *ANF* 5:641; Hilary, *On the Trinity* 8.29.

[18]Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on Paul's Epistles*, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 120 in reference to 1 Cor 12:6.

[19]Severian of Gabala, *Pauline Commentary from the Greek Church*, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 144 in reference to 1 Cor 14:28.

[20]See Jerome, *Against the Pelagians* 1.16; see also Augustine, *Confessions* 13.18.23.

[21]Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* 240, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 117 (regarding 1 Cor. 12:1). See also, Leo the Great, *Sermons* 75.2.

[22]Arnobius, *Against the Heathen* 1.50, cited from Bercot, *Dictionary* 303.

[23]Origen, *Origen Against Celsus* 1.2; Eusebius, *Church History* 5.7.1; Basil, *On the Spirit* 16.37; Ambrose, *Of the Holy Spirit* 2.13.149-52.

[24]Hippolytus, *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.1, cited from Roberts, *ANF* 7:479-80.

so for "the general benefit."[25] After listing the gifts, Tertullian emphasizes that they are for the purpose of building up the body, in keeping with the two great commandments (to love God and love others).[26] Origen concurs, arguing that those who speak in tongues should "seek the common good of the church."[27]

Novatian says that the purpose of the gifts (including tongues) is to make the church "perfected and completed."[28] Hilary contends that they are for the "perfecting of one body,"[29] the church. And the *First Epistle of Clement Concerning Virginity* makes it perfectly clear:

> With the gift, therefore, which thou hast received from our Lord, serve *thy* spiritual brethren, the prophets who know that the words which thou speakest are *those* of our Lord; and declare the gift which thou hast received in the Church for the edification of the brethren in Christ (for good and excellent are those things which help the men of God), if so be that they are truly with thee.[30]

Basil's point is equally apparent:

> Since no one has the capacity to receive all spiritual gifts, but the grace of the Spirit is given proportionately to the faith of each, when one is living in community with others, the grace privately bestowed on each individual becomes the common possession of the others. . . . One who receives any of these gifts does not possess it for his own sake but rather for the sake of others.[31]

Ambrosiaster believes spiritual gifts should be "conducive to the good of the brotherhood."[32] Chrysostom agrees, arguing that tongues was to be "used for the edification of the whole church."[33] John Cassian emphasizes the importance of love over any type of spiritual gift.[34] And Theodoret of Cyrus sums up the Corinthian error like this: "The Corinthians also did these things, but they did not use the gifts as they should have done. They were more interested in showing off than in using them for the edification of the church."[35]

Furthermore, the fathers indicate that the tongues-gift also served an important evangelistic purpose. For example, Hippolytus argues that

---

[25]Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 5.6.1, cited from Roberts, *ANF* 1:531.

[26]Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 5.8.

[27]Origen, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* 4.61-62, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 141.

[28]Novatian, *On the Trinity* 29, cited from Roberts, *ANF* 5:641.

[29]Hilary, *On the Trinity* 8.29-32. Hilary also references the gifts in *On the Trinity* 2.34.

[30]*The First Epistle of Clement Concerning Virginity* 11.

[31]Basil of Caesarea, *The Long Rules* 7, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 121.

[32]Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on Paul's Epistles*, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 142 in reference to 1 Cor 14:20.

[33]Chrysostom, *Homilies on 1 Corinthians* 36.5, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 144. This comment was made in reference to 1 Cor 14:27.

[34]John Cassian, *The First Conference of Abbot Chaeromon* 12.

[35]Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* 240, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 117 in reference to 1 Cor 12:1.

It is not therefore necessary that every one of the faithful should cast out demons, or raise the dead, or speak with tongues; but such a one only who is vouchsafed this gift, for some cause which may be advantage to the salvation of the unbelievers, who are often put to shame, not with the demonstration of the world, but by the power of the signs; that is, such as are worthy of salvation: for all the ungodly are not affected by wonders; and hereof God Himself is a witness, as when He says in the law: "With other tongues will I speak to this people, and with other lips, and yet will they by no means believe."[36]

John Chrysostom concurs: "The Corinthians thought that speaking in tongues was a great gift because it was the one which the apostles received first, and with a great display. But this was no reason to think it was the greatest gift of all. The reason the apostles got it first was because it was a sign that they were to go everywhere, preaching the gospel."[37] Augustine echoes this response:

In the earliest times, "the Holy Ghost fell upon them that believed: and they spake [*sic*] with tongues," which they had not learned, "as the Spirit gave them utterance." These were signs adapted to the time. For there behooved to be that betokening of the Holy Spirit in all tongues, to shew [*sic*] that the Gospel of God was to run through all tongues over the whole earth.[38]

This is not to say that the fathers did not recognize an element of personal benefit for the speaker. However, they make it equally clear that the intended use of the gift benefited the entire community, not just the speaker. For this to happen, the tongue had to be interpreted, leading the fathers to emphasize consistently the importance of interpretation.

Regarding the Interpretation of Tongues-Speaking
For the gift of tongues to be other-oriented, the church fathers stress that it must be interpreted. After all, if the foreign language is not translated, no one is able to understand it. The gift of interpretation is not simply optional; it is expected—thereby allowing tongues-speaking to fulfill its intended purpose.
Many of the church fathers reference the gift of interpretation, evidencing its widespread importance.[39] Origen, for example, says: "If the one who speaks in tongues does not have the power to interpret them, others will not understand, but he will know what he was moved by the Spirit to say. When this is understood by others as well, there will be fruit from it. Here as elsewhere, we are taught to seek the common good of the church."[40] Hilary agrees: "By the interpretation of tongues,

---

[36]Hippolytus, *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.1, cited from Roberts, *ANF* 7:479-80. Others concur, including Ambrosiaster (*Commentary on Paul's Epistles*, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 142 in reference to 1 Cor 14:21); Hegemonius (*The Acts of Archelaus* 36); Gregory of Nazianzen (*The Oration on Pentecost* 15-17); and Leo the Great (*Sermons* 82, 83).

[37]Chrysostom, *Homilies on 1 Corinthians* 35.1, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 138. This comment was made in reference to 1 Cor 14:2.

[38]Augustine, *Homilies on the First Epistle of John* 6.10, cited from Schaff, *NPNF*, First Series 7:497-98. See also Augustine, *The Letters of Petilian, the Donatist* 2.32.74.

[39]Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 4.21; Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 5.8; Origen, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* 4.61-62; Hilary, *On the Trinity*, 8.29-32; Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on Paul's Epistles*, see his comments on 1 Cor 12:10; John Chrysostom, *Homilies on 1 Corinthians* 36.5; Augustine, *On the Trinity* 5.13; John Cassian, *The First Conference of Abbot Nesteros* 5.

[40]Origen, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* 4.61-62, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 141.

that the faith of those that hear may not be imperiled through ignorance, since the interpreter of a tongue explains the tongue to those who are ignorant of it."[41] John Chrysostom agrees too: "Having spoken so much of tongues, that the gift is a thing unprofitable, a thing superfluous, if it have no interpreter.[42]

The weight of the patristic testimony not only indicates that tongues-speaking should be interpreted, it also implies that tongues-speaking consists of rational foreign languages—meaning that a true and consistent translation of the message is possible rather than an arbitrary creation of the meaning. Moreover, need for interpretation stems from the importance of edification—translating the message so that the entire congregation is benefited.

On the other hand, speech that cannot be understood may be of questionable origin. In the words of Severian of Gabala, "The person who speaks in the Holy Spirit speaks when he chooses to do so and then can be silent, like the prophets. But those who are possessed by an unclean spirit speak even when they do not want to. They say things that they do not understand."[43]

A Patristic Definition of Tongues-Speaking

Based on the patristic evidence, a rudimentary description of tongues (as it was understood by the church fathers) might be stated as follows: *the gift of tongues was a solitary and supernaturally endowed ability, given by the Holy Spirit to select Christians, enabling those believers to speak in previously unlearned, rational foreign languages. The intended use of the gift involved either the translation of the message (by an interpreter) for the general edification of fellow believers, or the translation of the message (by the hearer who heard it in his own tongue) for the evangelism of unbelievers.* The ability was not given to all Christians nor were they commanded to seek it. In fact, the gift does not even receive a high profile in the patristic literature (especially in comparison to the other gifts). While the fathers do discuss tongues-speaking on occasion, their writings do not highlight it as a normal part of the Christian experience.[44]

---

[41]Hilary, *On the Trinity* 8.29-32.

[42]John Chrysostom, *Homilies on 1 Corinthians* 36.5, cited from Schaff, *NPNF*, First Series 12:218.

[43]Severian of Gabala, *Pauline Commentary from the Greek Church*, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 144 in reference to 1 Cor 14:28.

[44]A conclusion about the patristic view on tongues-speaking should acknowledge a current controversy, even among Pentecostals, as to the relationship between Spirit-baptism and tongues-speaking in the patristics. Kilian McDonnell ("Does the Theology and Practice of the Early Church Confirm the Classical Pentecostal Understanding of Baptism in the Holy Spirit?" *Pneuma* 21/1 [Spring 1999]:115-34) argues that Spirit-baptism was central in the minds of the church fathers. But another Pentecostal author, Rick Walston (*The Speaking in Tongues Controversy* [Longwood, Fla.: Xulon, 2003] 156), admits that "the *connection* of the baptism in the Holy Spirit with speaking in tongues" is "absent from church history." In other words, the Pentecostal association of tongues-speaking with Spirit-baptism as a normal part of Christian experience (outside the book of Acts) lacks patristic support. "It is a little known fact among average Classical Pentecostals that the tongues-as-evidence doctrine is a relatively recent development" (ibid.).

Comparing Patristics with Contemporary Pentecostalism

Over the past century,[45] Pentecostal writings have given a very high profile to tongues-speaking, making it one of the movement's most basic and notable characteristics.

> Speaking with tongues (glossolalia) is the most dramatic and spectacular of all the signs in the Pentecostal movement. . . .   Among the fundamentalists and historical denominations glossolalia is not only an isolated phenomenon, but is repudiated by the communities as a whole, while for Pentecostals it remains one of the basic tenets and practices of the church.[46]

Such emphasis on tongues-speaking has led many Pentecostals to see the church as consisting of two classes of Christians—those who have spoken in tongues and those who have not. Hollenweger explains: "The greater part of the Pentecostal movement within the Protestant churches seems to have taken over the Pentecostal doctrine of the two sorts of Christians, those who have been baptized in the Spirit and those who have not. The former are qualified by speaking with tongues."[47] Stated another way, only those who are spiritually mature, having totally yielded themselves to God, are enabled to speak in tongues. Anyone else is, by default, considered less mature in the Christian faith. Pentecostal proponents argue, "For many people, speaking in tongues is the first time they have yielded a little of themselves into God's hands. It is the first time they have said they were willing to go all the way with the Lord and meant it!"[48] Thus, because the gift of tongues equates with religious sincerity and personal faithfulness, it is exalted by the movement as a premier spiritual prize.

Clearly, that emphasis on tongues contrasts with the patristic de-emphasis. Whereas the writings of the early fathers seldom mention the gift, contemporary Pentecostal writings constantly highlight it. "The question which Pentecostals have difficulty answering when they stress the significance of glossolalia is: If glossolalia is so significant, why has its history been so spotty, almost nonexistent from the apostolic age to about 1650?"[49] Or, why has a gift that is mentioned only occasionally and tangentially by the church fathers become one of the foundational pillars for Pentecostal practice?

---

[45]Although proponents trace their origin back to the primitive church, the American Pentecostal movement in its contemporary form began on January 1, 1901 when Agnes Ozman, a student of C. P. Parham, reportedly spoke in the Chinese language. It is significant that the first Pentecostals believed their tongues-speech was authentic foreign human language (Gerhard Hasel, *Speaking in Tongues* [Berrien Springs, Mich.: Adventist Theological Society, 1991] 11-12).

[46]Prudencio Damboriena, *Tongues as of Fire* (Cleveland, Ohio: Corpus, 1969) 101. See also Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Metuchen, N.J.: Hendrickson, 2000) 15. C. G. Williams ("Speaking in Tongues," in *Strange Gifts?*, eds. David Martin and Peter Mullen [New York: Basil Blackwell, 1984] 72) says that tongues-speaking is "central" to Pentecostal worship. Watson E. Mills concurs: "The charismatic phenomena of zenolalia and glossolalia, in the history of the Christian church, have been singled out by some groups as essential marks of the faith" ("Glossolalia: An Introduction," in *Speaking in Tongues* 3).

[47]Walter J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988) 9.

[48]James W. Jones, *Filled with New Wine* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1974) 86.

[49]E. Glenn Hinson, "The Significance of Glossolalia in the History of Christianity," in *Speaking in Tongues* 182.

Regarding the Nature of Tongues-Speaking.

According to Pentecostals, the gift of tongues does not necessarily involve an actual human language. Though they claim that the tongues they speak are indeed true languages, they are not always *human* languages. But are their assertions verifiable?

> Classical Pentecostals would insist that tongues are a true language and most neo-Pentecostals, Protestant and Catholic, usually agree. All Pentecostal literature, classical, Protestant and Catholic neo-Pentecostal, give examples of foreign languages which were spoken in the presence of someone competent in the language who verified the linguistic authenticity of what was spoken. However, when one accepts the Pentecostal presuppositions, namely that the language can be any language ever spoken, even languages no longer spoken, or even the language of the Angels (they cite 1 Cor. 13:1), the problems of scientific verification become staggering. Also the kind of controlled situation necessary for a truly scientific study rarely obtains when a language is recognized in a Pentecostal meeting. Without this kind of controlled situation most scientists would not accept tongues as true languages, and would rather contend that the recognition of the language by someone linguistically competent is based on psychology rather than linguistic factors.[50]

Criswell cites further evidence against the Pentecostal claims.

> As far as I have been able to learn, no real language is ever spoken by the glossolaliast. He truly speaks in an unknown and unknowable tongue. Tape recordings of those speaking in unknown tongues were played before the Toronto Institute of Linguistics. After these learned men in the science of phonetics had studied the recordings, they said, "This is no human language."[51]

Even when two or more different Pentecostal interpreters listen to the same audio recording of a tongues-speaker, their interpretations are totally different—suggesting that the tongues themselves are not real languages that are capable of being translated.[52] Damboriena agrees, saying, "The 'languages' I have heard consist in completely unintelligible bubblings of sound and words which not even the Penetcostals around me (and some of them had already been blessed with the gift) were able to grasp."[53]

Proponents of Pentecostalism admit that their version of tongues-speaking sounds like little more than incomprehensible muttering. Christenson acknowledges that when speaking in tongues "you do not understand what you are saying. . . . But it is a praying with the spirit rather than the mind."[54] Jones adds,

> For some (particularly academic types like myself) it is a matter of understanding. They

---

[50]Kilian McDonnell, "The Theology of Speaking in Tongues," in *The Holy Spirit in Today's Church* 93-95.

[51]W. A. Criswell, "Facts Concerning Modern Glossolalia," in *The Holy Spirit in Today's Church,* 92. See also M. Cartledge, *Charismatic Glossolalia* (Hants, England: Ashgate, 2002) 2.

[52]John P. Kildahl, "Six Behavioral Observations about Speaking in Tongues," in *Gifts of the Spirit and the Body of Christ*, ed. Elmo J. Agrimoson (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974) 77.

[53]Damboriena, *Tongues* 105.

[54]Larry Christenson, "Bypassing the Mind," in *The Holy Spirit in Today's Church* 87.

do not like things they cannot comprehend. Mystery frightens them. Since speaking in tongues appears so irrational, they will not involve themselves in something they are unable to figure out. . . . Because to speak in tongues seems so foolish, our fear of it forces us to examine how much our pride keeps us from surrendering totally to God.[55]

Thus Jones contends that the audible sound of unintelligible gibberish is actually a good thing, forcing Christians to humble themselves in their dependence on God.

Again, this Pentecostal proposition is in direct contrast to the views of the church fathers. Patristic evidence indicates that the fathers believed tongues to be actual languages. Thus, the ability to speak in tongues was the ability to speak in authentic foreign languages—all of which could be accurately translated. While on occasion this is the Pentecostal claim, it is certainly not the overarching thrust of their contemporary teaching or practice. As Hunter, in his study of the church fathers, aptly concludes:

Many present-day Pentecostals have more or less assumed that the historical precedents of tongues-speech were usually glossolalic [unintelligible speech]. This study, however, has found that when the Fathers clarified the nature of the tongues-speech being practiced they most usually specified them as being xenolalic [foreign human languages].[56]

Not only do Pentecostals expand their definition of tongues to include unintelligible speech, they also see such ecstatic speech as both normative and orthodox—desiring that the mind be bypassed as much as possible.[57] Thus, they promote a type of spiritual ecstasy, in which self-control and personal inhibition are removed. Yet, this ecstatic lack of control was exactly what the early fathers condemned.[58]

William Samarin, a linguistic professor at the University of Toronto, attended numerous Pentecostal and neo-Pentecostal meetings in several countries over a five-year period. At the end of his time, he concluded,

When the full apparatus of linguistic science comes to bear on glossolalia, this turns out to be only a façade language—although at times a very good one indeed. For when we comprehend what language is, we must conclude that no glossa, no matter how well constructed, is a specimen of human language, because it is neither internally organized nor systematically related to the world man perceives. . . . Glossolalia is indeed a language in some ways, but this is only because the speaker (unconsciously) wants it to be like language. Yet in spite of superficial similarities, glossolalia is fundamentally *not*

---

[55]Jones, *Filled with New Wine* 86.

[56]Hunter, "Tongues-Speech: A Patristic Analysis" 135. See also Edgar, *Satisfied by the Promise of the Spirit* 378.

[57]Damboriena (*Tongues* 111) records the experiences of Pentecostal leaders who espouse the out-of-control ecstasy that accompanies tongues-speech.

[58]Severian of Gabala, *Pauline Commentary from the Greek Church*, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 144 in reference to 1 Cor 14:28. Along these lines, the fact that unintelligible tongues-speech is not the sole property of Pentecostalism is noteworthy. Dayton (*Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* 15-16) notes, "In America, for example, glossolalia has appeared in such groups as the Shakers and Mormons of the nineteenth century." Robert G. Gromacki (*The Modern Tongues Movement* [Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1964] 5-10) observes that frenzied speech (glossolalia) occurred among the ancient Greek and early Phoenecian religions, the Greco-Roman mystery religions, Islam, Eskimo paganism, and paganism in Tibet and China. Hasel (*Speaking in Tongues* 14, 18) also includes "shamans" and "witch doctors" in the list of pagan tongue-speakers.

language.[59]

The Pentecostal response—that glossolalia should not be analyzed like a normal language because it is "spiritual" and not "rational"[60]— only reinforces the point that Pentecostal tongues does not consist of authentic foreign languages. Clearly this does not match up with the true gift as described by the fathers.

Regarding the Extent of Tongues-Speaking

Pentecostals teach that all Christians, as they progress in their spiritual lives, should come to the place where they can speak in tongues. After all, the gift of tongues is connected to Spirit-baptism and Spirit-baptism, as a post-conversion experience, is something every Pentecostal Christian is encouraged to seek. Thus, the believer who never speaks in tongues is missing out on a vital part of the full Christian experience.

With this in mind, Duffield and Van Cleave argue that "Prayer in tongues is normal for the Spirit-filled Christian."[61] In fact, "Pentecostals have often tested the faithfulness of their followers, as individuals or corporations, by their stand on the theology and practice of glossolalia."[62] Along these lines, the two Menzies say, "I believe Paul encourages us to see the private manifestation of tongues as edifying and available to every believer."[63] Basham even goes so far as to indicate that "something is missing" in the lives of those who have never experienced the gift.[64]

Rick Walston, a Pentecostal, argues that Pentecostals see a difference between the public use of tongues (which he calls "the gift of tongues") and the private use of tongues (which he calls "devotional tongues" or "prayer language").[65] He contends that, while not every Christian should experience public tongues-speaking, every Christian *should* experience devotional tongues. In this way, he attempts to reconcile Pentecostal practice with Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians 12–14.[66]

---

[59]William J. Samarin, *Tongues of Men and Angels* (New York: Macmillan, 1972) 127-28, 227. Also see Felicitas D. Goodman, "Glossolalia," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Mircea Eliade (New York: Macmillan, 1987) 5:564.

[60]J. R. Williams ("Charismatic Movement," in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984] 207) says: "Charismatics are not disturbed by linguists who claim that glossolalia has no observable language structure, for if such were the case, speaking in tongues would not be spiritual but rational speech."

[61]Guy P. Duffield and N. M. Van Cleave, *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology* (Los Angeles: L.I.F.E. Bible College, 1987) 341.

[62]Damboriena, *Tongues* 102.

[63]Robert P. Menzies and William W. Menzies, *Spirit and Power* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000) 142.

[64]Basham, "The Value of Speaking in Tongues" 79.

[65]Walston, *Tongues Controversy* 21-23. Donald Lee Barnett and Jeffrey P. McGregor, *Speaking in Other Tongues* (Seattle: Community Chapel, 1986) 326-27, argue for four aspects of tongues-speaking and draw a major distinction between private tongues and public tongues. See also J. Morris Ashcraft, "Glossolalia in the First Epistle to the Corinthians" in *Tongues*, ed. Luther B. Dyer (Jefferson City, Mo.: Le Roi, 1971) 75-76.

[66]Ibid. Lewis J. Willis ("Glossolalia in Perspective," in *The Glossolalia Phenomenon*, ed. Wade H. Horton [Cleveland, Tenn.: Pathway, 1966] 271) argues similarly. It should also be noted that this understanding has been contested, on exegetical grounds, by scholars such as Anthony A. Hoekema, *Tongues and Spirit Baptism* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981) 85-96. Hoekema views Paul's words as a

By contrast, however, the church fathers never draw this distinction between devotional tongues and public tongues. Though they concede that at times the gift is exercised privately (as Paul explains in 1 Corinthians 14), they tend to view this private use negatively.[67] More important, they indicate that private use is still the same gift of tongues (as mentioned in Isa 28:1, Acts 2:4-13, and 1 Cor 12:30)[68]—it is simply not interpreted for others.

Take, for example, Chrysostom's comments on 1 Corinthians 14:14-15 (the main passage Pentecostals use to defend devotional tongues):

> Ask accordingly not to have the gift of tongues only, but also of interpretation, that thou mayest become useful unto all, and not shut up thy gift in thyself alone. "For if I pray in a tongue," saith he, "my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful." Seest thou how by degrees bringing his argument to a point, he signifies that not to others only is such an one useless, but also to himself; if at least "his understanding is unfruitful?" For if a man should speak only in the Persian, or any other foreign tongue, and not understand what he saith, then of course to himself also will he be thenceforth a barbarian, not to another only, from not knowing the meaning of the sound. For there were of old many who had also a gift of prayer, together with a tongue; and they prayed, and the tongue spake, praying either in the Persian or Latin language, but their understanding knew not what was spoken. Wherefore also he said, "I'll pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth," i.e., the gift which is given me and which moves my tongue, "but my understanding is unfruitful."
>
> What then may that be which is best in itself, and doth good? And how ought one to act, or what request of God? To pray, "both with the spirit," i.e., the gift, and "with the understanding." Wherefore also he said, "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." He signifieth the same thing here also, that both the tongue may speak, and the understanding may not be ignorant of the things spoken.[69]

Notice that Chrysostom defines this "private prayer language" as authentic foreign languages—the same way he defines the "public" gift of tongues elsewhere. Moreover, he insists that even this "devotional" tongues-speech should be understood by the speaker (so that he can be edified) and also interpreted (so that others can be edified).[70] Clearly, he sees no categorical distinction between private use and public use. Thus, when the fathers indicate that the gift of tongues is not

---

corrective to Corinthian misuse and abuse, and not as biblical support for an altogether different type of tongues experience.

[67]See Hasel, *Speaking in Tongues* 150. The reason for this negative reaction is that they believed the ideal use of tongues was other-oriented.

[68]R. P. Spittler ("Glossolalia," in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, ed. Stanley M. Burgess [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002] 673) notes that classical Pentecostals admittedly support this distinction by reading their interpretation of Acts into 1 Corinthians. The fact that the fathers equated the gift in Acts with the gift in 1 Corinthians demonstrates that their interpretation necessitated no such division.

[69]Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians* 35.5-6, cited from Schaff, *NPNF*, First Series 12:211 in reference to 1 Cor 14:13-15.

[70]Ambrosiaster, commenting on 1 Corinthians 14:14, also views tongues-speech as a negative if it is not understood by the speaker. He says: "What can a person achieve if he does not know what he is saying?" (*Commentary on Paul's Epistles*, cited from *1–2 Corinthians*, ACCS 141). This contrasts with the Pentecostal description of devotional tongues, in which understanding and interpretation is unnecessary. Like Chrysostom, Ambrosiaster nowhere indicates he believed in two distinct kinds of tongues-speaking (i.e., private and public).

received by every believer, they mean this in the broadest sense—whether publicly or privately. Not every Christian is expected to speak in tongues.

Furthermore, if devotional tongues-speech was a universal part of the early church's experience, one would expect the church fathers to emphasize it (or at least mention it). Yet, the patristic evidence not only de-emphasizes private tongues-speech, but instead strongly stresses the other-oriented nature of the gift.

A survey of early Christian literature indicates that the church fathers believe in only one gift of tongues, giving no indication to the contrary. Furthermore, they teach that this solitary gift was given to only a select number of Christians—as the Holy Spirit desired. They do not teach that tongues-speaking (either private or public) was the normal experience of every Christian.[71]

Regarding the Acquisition of Tongues-Speaking.

Although Pentecostals claim that the tongues phenomenon practiced in their churches is a supernaturally imparted gift from God to willing believers, evidence suggests otherwise. Tongues-speaking is often faked, manipulated, or self-induced—the result being a human imitation rather than the genuine gift. As Weaver puts it, "The present day phenomenon of Christians claiming to speak in tongues has some other explanation than that it is a continuation of the New Testament practice of the gift."[72] Kildahl explains how this manufactured process works.

> There are five steps in the process of inducing someone to speak in tongues.... From a psychological point of view, the first step seems to involve some kind of magnetic relationship between the leader and the one who is about to attempt to speak in tongues. Second, the initiate generally has a sense of personal distress—usually involving a profound life crisis. Third, the initiate has been taught a rationale for understanding what tongues-speaking is. Fourth, the presence of a supporting group of fellow believers enhances the possibility of eventually speaking in tongues. Fifth, somewhere in the process there is an intense emotional atmosphere.[73]

In other words, tongues may be more closely linked to peer pressure and self-expectation than Spirit-endowment and a true gift of grace. After all, the Pentecostal leadership expects each member to speak in tongues; the congregation expects each member to speak in tongues; and the members themselves expect to speak in tongues.

In light of this, some Pentecostal churches actually offer training for those who wish to speak in tongues.[74] And Pentecostal authors Charles and Frances Hunter give this encouragement to their readers:

> You may start off with a little baby language, but just keep on. Remember when your children were small they started out with a very small vocabulary, and then as they added new letters to it, they were capable of making more words. The same thing is sometimes true of your Spirit language. The Spirit can only give back to you what you give to him, so put those extra sounds of the alphabet in and see what he does with them! Don't keep

---

[71]It should be noted that not all charismatics teach that every Christian should speak in tongues. For example, see Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994) 1076.

[72]Gilbert B. Weaver, "Tongues Shall Cease," *GJ* 14/1 (Winter 1973):23.

[73]Kildahl, "Six Behavioral Observations about Speaking in Tongues" 74.

[74]John P. Kildahl, *The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972) 2-5.

on speaking a baby language, but allow the Holy Spirit to develop a full language in and through you.[75]

That is a way of saying the gift of tongues requires time and practice to perfect—something far different than the full-fledged ability to speak foreign languages without any training or practice.

Studies have shown that people can be trained to imitate the Pentecostal version of tongues without detection.[76] And, maybe most significantly, "There are numerous former members of the Pentecostal movement who retain the ability to speak in tongues, even though they have no belief that their speech is a gift of God."[77] As Poythress summarizes:

> A significant body of professional linguistic, psychological, and sociological analysis of modern tongues-speaking (glossolalia) has now accumulated. Some of it attributes a generally positive value to speaking in tongues; some of it is quite negative. All of it agrees in treating glossolalia as at root a nonmiraculous phenomenon.[78]

In light of this, linguistic experts agree that glossolalia "is, actually, a learned behavior, learned either unawarely or, sometimes, consciously"[79] and "the tongue speaker is the product of considerable instruction."[80]

This evidence is again incompatible with that of the early church fathers. The fathers saw tongues as verifiably linked to a special endowment of the Holy Spirit. Pentecostals, on the other hand, struggle to deny accusations attacking both the legitimacy of this gift and the actual source behind them. In light of the facts, it seems reasonable to agree with Kildahl when he says, "In summary, my glossolalia research has included an examination of the phenomenon itself, and a study of the theories about it. I have concluded that it is a learned behavior which often brings a sense of power and well-being."[81] Edgar furthers this evaluation: "However, mere glossolalia is common and can be self-induced. They are not a manifestation of a miracle from God. As long as the New Testament gift of tongues is equated with mere ecstatic unintelligible utterance (glossolalia), it can be explained apart from the miraculous."[82]

Regarding the Purpose of Tongues-Speaking

Pentecostals divide the gift of tongues into its public use and its private

---

[75]Charles and Frances Hunter, *Why Should "I" Speak in Tongues???* (Houston: Hunter Ministries, 1976) 188.

[76]Kildahl, "Behavioral Observations" 76. False religions, such as the Hindus, also employ a form of glossolalia nearly identical to the Pentecostal type.

[77]Ibid.

[78]Vern S. Poythress, "Linguistic and Sociological Analyses of Modern Tongues-speaking: Their Contributions and Limitations," *WTJ* 42/2 (Spring 1980):367.

[79]Felicitas D. Goodman, "Glossolalia," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Mircea Eliade (New York: Macmillan, 1987) 5:563-64.

[80]Samarin, *Tongues of Men and Angels* 74.

[81]Kildahl, "Behavior Observations" 78. Spittler ("Glossolalia" 675) notes, "Glossolalia of simply human origin is probably more frequent than recognized. That explains, for example, the humanities scholar who 'taught himself' to speak in tongues and can do so at will."

[82]Edgar, *Satisfied* 154-55.

use. In so doing, they contend that the public use of tongues is for congregational edification, while the private use of tongues is for self-edification. In their estimation, this self-edification is a primary purpose of private glossalia. As one Pentecostal work explains: "Every Spirit-filled Christian can and should pray frequently in tongues for self-edification (1 Cor. 14:2, 4, 5, 18), building himself up by praying in the Holy Ghost."[83] Commenting on 1 Corinthians 14, James Slay remarks,

> This chapter attests to the truth that the glossolalia phenomenon can and does benefit the individual. Tongues and the interpretation of tongues are gifts placed in the church by the will of God and through the Spirit. This enduement is a vital part of the charismata, and as it blesses the individual, quite naturally it will have a salutary effect upon the church since the church is composed of individuals.[84]

According to Spittler, "the significance of glossolalia for the individual speaker may lie in its capacity to vent the inexpressible—hence the observed connection with stress."[85] Wayne E. Ward echoes this same description:

> Perhaps the most persistent positive claim for the experience of tongue speaking is that it provides a continuing source of spiritual power and joy in the Christian life. Almost all who have had the experience say that it enriches their prayer life in such a way that it seems they have never prayed before. Many describe an abounding joy which floods their lives, and many others demonstrate a new vitality which is the strongest argument for the tongues experience.[86]

Self-edification, personal renewal, and private religious experience are listed as primary purposes and results of the gift.

The church fathers, on the other hand, do not make any division between public and private tongues. Thus, though the church fathers generally recognize that the use of any gift (including tongues) includes some personal benefit, they are also quick to clarify that personal edification is never the main purpose of the gifts. Instead, the ideal use of tongues-speech in any context includes its interpretation for the good of the community. The idea that tongues-speech is primarily intended as stress relief, or even personal spiritual renewal, is a concept that is absent from early Christian literature.

Regarding the Interpretation of Tongues-Speaking

In maintaining the division between public and private tongues, Pentecostals claim that only public tongues require interpretation.[87] Furthermore, they contend that this interpretation does not necessarily mean a strict translation. Thus the question is raised:

---

[83]Donald Lee Barnett and Jeffrey P. McGregor, *Speaking in Other Tongues* (Seattle: Community Chapel, 1986) 327.

[84]James L. Slay, "Glossolalia: Its Value to the Individual," in *The Glossolalia Phenomenon* 240.

[85]Spittler, "Glossolalia" 675. Ernest Best agrees, noting that the practice "certainly brings joy and release from tension to some Christians" ("The Interpretation of Tongues," in *Speaking in Tongues* 310).

[86]Wayne E. Ward, "Various Views of Tongue Speaking," in *Tongues* 21.

[87]Barnett and McGregor, *Other Tongues* 326.

Is the gift of "interpretation of tongues" a gift of the ability to translate into the common language of the hearers what is being uttered by one who is "speaking in tongues?" Or does "interpretation" here mean, rather, exegesis or explanation? For instance, what is "spoken in a tongue" might be enigmatic or oracular: the words might be intelligible but the meaning is obscure; the gift of interpretation would then be the gift of the ability to make plain the meaning of what was being uttered. Or, to consider a third possibility, does "interpretation" mean here what an art critic does when he reports on the message or meaning of a piece of music? In this case the interpreter would neither translate nor convey in plain language the gist of an enigmatic message; he would, rather, explain the aim and the mood (praise, lament, thanksgiving, exultation) of the utterance.[88]

In response to criticism, one Pentecostal writer contends, "An interpretation is not always a translation or a rendering from one language to another in equivalent words or grammatical terms. An interpretation is a declaration of the meaning and may be very differently stated from the precise form of the original."[89]

On the basis of this answer, Pentecostal interpretations can have a wide variety of meaning—even when interpreting the same tongues-message. Kildahl, for example, had several Pentecostal interpreters listen to a single audio recording of glossolalia. After his experiment, he noted,

In no instances was there any similarity in the several interpretations. The following typifies our results: one interpreter said the tongue-speaker was praying for the health of his children; another that the same tongues-speech was an expression of gratitude to God for a recently successful church fund-raising effort.[90]

But, when he confronted the interpreters with the inconsistencies, he was told that "God gave to one person one interpretation and to another person another interpretation."[91]

While this explanation is certainly convenient, it does make them vulnerable to the accusation that, generally speaking, Pentecostal glossolalia does not consist of authentic languages[92] and therefore cannot be translated with any degree of consistency or certainty. Even when exercising private tongues, Pentecostals admit that the speaker does not understand what he is praying: "Many of you will be hearing little sounds right now running through your mind. Strange little parts of words. Strange little syllables. You don't understand them, but listen for them, because this is the beginning of your Spirit language. Some of you may not hear anything, but will just begin to speak in a moment."[93] Even so, they contend that believers can be edified: "This writer feels that glossolalia, even if it be an uninterpreted outburst of ecstatic praise, would not only edify the speaker but might possibly convict the earnest spectator."[94]

In contrast, the church fathers continually emphasized the importance of interpretation whenever tongue-speaking is used. In their thinking, tongues-speech

---

[88]Stuart D. Currie, "Speaking in Tongues" 84.

[89]Slay, "Glossolalia," 239.

[90]Kildahl, *Psychology* 63.

[91]Ibid.

[92]See Samarin, *Tongues of Men and Angels* 1-2, 73.

[93]Charles and Frances Hunter, *Why Should "I" Speak in Tongues???* 185.

[94]Slay, "Glossolalia" 239.

profits no one if it cannot be understood. Furthermore, their emphasis on tongues-speech as consisting of rational foreign language indicates that they understood interpretation to consist primarily of translation (and possibly explanation). If rational languages are presupposed (for tongues-speech), no reason exists to redefine *interpretation* as anything else.

A Pentecostal Definition of Tongues
        Having established the propositions above, an honest Pentecostal description of tongues (at least in its practical outworking) might be stated as follows: *The gift of tongues includes the ability to speak in a spiritual language (which has no definable relationship to any authentic rational language) either for the church or for personal edification. If intended for the church, tongues are interpreted by those with the gift of interpretation (with various meanings derived from the same message). If intended for personal edification, the message is not interpreted at all. On the whole, tongues-speaking is often a self-induced phenomenon, available to all who are willing to learn it.*[95] Though some Pentecostal leaders may not endorse this description verbatim, it accurately reflects their writings and parallels the history and practice of tongues-speech in their ecclesiastical circles.

<div align="center">

Conclusion

</div>

        Based on the preceding study, it follows that the church fathers disagree with contemporary Pentecostals on several fundamental aspects as to the essence and practice of tongues-speaking. While Pentecostal adherents are forced to divide tongues-speaking into two categories—private and public—the church fathers see no such division. Instead, the patristic writings suggest a solitary gift of tongues that consisted of the supernatural ability to speak previously unknown foreign languages for the purpose of evangelism and edification. On this basis it is safe to conclude that the Pentecostal phenomena prevalent over the past century is not the same as that of the early church. Instead it is of recent origin in the history of Christianity. As Hasel explains,

> The contemporary phenomenon of "speaking in tongues," which is practiced by millions of Christians around the world at present, is of recent origin in Christianity. Even though there have been attempts by the score to demonstrate that the phenomenon of glossolalia in modern times has roots going back for centuries in Christian practice, it remains certain that it is of recent origin.[96]

---

        [95]Basham ("The Value of Speaking in Tongues" 82-83) notes that the private use of tongues is by far the most common in Pentecostal circles. This ability is not only given to Christians but can also be seen in pagan rituals and practices.

        [96]Hasel, *Speaking in Tongues* 17.

AMENHOTEP II AND THE HISTORICITY
OF THE EXODUS-PHARAOH

Douglas Petrovich[*]

A belief in biblical inerrancy necessitates an accompanying belief in the Bible's historical accuracy. Biblical history can be harmonized with Egyptian history, claims to the contrary notwithstanding. Israel's exodus from Egypt in 1446 B.C. fits with the chronology of the 18th Dynasty pharaohs in Egyptian records. The tenth biblical plague against Egypt fits with what is known about the death of Amenhotep II's firstborn son. If this Amenhotep was the exodus pharaoh, biblical data about the perishing of his army in the Red Sea should not be understood as an account of his death. His second Asiatic campaign very possibly came as an effort to recoup his reputation as a great warrior and recover Egypt's slave-base after the loss of two million Israelite slaves through the exodus. The record of 3,600 Apiru on the booty list for his second Asiatic campaign appears to be a small number of the escaped Hebrews whom he recaptured and brought back to Egypt. If Hatshepsut is identified with the biblical Moses' adoptive mother, attempts to erase her memory from Egyptian records may have come from efforts of Amenhotep II because of her part in rescuing Moses when he was a baby and becoming his adoptive mother. Such scenarios show the plausibility of harmonizing the biblical account of the exodus with secular history and supporting the position of biblical inerrancy.

* * * * *

I. Introduction

Historical accuracy has been and is a major issue in attacks on the inerrancy of the Bible. Ladd's words reveal his yielding to such an attack: "[T]he authority of the Word of God is not dependent upon infallible certainty in all matters of history and criticism."[1] A recent revisionistic version of Israel's history has questioned the Bible's account of that history.[2] A prime example is the words of Finkelstein, who speaks of "the rise of the true national state in Judah [in the eighth century BC]. . . . That national state produced a historical saga so powerful that it led biblical historians and archaeologists alike to recreate its mythical past—from stones and

---

[*]Douglas Petrovich, a TMS alumnus, serves on the faculty of Novosibirsk Biblical Theological Seminary, Novosibirsk, Russia.

[1]George Ladd, *The New Testament and Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967) 16.

[2]William G. Dever, *What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know It?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) 4.

potsherds."[3] Such attacks on biblical inerrancy necessitate a reasoned defense of the Bible's historical accuracy. Lindsell writes, "When inerrancy is lost, it is palpably easy to drift into a mood in which the historicity of Scripture along with inerrancy is lost."[4]

The following discussion examines the trustworthiness of biblical history by using the Hebrew exodus from Egypt (hereafter, simply "exodus") as a test case. More specifically, an examination of the exodus-pharaoh's life will show whether biblical history can be harmonized and synchronized with Egyptian history and whether biblical chronology is clear and trustworthy in light of a literal interpretation of relevant passages.

The need for examining the former issue is that many Egyptologists are denying the veracity of the exodus, attempting to show that the exodus never occurred. Renowned Egyptologist Donald Redford concludes, "The almost insurmountable difficulties in interpreting the exodus-narrative as history have led some to dub it 'mythology rather than . . . a detailed reporting of the historical facts' and therefore impossible to locate geographically."[5] Redford then allies himself with this view when he states, "[D]espite the lateness and unreliability of the story in exodus, no one can deny that the tradition of Israel's coming out of Egypt was one of long standing."[6]

The need for discussing the latter premise is that many biblical scholars who affirm the historicity of the exodus now date it to the thirteenth century B.C., questioning concrete numbers in the Bible that taken literally would place the exodus in the fifteenth century B.C. The eminent Egyptologist and biblical scholar Kenneth Kitchen is foremost among them: "Thus, if all factors are given their due weight, a 13th-century exodus remains—at present—the least objectionable dating, on a combination of *all* the data (biblical and otherwise) when those data are rightly evaluated and understood in their context."[7] Though Kitchen is a noted scholar in OT history and chronology, the accuracy of his conclusion is disputed.

Wood rejects the 13th-century-exodus theory by a reevaluation of the archaeological evidence pertinent to key Palestinian cities.[8] Young also opposes this trend:

> A date for the exodus in the mid-fifteenth century BC has been much maligned because of favorite theories that identified various pharaohs of a later date with the pharaohs of the oppression and exodus. . . . It is hoped that the present study has strengthened the case for the accuracy of the chronological numbers as preserved in the Masoretic text, and at the same time has helped to discredit theories which put the exodus anywhere but in the middle of the Fifteenth Century BC.[9]

---

[3]Israel Finkelstein, "City-States to States," in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past*, eds. William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003) 81.

[4]Harold Lindsell, *The Battle for the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976) 206.

[5]Donald B. Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1992) 408-9.

[6]Ibid., 412.

[7]Kenneth A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003) 310.

[8]Bryant G. Wood, "The Rise and Fall of the 13th-Century Exodus-Conquest Theory," *JETS* 48/3 (Sep 2005):476.

[9]Rodger C. Young, "When Did Solomon Die?," *JETS* 46/4 (Dec 2003):603.

Young established a fifteenth-century date for the exodus through chronological evidence, but this article seeks to accomplish it through historical evidence, evidence from the reign of Pharaoh Amenhotep II (*ca.* 1455-1418 B.C.).[10] That reign coincides with the one of the exodus-pharaoh according to conventional views of biblical and Egyptian chronology.

Answers to the following questions will show whether Amenhotep II is a viable candidate for the exodus-pharaoh and whether biblical history synchronizes with Egyptian history. Could the eldest son of Amenhotep II have died during the tenth plague as the exodus-pharaoh's son did? Did Amenhotep II die in the Red Sea as the exodus-pharaoh allegedly did?[11] Can any of Amenhotep II's military campaigns be related to the exodus events? Can the loss of over two million Hebrew slaves be accounted for in the records of Amenhotep II's reign? Is there evidence to confirm that Amenhotep II interacted with the Hebrews after they left Egypt? If Amenhotep II is the exodus-pharaoh, could the obliteration of Hatshepsut's image from many Egyptian monuments and inscriptions be a backlash from the exodus?

II. Two Background Matters

Biblical Chronology: Dating the Exodus

The central text for establishing the exact date of the exodus, 1 Kgs 6:1, connects it to later Israelite history by noting that Solomon began constructing the Temple in the 480th year after the exodus, signifying an elapsed time of 479 years.[12] All but the minimalists agree that the 479 years begin with May of 967 or 966 B.C., depending on whether one accepts Young's or Thiele's version of Solomon's regnal dates.[13] Thus the 479 years began in either 1446 or 1445 B.C., either of which can be substantiated by the biblical text and agree with the conclusions of this article.

Case for dating the exodus in 1446 B.C. A compelling argument for choosing 1446 is that the Jubilee cycles agree exactly with that date, yet are completely independent of the 479 years of 1 Kgs 6:1. The Jubilee dates are precise only if the priests began counting years when they entered the land in 1406 B.C. (cf. Lev 25:2-10). The Talmud (*'Arakin* 12b) lists seventeen cycles from Israel's entry until the last Jubilee in 574 B.C., fourteen years after Jerusalem's destruction, a

---

[10]Both here and throughout the present work, any dating that follows the formula, "*ca.* xxxx-yyyy B.C.," signifies the regnal years of a given monarch, unless otherwise noted. The reason for settling on these dates will be discussed subsequently.

[11]It is probably more accurate to refer to the Red Sea as the "Sea of Reeds," but the traditional designation will be used here. For an excellent study on this topic, see Hoffmeier's chap. 9, "The Problem of the Re(e)d Sea" (James K. Hoffmeier, *Israel in Egypt: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Exodus Tradition* [New York: Oxford University, 1996] 199).

[12]Young, "When Did Solomon Die?," 602. A textual variant has arisen in 1 Kgs 6:1, with the original text reading either "480th year" (MT and Vg) or "440th year" (LXX). Though the antiquity of the LXX renders its text important for determining the originality of any variant in the Hebrew Bible, the MT possesses greater authority than any ancient translation, including the LXX (cf. Ernst Würthwein, *Text of the Old Testament*, 2d ed., trans. Erroll Rhodes [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995] 116; Edwin R. Thiele, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* [reprint, Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1994] 90-94). The "480th year" is taken to be original.

[13]Young, "When Did Solomon Die?" 601-2; Thiele, *Mysterious Numbers*, 80. Kitchen also prefers 967 B.C. (Kitchen, *Reliability of the OT* 203).

statement also found in chap. 11 of *The Seder 'Olam*, which predates the Talmud.[14] Consequently, 1446 is preferred over 1445.[15]

Case for dating the exodus to 1267 B.C. Some prefer dating the exodus late, in 1267 B.C., interpreting "480th" figuratively. Actually, "Dating the period of the oppression and exodus to the fifteenth century B.C. has largely been replaced in favor of a thirteenth-century date."[16] One reason for this change is an alleged superior correspondence with the historical and archaeological record, since (1) the earliest extra-biblical attestation to Israel's presence in Canaan is the Merneptah Stele of *ca.* 1219 B.C., and (2) no evidence of the Israelites in Canaan from *ca.* 1400-1200 B.C. exists. However, late-exodus proponents should remember the "invisibility of the Israelites in the archaeology of Canaan between ca. 1200 and 1000" B.C., so the extension of their invisibility by two more centuries should create no additional problem.[17] Moreover, Millard notes by analogy that the Amorites are absent from the archaeology of Babylonia, as only the texts attest to their presence, yet no scholar doubts their impact on Mesopotamia's history in the early second millennium B.C.[18]

A second reason for this change is that Raamses, the store-city that the Israelites built (Exod 1:11), is usually identified with Pi-Ramesses, which flourished from *ca.* 1270-1100 B.C. and was comparable to the largest cities of the Ancient Near East (hereafter, "ANE"), but was built only during the reign of Ramses II (*ca.* 1290-1223 B.C.).[19] Whether or not Exod 1:11 is prophetic, that Pi-Ramesses is biblical Raamses, is not guaranteed. Scolnic warns, "The truth is that there are very few sites indeed that yield the kind of evidence required to make the site identifica-

---

[14]Young, "When Did Solomon Die?" 599-603. Advocates of a thirteenth-century-B.C. exodus have yet to explain the remarkable coincidence of the Jubilee cycles, which align perfectly with the date of 1446 B.C. for the exodus.

[15]Moreover, an exact month and day for the exodus can be deduced, as God both established for Israel a lunar calendar that began with the month of Nisan (originally "Abib," per Exod 13:4) and precisely predicted the day of the exodus. The new moon that began Nisan of 1446 B.C. reportedly occurred at 19:48 UT (Universal Time) on 8 April (Fred Espenak, "Phases of the Moon: -1499 to -1400," http://sunearth.gsfc.nasa.gov/eclipse/phase/phases-1499.html, accessed on 02/20/06), assuming there were no significant variations in the earth's rotation, apart from the roughly 25 seconds per century that NASA allows for the tidal retardation of the earth's rotational velocity. However, factoring in variations caused by differences in points of observation and by the "long day" of Josh 10:13 and the reversed shadow of 2 Kgs 20:10, one can estimate that the first day of Nisan in Egypt fell on Friday, 10 April, 1446 B.C. From here, the biblical text can extrapolate the exodus date. The Lord said that on the tenth day of the month (19 April), each Jewish family was to slaughter an unblemished lamb and eat the Passover Feast (Exod 12:3). On the fifteenth day of the month (before sunset on 25 April), the morning after the Death Angel came at about midnight and struck down all of the firstborn of Egypt (Exod 12:12, 29), the Israelites began their exodus (Exod 12:33, 34, 39; Num 33:3). Since they counted their days from dusk to dusk, the fifteenth day of the month included both the Friday night in which the Death Angel passed over them and Saturday's daytime hours, during which they departed. Therefore, the exodus may be dated with relative confidence to 25 April 1446 B.C.

[16]Hoffmeier, *Israel in Egypt* 124.

[17]Alan Millard, "Amorites and Israelites: Invisible Invaders—Modern Expectation and Ancient Reality," in *The Future of Biblical Archaeology: Reassessing Methodologies and Assumptions*, eds. James K. Hoffmeier and Alan Millard (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004) 152-53.

[18]Ibid., 152.

[19]Hoffmeier, *Israel in Egypt* 119, 125; Wood, "The Rise and Fall" 478; Kitchen, *Reliability of the OT* 255.

tions that we, especially we who are openly interested in religion, yearn to make."[20] Yet presumptuous external arguments have prompted many to advance the date of the exodus forward by two centuries, and have taken 1 Kgs 6:1 as symbolical.

Scholars have proposed two explanations to explain "the 480th" year allegorically, one based on calculating a generation as being twenty years[21] and another based on equal and non-equal components.[22] One weakness with any allegorical interpretation is that in 1 Kgs 6:1, Moses used an ordinal number, not a cardinal, making a figurative use even more inexplicable. Another weakness is that the exodus-pharaoh *followed* an exceedingly lengthy reign, not *boasted* of one, as does Ramses II. Moses fled from pharaoh, who sought to execute him for killing an Egyptian (Exod 2:15), departing from Egypt when he "was approaching the age of forty" (Acts 7:23). Only "after forty years had passed" did the angel speak to him at the burning bush (Acts 7:30), which immediately follows the statement that "in *the course of* those many days, the king of Egypt died" (Exod 2:23). Thus the pharaoh who preceded the exodus-pharaoh must have ruled beyond forty years, a criterion not met by the modest reign of Seti I (*ca.* 1305-1290 B.C.), Ramses II's predecessor.[23]

Additionally, if "480th" merely represents a collection of equally or non-equally divisible components, what is to prevent the subjective periodization of other numbers within Scripture? In Exodus 12:40-41, Moses notes that "at the end of 430 years—to the very day—all the hosts of the Lord departed from the land of Egypt." Does 430 also represent a compilation of time periods? If so, are they divided into 10-year spans, since the number is indivisible by 20? Is the inclusion of the qualifier, "to the very day," simply to be dismissed as a later scribal gloss? Moreover, who can allegorize the number enshrouded in mystery correctly? Even opponents of biblical inerrancy recognize the folly of such allegorization, one calling it the devising of "ingenious solutions. The most common trick has been to reduce time spans to generations: thus the 480 figure must really represent twelve generations."

The preference must be for understanding 1 Kgs 6:1 literally. Cassuto studied ascending and descending Hebrew numbers.[24] As Wood notes from this study, a number written in ascending order—as with "eightieth and four-hundredth" in 1 Kgs 6:1—is always "intended to be a technically precise figure."[25] Besides, no allegorical use of "480th" adequately replaces its natural use. Since the advocates of

---

[20]Benjamin Edidin Scolnic, "A New Working Hypothesis for the Identification of Migdol," in *Future of Biblical Archaeology* 91.

[21]Hoffmeier, *Israel in Egypt* 125.

[22]Kitchen, *Reliability of the OT* 308-9. The nine, 40-year periods include, (1) Egypt to Sinai to Jordan (Num 11:33); (2) Othniel's rule (Judg 3:11); (3-4) Eighty years of peace after Ehud (Judg 3:30); (5) Peace after Deborah (Judg 5:31); (6) Gideon (Judg 8:28); (7) Eli (1 Sam 4:18); (8) Samson's judgeship and Samuel's floruit (Judg 15:20; 1 Sam 7:2); and (9) David's reign (1 Kgs 2:11). The five aggregate periods include, (1) Forty-eight years for Abimelek, Tola, and Jair; (2) Thirty-one years for Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon; (3) Thirty-two years for Saul's reign, (4) four years for Solomon's reign; and (5) five theoretical years for the rule of Joshua and the elders of his era.

[23]In contrast, Thutmose III, the father and predecessor of Amenhotep II who ruled just under fifty-four years, is the *only* other pharaoh of the Eighteenth or Nineteenth Dynasty to rule over forty years. This factor, combined with all of the other evidence, causes one writer to declare, "Thutmose III must be the ruler whose death is recorded in Exodus 2:23" (John Rea, "The Time of the Oppression and Exodus," *Grace Journal* 2/1 [Winter 1961]:11).

[24]Umberto Cassuto, *The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961) 52.

[25]Wood, "The Rise and Fall" 482.

a late exodus are more driven by arguments from silence that the Israelites could not have inhabited Canaan before the thirteenth century B.C. than by textual evidence, this number should be taken literally, reinforcing 1446 B.C. as the year of the exodus.

Egyptian Chronology: Dating the Pharaonic Reigns

Before determining whether Amenhotep II is a viable candidate for the exodus-pharaoh, one must synchronize the date of the exodus with Egyptian history. Though inspiration does not extend to extra-biblical literature or ancient inscriptions, some extant writings are trustworthy. Several factors are relevant.

First, the Ebers Papyrus, an ancient Egyptian manuscript that dates the heliacal rising of Sothis in Year 9, Month 3, Season 3, Day 9 (*ca*. 15 May) of Amenhotep I's reign, records this astronomical event that assigns its composition to an identifiable time in the Eighteenth Dynasty.[26] Since astronomers can pinpoint this event by charting the positions of stars in antiquity, the papyrus can be dated to *ca*. 1541 B.C., making the initial regnal year *ca*. 1550 B.C.. This widely accepted dating is based on the ancient capital of Memphis as the point of observation, despite the Theban provenance of the papyrus. A Theban point of observation, which is accepted by other Egyptologists, dates the papyrus to *ca*. 1523 B.C.[27] Though the Egyptians never stated where they observed the Sothic rising, Olympiodorus noted in A.D. 6 that it was celebrated at Alexandria, after being observed at Memphis.[28] Therefore, Memphis is the probable correct point of observation for the rising.

Second, even without astronomical dating, the chronology of Egypt in the mid-1400s B.C. remains sure. Ward notes that "New Kingdom chronology can be fairly well established on the basis of the monuments and synchronisms, without recourse to the astronomical material."[29] As for the Eighteenth Dynasty, he adds that the 25-year gap separating current theories on its starting date narrows to a scant three or four years by the middle of the dynasty, meaning that most mainstream Egyptologists consider the dating of Egypt's exodus-era history to be fixed and reliable.[30]

Last, regnal dates of Eighteenth-Dynasty pharaohs from the Ebers Papyrus to the exodus are fixed with relative certainty. With firm regnal dates for Amenhotep I, the reigns of the subsequent Eighteenth-Dynasty pharaohs down to Amenhotep II

---

[26]The Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt (*ca*. 1560-1307 B.C.) saw the reunification of Egypt after an era of foreign rule under the Hyksos and initiated a radically new era. The northward thrusts of Theban dynasts continued until Thutmose I crossed the Euphrates River in *ca*. 1524 B.C.. Egypt also expanded into Sudan, building many temples at Gebel Barkal, about 1,280 mi south of Memphis. The state accrued vast riches through foreign expeditions that changed Egyptian society. The nation no longer functioned in isolation, but Egypt interacted with Mitanni, the Hittites, Assyria, Babylonia, and a host of principalities in Syria and Palestine (William W. Hallo and William Kelly Simpson, *The Ancient Near East: A History*, 2d ed. [Fort Worth, Tex.: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1998] 253).

[27]William A. Ward, "The Present Status of Egyptian Chronology," *BASOR* 288 (Nov 1992):58-59. Not all scholars are convinced that astronomical evidence provides "benchmark dates" for the reigns of given pharaohs (ibid., 53, 54). Uncertainty about dates, however, does not characterize all regnal dating, but rather only that of selected rulers. Therefore, if direct evidence of an absolute date that is fixed to a time in the reign of a pharaoh is connected to a series of predecessors or successors whose regnal lengths are certain, benchmark dates can be assigned to their reigns.

[28]Ibid., 59.

[29]Ibid., 56. Egypt's New Kingdom (*ca*. 1560-1069 B.C.) consists of Dynasties 18-20.

[30]Ibid.

are as follows: Thutmose I (*ca.* 1529-1516 B.C.), Thutmose II (*ca.* 1516-1506 B.C.), Queen Hatshepsut (*ca.* 1504-1484 B.C.), Thutmose III (*ca.* 1506-1452 B.C.), and Amenhotep II (*ca.* 1455-1418 B.C.).[31] With these reigns chronologically ordered, a positive evaluation of Amenhotep II's candidacy for the exodus-pharaoh is possible.

III. The Tenth Plague and the Firstborn Son of Amenhotep II

God told Moses that he would harden pharaoh's heart and that pharaoh would refuse to free the Israelites (Exod 4:21). God then instructed Moses to tell pharaoh, "Thus says the Lord, 'Israel is my son, my firstborn. And I said to you, "Let my son go, that he may serve me." But you have refused to let him go. Behold, I will kill your son, your firstborn'" (Exod 4:22b-23). After the ninth plague, God repeated this prediction: "[A]ll the firstborn in the land of Egypt will die, from the firstborn of the pharaoh who sits on his throne" (Exod 11:5). The challenge is to identify the eldest son of Amenhotep II. Several candidates are possible.

Was it Thutmose IV? For the exodus-pharaoh, the worst part of God's prediction of judgment was that his own firstborn son would die. If Amenhotep II was the exodus-pharaoh, his firstborn son had to die before ruling, which the historical record should confirm. The son who succeeded Amenhotep II was Thutmose IV (*ca.* 1418-1408 B.C.), whose Dream Stele—which is located between the paws of the Great Sphinx—reveals that he was not the original heir to the throne.[32] Moreover, inscriptional and papyritious evidence confirms that Thutmose IV was not the eldest son of Amenhotep II.

Was it Prince Amenhotep? The papyrus British Museum 10056 (hereinafter BM 10056) speaks of "Prince Amenhotep." The only title used of him, apart from "king's son," is "*sm*-priest."[33] To which Amenhotep is the scribe referring? Although the year is completely lost from the regnal date on this manuscript, the surviving month (4) and day (1) mark precisely the date of Amenhotep II's accession, implying that Prince Amenhotep was his son.[34] This prince almost certainly resided in or near Memphis,[35] due to his office being connected to the high priesthood of Ptah.[36]

---

[31]Egyptologists disagree over the year of Thutmose III's accession, with three views predominant: *ca.* 1504 B.C., *ca.* 1490 B.C., and *ca.* 1479 B.C. (Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel* 104). The year 1504 is preferred because of its exclusive agreement with the Ebers Papyrus when assuming a Memphite point of observation for the rising of Sothis. Shea agrees (William Shea, "Amenhotep II as Pharaoh," *Bible and Spade* 16/2 [2003]:43). The date used here dates back two years from the standard number, in order to harmonize with the second Palestinian campaign of Amenhotep II to be discussed later. This alteration is justifiable either by the uncertain regnal length of Thutmose II, whose reign lasted no less than four years or more than twelve years (Amélie Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East ca. 3000-330 B.C.*, vol. 1 [London: Routledge, 1995] 1:191), or by the existence of a variable of ±6 years after calculating the date for the rising of Sothis (W. S. LaSor, "Egypt," in *ISBE*, vol. 2 [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982] 40).

[32]Peter Der Manuelian, *Studies in the Reign of Amenophis II* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1987) 40.

[33]Donald B. Redford, "The Coregency of Tuthmosis III and Amenophis II," *JEA* 51 (Dec 1965):111.

[34]Ibid., 110.

[35]Upon Amenhotep I's death, Thebes was the most prominent city of the native Egyptians, but Thutmose I, who did not descend from his predecessor, moved the chief residence of the Egyptian court from Thebes to Memphis, where he constructed a royal palace that was used until the reign of Akhenaten (*ca.* 1369-1352 B.C.). Memphis was also the headquarters of the pharaonic braintrust, where great military campaigns were planned, and Egyptian soldiers were "armed before pharaoh." In fact, all of the Asiatic military campaigns of Thutmose III and Amenhotep II were launched from Memphis, the residence for pharaonic successors who were coregents (Kuhrt, *Ancient Near East* 191; Sir Alan

The late Eighteenth Dynasty attests to numerous high priests of Ptah. Their order and tenures in no way prohibit counting the Prince Amenhotep of BM 10056 among them. Actually, a significant gap occurs in the *sm*-priest list between the end of Thutmose III's reign and the beginning of Thutmose IV's reign. This gap, which encompasses the reign of Amenhotep II, can partially be filled with the service of Prince Amenhotep. Redford confidently identifies this prince with another royal personage: the king's son whom Selim Hassan dubbed "Prince B," who erected the wall-carved stele in the Sphinx temple of Amenhotep II.[37] Three factors support the identification of Prince B with Prince Amenhotep: (1) both were the son of a king; (2) Amenhotep II was the father of both; and (3) they both resided at Memphis, functioning in the role of *sm*-priest.

Prince B/Amenhotep undoubtedly was an important figure, as he was called the "one who enters before his father without being announced, providing protection for the King of Upper and Lower Egypt," and "commander of the horses."[38] Since his name was enclosed in a cartouche, he was the heir apparent when the stele was carved, meaning that he stood in line for the throne ahead of Thutmose IV, who obviously was his younger brother. Therefore, some conclusions about this prince may be drawn: (1) he was the royal son of Amenhotep II; (2) he was never called "the king's eldest son"; (3) he served as the *sm*-priest and lived in the royal palace at Memphis; (4) he was once the heir to the throne; (5) he lived approximately until Year 30 or 35 of his father's reign; and (6) he never ascended to the throne.[39] If this prince was the heir to the throne without being firstborn, who was the eldest son?

Another candidate for the eldest son of Amenhotep II is an unattested "Thutmose." Redford, who considers the exodus as mythical, may supply the answer: "The fact that he (Prince B/Amenhotep) was named Amenhotep like his father might

---

Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs* [New York: Oxford University, 1976] 177). Regarding Amenhotep II's youth, Grimal notes, "That the young prince should have been active at Memphis is no surprise, for it was there that all young heirs to the throne had been brought up since the time of Thutmose I" (Nicolas Grimal, *A History of Ancient Egypt*, trans. Ian Shaw [Oxford: Blackwell, 1992] 220). Thus Thutmose I was an excellent candidate for the pharaoh who instructed the chief Hebrew midwives, requesting the execution of the newborn Israelite boys (Exod 1:15). Numerous summonings of these midwives, whose authoritative rank necessitated their proximity to national Israel in Goshen, implies their proximity to pharaoh, a requirement easily satisfied if pharaoh was in Memphis, but not in Thebes. "The journey from Memphis to Thebes [alone] would have been a slow one of perhaps two to three weeks" (Joyce Tyldesley, *Hatchepsut: The Female Pharaoh* [London: Viking, 1996] 36). A slow pace from Goshen to Memphis, which did not require the same upward walk as did a trip to Thebes, required a mere 1½ to 2½ days. Pharaoh's messengers probably traveled to Goshen on horseback with even a shorter travel time. Wood identifies Ezbet Helmi, located just over one mile southwest of Pi-Ramesses, as the royal residence of the exodus-pharaoh during the Israelites' stay in Goshen (Wood, "The Rise and Fall" 482). Though this may have been the site of two palace structures (ibid., 483), no epigraphical evidence confirms that Amenhotep II ever resided there. The discovery of a scarab with his royal cartouche at Ezbet Helmi no more proves his personal occupation of the city (ibid., 484) than the discovery of a scarab with his cartouche at Gibeon proves he resided on the Central Benjamin Plateau (James B. Pritchard, *Gibeon: Where the Sun Stood Still* [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1962] 156). Memphis, a known royal residence of Amenhotep II, is a far better candidate for the Delta site where the exodus-pharaoh interacted with Moses.

[36]Other New-Kingdom princes who were *sm*-priests also functioned as chief pontiffs at Memphis, such as "the king's son and *sm*-priest, Thutmose," who appears with his father, Amenhotep III, at his burial in the Serapeum (Redford, "Coregency of Tuthmosis III" 111).

[37]Ibid., 112, 114.

[38]Ibid., 114.

[39]Ibid., 110, 114.

be taken to indicate that he was not the firstborn, that an older son named Thutmose had been born to Amenhotep II. It would be necessary to assume, however, that this Thutmose had passed away in childhood without leaving a trace."[40] Redford suggests that the practice of these pharaohs was not to name their firstborn sons after themselves, but to use the alternate birth-name. If Prince Amenhotep was not the eldest son of Amenhotep II, who by custom would have named his first son "Thutmose," then the Thutmose sitting on the lap of Hekreshu, the royal tutor, on the wall of Tomb 64 in Thebes may be "the eldest son" of the king.[41] Therefore, if Amenhotep II was the exodus-pharaoh, perhaps his eldest son Thutmose died early in the reign without leaving a trace, thus satisfying both the historical and biblical records (Exod 12:29).

IV. Theory of the Exodus-Pharaoh Dying in the Red Sea

Although the Christian community historically has accepted that the exodus-pharaoh died in the Red Sea when his army drowned, Exodus has no such statement, nor is it stated anywhere else in Scripture.[42] One of the most important principles that seminary studies taught the present writer is, "Say everything the text says; say no more, and say no less!" Saying more than what is written is eisegesis, i.e., reading into the text what the interpreter presupposes it to say. Regarding the fate of this pharaoh, Moses states that the Lord would "be honored through pharaoh" by the destruction of his army (Exod 14:4), but he never speaks of pharaoh's death.

Ps 106:11 as Proof of the Exodus-Pharaoh's Death in the Red Sea

Supporters of the view that pharaoh died in the Red Sea often appeal to Ps 106:11. The setting is the Red-Sea rebellion that was instigated by "the (Israelite) fathers [who were] in Egypt" (Ps 106:7). God parted the waters "that he might make his power known" (Ps 106:8). After describing the parting (Ps 106:9), the psalmist adds, "And he saved them from the hand of the one who hated them and redeemed them from the hand of the enemy; the waters covered their adversaries; not one of them was left" (Ps 106:10-11). The adversaries are obviously the Egyptian soldiers, the enemies who were haters of the Jews.

Allegedly, pharaoh—the chief adversary—was among the smitten Egyptians. If Amenhotep II actually was the exodus-pharaoh, then his reign ended abruptly during the year of the exodus, or *ca.* 1446 B.C.. Since he ruled at least 26 years, which will be shown below, if he was the exodus-pharaoh, his reign had to begin by *ca.* 1471 B.C. The weakness with the Red-Sea-death theory, though, is that it cannot be synchronized with the reigns of the previous five pharaohs, whose regnal dates are known, and fixed by the Ebers Papyrus. Since they are known—except for that of Thutmose II, whose rule lasted between four and twelve years—Amenhotep II's ninth year could not have begun in or before *ca.* 1471 B.C. Even if Thutmose II ruled for a minimum of four years, the reign of Amenhotep II had to begin in *ca.* 1462 B.C. or later, leaving nine years too few for the reigns of all of the intervening monarchs. Therefore, due to the limitations that represent fixed points in biblical and

---

[40]Ibid., 114.

[41]Ibid., 114-15.

[42]Wood, "The Rise and Fall," 478. Shea correctly notes that "Ex 14-15 is not directly explicit upon this point," though he subsequently takes an unjustified logical leap by extrapolating, "but it is the logical inference there [that pharaoh also drowned]" (Shea, "Amenhotep II as Pharaoh" 46).

Egyptian chronologies, if he was the exodus-pharaoh, Amenhotep II could not have died in the Red-Sea incident.

If the exodus-pharaoh lived through the Red-Sea massacre, Ps 106:11 remains uncompromised. The text never specifically mentions pharaoh, so there is no reason to conclude that he died by drowning. The hater and enemy of Israel is Egypt as a collective whole, and certainly not every Egyptian drowned in the Red Sea when "the water covered their adversaries," so God delivered his people from Egypt itself. Only those Egyptian adversaries—as national representatives—who chased the Israelites into the sea were consumed by water, and since they were the taskforce dispatched on this mission, their defeat signals the demise of the entire nation. Moreover, not one of these representatives, who comprised the bulk of pharaoh's vast imperial army, survived after the dividing walls of the sea collapsed. This is confirmed by the Mosaic text that probably provided the basis for the psalmist's words: "The waters returned and covered the chariots and the horsemen, even in Pharaoh's entire army that had gone into the sea after them; not even one of them remained" (Exod 14:28).

Ps 136:15 as Proof of the Exodus-Pharaoh's Death in the Red Sea

The text most frequently used to prove that pharaoh died with his army is Ps 136:15: "But He overthrew pharaoh and His army in the Red Sea. . . ." A cursory reading of the text leads most to believe that because God "overthrew" pharaoh and his army, both parties must have died.[43] However, the Hebrew verb נער (*n'r*, "he shook off") shows that God actually "shook off" the powerful pharaoh and his army, who were bothersome pests that God—whose might is far greater than theirs—merely brushed away. The same Hebrew verb is used in Ps 109:23, where David laments, "I am gone like a shadow when it lengthens; I am shaken off like the locust." Here, he describes the sad condition of his suffering and being cast away. The verb indicates that David has become as a locust that is casually flicked away from a garment. David was not describing his own death. The context of Psalm 136, which states that God "brought Israel out from their midst . . . with a strong hand and an outstretched arm" (Ps 136:11-12), confirms that the unequalled might of God is the thrust of the passage, accentuating the ease with which He shook off Israel's adversary, pharaoh and the mighty Egyptian army.

Another argument against the view that Ps 136:15 signals the death of pharaoh is that the verse probably alludes to Exod 14:27, which uses the same verb for "shake off," but omits pharaoh from among those whom the Lord shook off. Instead, the text clearly states, "I [God] will be honored through pharaoh and all his army, and the Egyptians will know that I am the Lord" (Exod 14:4; cf. 14:17). God was honored through pharaoh in the mass destruction of his army, but pharaoh did not have to die for this to occur.[44] In Ps 136:15, the psalm writer was not rejoicing over the death of anyone, but that almighty God shook off the Egyptians by freeing Israel from their enemy's clutches.

---

[43]Wood, "The Rise and Fall" 478.

[44]Shea disagrees: "Yahweh says that he will get glory over pharaoh. While some of that glory could be maintained by his loss of troops in the Sea of Reeds, if he escaped with his own life, some of that glory could have been diminished" (Shea, "Amenhotep II as Pharaoh" 46). This is not true. God displayed his glory by decimating Sennacherib's army when the Assyrians marched against Judah and Sennacherib escaped (2 Kgs 19:35), but it was not diminished when Sennacherib returned unscathed.

The Death and Regnal Length of Amenhotep II

Under what circumstances did Amenhotep II die? Fortunately, his mummified corpse has been preserved.[45] Victor Loret, fresh from his discovery of the tomb of Thutmose III in the Valley of the Kings, discovered the royal tomb of Amenhotep II on March 9, 1898. Confirmation that this burial chamber belonged to Amenhotep II came when Loret identified his nomen and praenomen on the painted, quartzite sarcophagus. This magnificent sepulcher represented a first for the excavations in the Valley of the Kings, as the king actually was found in place in his own sarcophagus, albeit lying in a replacement cartonnage coffin.[46]

The length of the reign and the date of death of Amenhotep II is open to question. Though Thutmose III is documented to have died in Year 54, no evidence exists to date explicitly the regnal year of Amenhotep II's death. The highest known regnal date among the indisputable evidence, Year 26, is inscribed on a wine juglet from the king's Theban funerary temple.[47] Redford, using questionable logic, asserts that since the juglet was found in the king's funerary temple, Year 26 represents the end of his reign.[48] Wente and Van Siclen dispute this assertion, though, showing evidence of the long-term storage of wine, and the active functioning of Egyptian mortuary temples long before the deaths of the pharaohs for whom they were built.[49]

Another possible length of his reign is 30 or 35 years. One source contributing to the argument that Amenhotep II reigned *over* 26 years is BM 10056. One scholar dates a fragmentary regnal year in v. 9,8 of this papyrus to "Year 30," though he admits that the number also could be read differently, such as "Year 35."[50] If one of these readings is correct, Amenhotep II's reign lasted at least thirty years, maybe thirty-five. Many scholars have postulated that he reigned beyond thirty years because he observed a regnal jubilee called a *sed* festival, a celebration that historically marked the thirtieth year of a pharaoh's reign. Though the *sed* festival was used for centuries to honor this regnal anniversary,[51] Der Manuelian warns against concluding too much about the regnal length of Amenhotep II just because he celebrated one: "No dates accompany the jubilee monuments (of Amenhotep II), and our understanding of the jubilee institution is too imperfect to allow us to assign

---

[45]No doubt exists among Egyptologists that this mummy is the corpse of Amenhotep II. His physical features bear a marked resemblance to his father and his son (James E. Harris and Kent R. Weeks, *X-Raying the Pharaohs* [New York: Scribners, 1973] 138).

[46]Nicholas Reeves, *Ancient Egypt: The Great Discoveries* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2000) 103.

[47]The king's praenomen is inscribed on one side of the jar, while the other side is inscribed with "Year 26" and "Panehsy," the name of the king's vintner (Der Manuelian, *Amenophis II* 42).

[48]Redford's assumes that wine had to be consumed not long after the bottling process (Donald B. Redford, "On the Chronology of the Egyptian Eighteenth Dynasty," *JNES* 25 [1966]:119).

[49]E. F. Wente and C. C. Van Siclen III, "A Chronology of the New Kingdom," in *Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 39 (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1976) 228.

[50]Redford, "Coregency of Tuthmosis III" 110.

[51]The Twelfth-Dynasty pharaoh Sesostris I (*ca.* 1960-1916 B.C.) erected two obelisks in front of the temple pylon at Heliopolis on the occasion of his first *sed* festival, commemorating his thirtieth regnal year (Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt* 164). During the Eighteenth Dynasty, Thutmose III seemingly celebrated a *sed* festival in his thirtieth year as well; Redford suggests that the year of rest from Asiatic campaigning between Thutmose III's sixth and seventh campaigns, which corresponds precisely to his Year 30, signifies a "holiday year" used to celebrate this landmark anniversary (Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel* 158).

an automatic '30th year' at every mention of a *hb-sed* festival."[52]

Caution must be exercised before automatically assigning a thirty-year reign to every pharaoh who celebrated this event, but the *sed* festival of Amenhotep II may just signify that his reign exceeded thirty years. More conclusive than the *sed*-festival evidence is that on Thutmose IV's Lateran Obelisk, which was erected thirty-five years after the death of Thutmose III, to whom it was dedicated. Wente and Van Siclen suggest that the thirty-five years marks the length of the interceding reign of Amenhotep II minus the coregency with his father, which is known to be 2 1/3 years.[53] If their argumentation is correct, Amenhotep II reigned 37 1/3 years, and was fifty-five at death.[54]

If this last regnal-year estimate is accurate, a lifespan of fifty-five years for Amenhotep II is deduced by adding his 37 1/3-year reign to the eighteen years he lived before his coronation, a number taken from the larger of the two Sphinx Stelae of Amenhotep II: "Now his majesty appeared as king as a fine youth . . . having completed 18 years in his strength . . . ; now after these things, his majesty appeared as king."[55] An X-ray investigation of the royal mummies may assist in dating his regnal length. The mummy of Amenhotep II is estimated to have been forty-five at death,[56] meaning that a fifty-five-year lifespan exceeds the projections of the X-ray evidence, and thus is "an impossibly high result according to the medical evidence."[57] Robins, however, is convinced that when identifying a pharaoh's age at death, there is good reason to cast doubt on X-ray evidence as a whole.[58] Support

----

[52]Der Manuelian, *Amenophis II* 43.

[53]Wente and Van Siclen III, "Chronology of the New Kingdom" 227-28. The occurrence of a coregency under Thutmose III and Amenhotep II is essentially undisputed among conservative Egyptologists, as supporting evidence for it is plentiful. See Redford, "Coregency of Tuthmosis III" 116; Der Manuelian, *Amenophis II* 24; and Richard A. Parker, "Once Again the Coregency of Thutmose III and Amenhotep II," in *Studies in Honor of John A. Wilson*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 35 (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1969) 228.

[54]Shea disputes the notion of a coregency under Thutmose III and Amenhotep II, though he formerly advocated one. He builds his position on the presupposition that Amenhotep II died in the Red Sea. The proof Shea presents is that Amenhotep II reportedly launched two "first campaigns." According to Shea's theory, a successor (Amenhotep IIB) was secretly and deceitfully placed on the throne after Amenhotep IIA drowned in the Red Sea, but with the caveat that the later pharaoh used the same birth name and throne name as his deceased predecessor, thus completing the reign of "Amenhotep II" as an imposter (Shea, "Amenhotep II as Pharaoh" 44-46). This theory is weak, however, because it is based on the presupposition that the exodus-pharaoh died in the Red Sea, a presumption already shown to be inaccurate. If the two "first campaigns" of Amenhotep II were only one campaign, which will be proven subsequently, Shea loses all impetus for his fantastic claim. Moreover, he provides no precedent for two pharaohs ruling under the same name.

[55]Redford, "Coregency of Tuthmosis III" 117.

[56]Vandersleyen notes that in spite of the good physical development of Amenhotep II, an examination of his mummy reveals that he was of average height and died at about forty-four years of age (Claude Vandersleyen, *L'Egypte et la Vallée du Nil*, vol. 2 [Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1995] 336). Harris and Weeks, adding that his wavy hair was brown with gray at the temple, suggest that he was forty-five at death (Harris and Weeks, *X-Raying* 138).

[57]Der Manuelian, *Amenophis II* 44.

[58]G. Robins, "The Value of the Estimated Ages of the Royal Mummies at Death as Historical Evidence," *Göttinger Miszellen* 45 (1981):63-68.

for this criticism is found in the discrepancy related to Thutmose III's lifespan.[59] Though he lived at least until age fifty-five, his mummy reportedly displays skeletal features of a 40-45 year-old man, meaning that with X-ray evidence his mummy appears no less than 10-15 years younger than his actual age at death.[60] Thus the 10-year discrepancy for Amenhotep II is not problematic, and a reign of 37 1/3 years appears realistic.

V. The Second Asiatic Campaign as a Result of the Exodus

Great Reduction in Campaigning and Expansionism

The renowned conqueror, Thutmose III, led seventeen military campaigns into the Levant, but his son—in stark contrast—led only two or three. Though many scholars have attempted to determine the exact number, a virtual dearth of discussion deals with this sharp decline. Aharoni attributes it to an underlying diminishment of Egyptian power: "Already in the days of Amenhotep II, the son of Thutmose III, cracks began to appear in the structure of the Egyptian Empire."[61] Vandersleyen hints at the dissipation of Egypt's might by the end of Amenhotep II's reign: "It seems possible to consider this reign as unsuccessful, a time of decline: a few exploits abroad, a few preserved memorials, an almost complete absence of sources after the ninth year of the reign."[62] Yet the intervening years featured neither Egypt's engagement/loss in war nor a significant change in the political climate. Der Manuelian writes, "Despite Thutmose III's military success, Mitanni remained Egypt's primary adversary in Dynasty 18, and there is no reason to doubt her continued aggressive policy in the reign of the young king Amenhotep II."[63]

Although this may be true, Amenhotep II's Year-9 campaign was the last to pit Egypt against Mitanni. During the reign of Thutmose IV, Mitanni—under threat from the Hittite King Tudhaliyas II—attempted to forge an alliance with its Egyptian arch enemy, demonstrating a complete reversal in relations between these formerly incompatible superpowers. EA (Amarna Letter) 109 reveals that by the mid-fourteenth century B.C., Egypt held only nominal control of Palestine, as they no longer struck fear into the Canaanite rulers.[64] One author notes that "this relative military inertness lasted until Horemheb's coming to power" in *ca.* 1335 B.C.[65] How does one explain this great disparity in Egypt's campaigning, the uncharacteristic change in political policy toward their bitter enemy to the north, and Egypt's general

---

[59]Though Thutmose III's exact age at his accession is unknown, his reign lasted into his fifty-fourth regnal year. According to Brugsch-Bey, he reigned 53 years, 11 months, and 1 day (Heinrich Brugsch-Bey, *Egypt Under the Pharaohs* [London: Bracken Books, 1902] 193), and Tyldesley claims that he reigned 53 years, 10 months, and 26 days (Tyldesley, *Hatchepsut* 96, 215).

[60]Harris and Weeks, *X-Raying* 138.

[61]Yohanan Aharoni and Michael Avi-Yonah, *The Macmillan Bible Atlas* (New York: Macmillan, 1977) 34.

[62]Vandersleyen, *L'Egypte* 2:341.

[63]Der Manuelian, *Amenophis II* 59.

[64]"Previously, on seeing a man from Egypt, the kings of Canaan fled bef[ore him, but] now the sons of Abdi-Ashirta make men from Egypt prowl about [like do]gs" (*The Amarna Letters*, ed. and trans. William L. Moran [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1992] 183).

[65]Vandersleyen, *L'Egypte* 2:333. This and all subsequent quotes by Vandersleyen are translated into English from the original French by Lydia Polyakova and Inna Kumpyak. Horemheb reigned from *ca.* 1335-1307 B.C.

loss of power and imperialistic dominance?

Shortage of records of Amenhotep II's relative military inertness cannot be accounted for by his modesty. He recorded his military excursions into Asia in *The Annals of Amenhotep II*, which contain not a complete, daily record of each stop on the routes, but only a selection of the events that accentuate his courage and present him in a positive light.[66] Pritchard adds, "Amenhotep II gloried in his reputation for personal strength and prowess. His records, therefore, contrast with those of his predecessor and father, Thutmose III, in emphasizing individual achievement."[67] Amenhotep II's exploits were motivated by a thirst for universal fame and glory.

The Number of Amenhotep II's Asiatic Campaigns

Prior to the discovery of the Memphis Stele, most scholars assumed that both Amenhotep II's Asiatic campaign recounted on the fragmentary Karnak Stele and the operations against Takhsi mentioned in the Amada and Elephantine Stelae describe one event. With the Memphis Stele's discovery, it is still possible that the Karnak, Amada, and Elephantine Stelae refer to a common campaign, but the notion of only one campaign was proven false, since the Memphis Stele clearly delineates two distinct, separately numbered campaigns.[68] However, its text presents a dilemma: "The translator finds it impossible to reconcile the dates in these several stelae."[69] The available evidence allows for two views: (1) Amenhotep II conducted three Asiatic campaigns; (2) Amenhotep II conducted two Asiatic campaigns. Relevant ancient evidence solves this dispute, which is critical to this pharaoh's biography.

Two sources record multiple Asiatic campaigns under Amenhotep II, the Memphis and Karnak Stelae—partial duplicates in content. Both stelae are attributed to him, as they begin with his complete titulary. The Memphis Stele, later reused by a Twenty-First-Dynasty prince as part of the ceiling of his burial chamber (*ca.* 875 B.C.), offers the more extensive text. It presents both an earlier campaign in central and northern Syria, and a later one in Palestine, dating "his first victorious campaign" to Year 7, Month 1, Season 3, Day 25 (*ca.* 15 May) and "his second victorious campaign" to Year 9, Month 3, Season 1, Day 25 (*ca.* 15 November).[70]

Another source, the Karnak Stele, which lies to the south of the Eighth Pylon at Karnak, is more damaged than the Memphis Stele. It consists of a two-part relief, each displaying a pharaoh who is presenting an offering to Amun-Re. Between the two parts is a vertical line of text that records the restoration of the monument by Seti I.[71] Whether this stele originally bore the same dates as the Memphis Stele is unknown, but that the Karnak Stele describes the same two campaigns as the Memphis Stele is clear. In fact, Hoffmeier refers to them as "two nearly identical stelae," though the Karnak Stele devotes much less space to the second campaign

---

[66]Yohanan Aharoni, "Some Geographical Remarks Concerning the Campaigns of Amenhotep II," in *JNES* 19/3 (July 1960):177.

[67]James B. Pritchard, *ANET* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 1950) 245.

[68]Redford, "Coregency of Tuthmosis III" 118.

[69]Pritchard, *ANET* 245.

[70]Ibid., 245-46; Redford, "Coregency of Tuthmosis III" 119.

[71]Henry Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, vol. 2 (Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois, 2001) 305.

than does the Memphis Stele.[72] Both stelae were hacked-up during the Amarna Revolution and restored during the Nineteenth Dynasty, with poorer restoration on the Karnak Stele.[73] Its postscript names Thutmose as the erector, assumed to be Thutmose IV, who apparently erected the stele after his accession.[74]

The Amada and Elephantine Stelae also offer evidence regarding the number of campaigns. They speak of a "first victorious campaign" of Amenhotep II, during which seven Syrian chiefs were captured in the region of Takhsi. Both texts state that they were erected "after his majesty returned from Upper Retenu, having felled all those who had rebelled against him while he was extending the borders of Egypt.[75] His majesty came joyously to his father Amun, having slain with his own bludgeon the seven chiefs who were in the district of Takhsi."[76] Both stelae commence with this date: Year 3, Month 3, Season 3, Day 15 (*ca*. 4 July), which coincides with a celebration after the Egyptians returned from the first campaign.[77] This date demonstrates that the "first victorious campaign" transpired no later than Year 3 of Amenhotep II. How can the Year-3 date on these stelae be resolved with the Year-7 date on the Memphis Stele when both describe his first campaign?

Through use of these sources one can evaluate the two theories of how many campaigns. (1) Many scholars believe that Amenhotep II campaigned three times into Asia, with two options offered to resolve the conflicting information on the stelae. Option one: The numbering of campaigns is particular to individual stelae. Drioton and Vandier suggest that Amenhotep II undertook Asiatic campaigns in Years 3, 7, and 9, and that the "first victorious campaign" on the Memphis Stele is the first of two campaigns described on *that particular* stele.[78] Thus the scribe merely used "first" and "second" to distinguish from one another the two campaigns on the stele. The problem with this theory is that within Egyptian historiography, this method of dating military campaigns is unparalleled. The practice would be strange indeed among Eighteenth-Dynasty pharaohs, since the expression consistently refers not to successively numbered campaigns in one record, but to chronologically tallied campaigns that occurred over the course of a king's reign.[79] The 17 campaigns of Thutmose III, for example, are numbered successively throughout his reign.

[72]James K. Hoffmeier, "The Memphis and Karnak Stelae of Amenhotep II," in *The Context of Scripture: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*, vol. 2, ed. William W. Hallo (Leiden: Brill, 2000) 19.

[73]Pritchard, *ANET* 245; Redford, "Coregency of Tuthmosis III" 119.

[74]Breasted, *Ancient Records* 2:309.

[75]The word "Retenu," an Egyptian term used of Syro-Palestine, is found in the account of Thutmose III's first Asiatic campaign, during which the Egyptians besieged Megiddo for seven months. When the city fell in December of Year 22, all of the Canaanite leaders—with the exception of the king of Kadesh, who had fled—fell in one stroke. Once these petty kings were in Egyptian hands, they were required to take this vow: "The lands of Retenu will not rebel again on another occasion," and, "We will never again act evilly against Men-kheper-Re (Thutmose III)—who lives forever, our good lord—in our lifetime" (Pritchard, *ANET* 238; Hoffmeier, "Memphis and Karnak Stelae," in *Context of Scripture* 2:16). Since city-states throughout Syro-Palestine were involved in this rebellion, the territory of the kings of Retenu who pledged perpetual loyalty to Thutmose III must have comprised both Syria and Palestine.

[76]Redford, "Coregency of Tuthmosis III" 119.

[77]Pritchard, *ANET* 245.

[78]Eitienne Drioton and Jacques Vandier, *L'Egypte* (Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1938) 406, 663.

[79]Redford, "Coregency of Tuthmosis III" 120.

Option two: The numbering of campaigns differs from coregent status to sole-ruler status. This variation dates one victorious campaign to his coregency with Thutmose III, and the other to his sole rule. Like Drioton and Vandier, Badawy, Edel, and Alt also separate the Takhsi campaign from those described on the Memphis Stele, postulating Asiatic campaigns in Years 3, 7, and 9. Alt asserts that "first victorious campaign" is used correctly on the Amada, Elephantine, and Memphis Stelae. The earlier "first victorious campaign" occurred in Year 3, during the coregency, while the latter one transpired in Year 7, on his first military excursion as an independent monarch. To accent his own achievement, Amenhotep II simply restarted his numbering once he stepped out of his father's shadow.[80] Once again, though, no precedent exists for pharaohs dating their military campaigns separately: first as a coregent, then as a sole ruler. This theory would be far more tenable if an inscription were found that dubbed the initial campaign described on the Memphis Stele as "the first victorious campaign of Amenhotep II's sole rule." Moreover, a crippling weakness is that Amenhotep II launched his Year-3 campaign as sole ruler, in response to the Syro-Palestinian revolt waged after his father's death.

Insurmountable obstacles plague both versions of the three-campaign theory. The greatest problem is the lack of precedent for any such dual numbering of military campaigns by New-Kingdom pharaohs. Redford rightly notes, "[T]hat two separate systems of year-numbering were employed by Amenophis (II) is without other foundation and is *a priori* unlikely."[81] Moreover, a comparison of lines 2-3 on the Memphis Stele with lines 16-19 on the Amada Stele—both of which describe his "first victorious campaign"—reveals some strong similarities, particularly in the choice of words and the parallel actions depicted, so all of the various "first campaigns" of Amenhotep II must refer to a single Asiatic campaign.[82]

(2) The inadequacies of the three-campaign theory have caused many scholars to propose that Amenhotep II launched only two Asiatic campaigns, despite the victory stelae attributing campaigns to Years 3, 7, and 9. This theory also has two options. Option one: The Year-3 campaign is synonymous with the Year-7 campaign due to differing regnal counting systems. Its proponents assert that the Amada and Elephantine Stelae record the same campaign as the Memphis Stele's first campaign, but with the stipulation that the latter stele counts regnal years from the beginning of the coregency, while the former stelae count them from the outset of the sole rule. As Pritchard calculates, "A possible reconciliation would be that the 7th year after the coregency began was the 3rd year of the sole reign."[83] One problem with this variation is the lack of precedent for dating pharaonic regnal years using two differing methods: sometimes coregent numbering, and other times sole-regent numbering. Another problem is that the coregency lasted a mere 2 1/3 years, making it mathematically impossible to equate the two campaigns, since the coregency would have to last for a minimum of three years and one day for Pritchard to be correct.

Option two: The Year-3 campaign is synonymous with the Year-7 campaign due to an inaccurate date displayed on the Memphis Stele. This version also assumes that the first campaign on the Karnak Stele, the campaigns described on the

---

[80]Ibid.

[81]Ibid., 121.

[82]Anson F. Rainey, "Amenhotep II's Campaign to Takhsi," *JARCE* 10 (1973):71.

[83]Pritchard, *ANET* 245.

Elephantine and Amada Stelae, and the first campaign on the Memphis Stele, all refer to the same event. However, it purports that the Amada and Elephantine Stelae correctly date the "first victorious campaign" to Year 3, while the Memphis Stele displays a wrongly-reconstructed date etched onto it by a Nineteenth-Dynasty stelae-restoration crew that attempted to repair the damage the stelel suffered during the Amarna Age. Vandersleyen observes that "the Memphis date is on the part of the memorial that was seriously damaged in the Amarna Age; the date that we read today is the result of Rameside restoration."[84] He concludes, "Thus the initial date of Year 7 on the Memphis Stele is a[n inaccurate] restoration made by the Ramesides."[85]

Both variations of the three-campaign theory are indefensible. Vandersleyen perceptively notes, "The simplest and most logical solution is that there was only one 'first campaign,' . . . more plausibly in Year 3 than in Year 7."[86] Therefore, based on the likelihood of a singular error on the Memphis Stele—due to inaccurate restoration by Ramesside craftsmen—as the best explanation to harmonize the conflicting evidence on the stelae, the two-campaign theory is preferred. The Elephantine Stele, whose events are set in Takhsi,[87] even provides a *terminus ad quem* for the first campaign, as line twenty-six dates the stele to Year 4. "It is only reasonable to conclude that the events including the Takhsi campaign recounted in the text before this postscript are earlier than Year 4. Thus there is no reason to deny the clear implication of the text that the expedition against Takhsi transpired before [the end of] Year 3."[88] Also supporting the view that the Memphis Stele's first campaign was waged in Year 3, and not in Year 7, is the evidence from Amenhotep II's cupbearer. During Year 4, the cupbearer Minmès remarks that a stele was built for pharaoh in Naharin, to the east of the Euphrates River, the inscription of which confirms that the first Asiatic campaign occurred before Year 4 ended.[89]

---

[84]Vandersleyen, *L'Egypte* 2:324. Rainey affirms the activity of later restoration on the Memphis Stele, remarking that its opening lines are difficult to read due to faulty restoration by a later scribe (Rainey, "Amenhotep II's Campaign to Takhsi" 72).

[85]Vandersleyen, *L'Egypte* 2:325. Shea correctly asserts that "the identification of the campaign of Year 7 is not a scribal error because the campaign of Year 9 is identified as 'his second campaign of victory' in the same text" (Shea, "Amenhotep II as Pharaoh" 46), but he fails to account for the possibility that while the original scribe etched the year of the pharaoh's first campaign onto the stele correctly, it was subject to intentional alteration and potentially faulty reparation.

[86]Vandersleyen, *L'Egypte* 2:323-24.

[87]Critics of the two-campaign theory argue that "Takhsi," a region in Syria already known as such at the time of Thutmose III, does not appear on the Memphis and Karnak Stelae, where another "first campaign" is discussed, thus suggesting a variance in destinations. Shea objects that while the Year-3 campaign identifies Takhsi as the region of the campaigning, this term is never mentioned in the account of the Year-7 campaign, thus implying that these two accounts cannot describe the same campaign (Shea, "Amenhotep II as Pharaoh" 46), despite both accounts documenting a campaign that was waged in Syria. This objection is weak, however, since the purpose of the Amada Stele was not to boast of military exploits, but rather to commemorate the work completed on the Amada temple in Nubia. The Memphis and Karnak Stelae had only one goal in mind: to boast of pharaoh's military victories in Asia (Vandersleyen, *L'Egypte* 2:323-24; Hallo and Simpson, *Ancient Near East* 261-62). Since the commissioner of these stelae had no need to mention the capture of the rulers of Takhsi, only *one* of the regions on the campaign's itinerary, they simply chose not to use the term.

[88]Redford, "Coregency of Tuthmosis III" 119-20.

[89]K. Sethe and W. Helck, eds., *Urk. Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums: Urkunden der 18 Dynastie*, vol. 4 (Berlin: Leipzig, 1906-1958) 1448; Vandersleyen, *L'Egypte* 2:324.

The First Asiatic Campaign of Amenhotep II

For brevity, the first campaign of Amenhotep II will be referred to as A1, while his second campaign will be called A2. As indicated, he launched A1 in Year 3, and the dating of events related to this campaign is as follows: (1) Thutmose III died on *ca*. 22 March 1452 B.C.; (2) Amenhotep II presided over the funeral and was confirmed as sole ruler; (3) the Syro-Palestinian city-states rebelled after hearing of Thutmose III's death; (4) Amenhotep II assembled his army from throughout Egypt and nearby garrisoned cities; and (5) Amenhotep II launched A1, arriving at his first destination on *ca*. 15 May 1452 B.C..

The death of Thutmose III led to a massive revolt in his Syro-Palestinian territories, prompting the launching of A1.[90] Amenhotep II officiated at his father's funeral as the "new Horus," as Thutmose III was buried on the west bank of the Nile River at Waset, in his elevated, cliff-cut "mansion of eternity."[91] Amenhotep II's presence at the funeral, combined with the nearly two-month gap between his father's death and the army's arrival at their first destination, dispels the notion that he was already engaged in A1 when his father died. The energetic son of Egypt's greatest imperialist wasted no time, as he probably left Egypt in April of *ca*. 1452 B.C., just as his father had done on his first Asiatic campaign, exactly thirty-two years prior. The undisputed epicenter of the rebellion was the coastal cities of Syria, the focal point of the discussion in *The Annals of Amenhotep II*, though perhaps Palestine also rebelled. The young pharaoh proceeded by land to quell this revolt.[92]

The Second Asiatic Campaign of Amenhotep II

Amenhotep II indisputably launched A2 in Year 9. If his reign began in *ca*. 1455 B.C., which harmonizes with the Ebers Papyrus and the regnal lengths of the intervening pharaohs, his ninth year lasted from *ca*. 22 November 1447 – 22 November 1446 B.C. Therefore, the exodus date of *ca*. 25 April 1446 B.C. should be placed within this particular regnal year, unless the Year-9 reading on the Memphis Stele is ever proven to be an inaccurate reconstruction. Both ancient sources and modern commentators are far quieter about A2 than they are about A1. Clearly, A1 was launched to squelch a rebellion, but why did Amenhotep II embark on a second trip into Asia six years later? Two principal theories have been proposed to identify the occasion.

The first theory for the motive of A2 is that it was launched to correct the shortcomings of A1. According to Aharoni, "The failure of the first campaign may be inferred by Amenhotep II's setting out two years later on a second campaign in order to put down revolts in the Sharon and in the Jezreel Valley."[93] Aharoni sees in A1 an excursion that never accomplished its primary mission: the conquest of Mitanni. Grimal concurs: "[T]hese two campaigns were the last to pit Egypt against Mitanni."[94]

---

[90]The view that A1 was launched in response to an Asiatic revolt is held by Breasted and most modern Egyptologists (e.g., Breasted, *Ancient Records*, 2:304; Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel* 163; Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt* 218).

[91]Dennis Forbes, "Menkheperre Djehutymes: Thutmose III, A Pharaoh's Pharaoh," *KMT* 9/4 (Winter 1998-1999):65.

[92]Breasted, *Ancient Records*, 2:304.

[93]Aharoni and Avi-Yonah, *The Macmillan Atlas* 34.

[94]Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt* 219.

The first problem with this view is its dependence on the three-campaign theory, since Aharoni assumes that a Year-7 campaign was fought two years prior to the Year-9 campaign. However, there was no Year-7 campaign, as the "first campaign" of the Memphis Stele actually occurred in Year 3. Given the six-year gap between the two campaigns, the theory that A2 was launched to rectify the failures of A1 is invalid. Of even greater weight, the failure of A1 would have resulted in another campaign directed principally into Syria, if not into Mitannian territory farther to the north, not a brief raid into southern Palestine to accomplish little more than the acquisition of slaves and booty.

The second theory for the motive of A2 is that it was launched to replenish the Egyptian slave base and many of the valuable commodities that were lost when the Israelites plundered and fled Egypt. According to this theory, pharaoh's motive relates to the exodus. If the exodus and Amenhotep II's Year-9 campaign transpired in the same year, which is possible given the chronological coincidences, a brief campaign into southern Palestine to recover some of his losses would be both logical and expected. The feasibility of this possibility will be evaluated in light of the details related to A2.

Pre-Winter Launching of the Second Asiatic Campaign

The date of Year 9, Month 3, Season 1, Day 25 (or *ca*. 16 November 1446 B.C.) recorded on the Memphis Stele represents either the Egyptian army's launching date from Memphis or the arrival date at their first destination, more likely the latter. Either way, in antiquity a November date for a military campaign was extremely rare. "The present date would fall in the early part of November, an unusual season for an Egyptian campaign in Asia."[95] It was unusual because the campaign would be fought throughout the cold, rainy winter, when ancient monarchs typically remained within their borders, dealt with internal affairs, and planned for springtime military campaigns.[96] The biblical text confirms the normalcy of springtime launchings: "Then it happened in the spring, at the time when kings go out to battle, that Joab led out the army and ravaged the land of the sons of Ammon, and he came and besieged Rabbah" (1 Chr 20:1).

Der Manuelian comments on A1: "Hardly one to break with the blossoming military tradition of the early New Kingdom, Amenophis set out in April of his seventh year, the preferred season for embarking on such ventures."[97] Vandersleyen contrasts this with the unprecedented timing of A2: "The second Asiatic campaign began on the 25th day of the 3rd month (*akhet*) of the 9th year, during an unusual season for military campaigns. It was probably induced by the necessity of urgent intervention." Amenhotep II's decision to lead an attack force into Palestine in November was extremely unorthodox, so obviously the situation required urgent Egyptian intervention. But in what did he need to intervene? Unlike A1, which was launched to quell a rebellion, A2 had no obvious occasion.

---

[95]Pritchard, *ANET* 246.

[96]Examples of campaigns launched in spring are plentiful. Thutmose III's first Asiatic campaign, as he arrived at his first destination (the border fortress of Tjel) on *ca*. 20 April 1484 B.C.; Amenhotep II's first Asiatic campaign, as he arrived at his first destination; Raamses II departure for Kadesh in late April, ca. 1274 (Shamash-Edom) on *ca*. 15 May 1452 B.C. are examples (Kenneth A. Kitchen, *Pharaoh Triumphant: The Life and Times of Ramesses II* [Warminster, Eng.: Aris & Phillips. 1982] 53).

[97]Der Manuelian, *Amenophis II* 59. As shown above, "seventh" should be corrected to "third."

Contrast between the Two Asiatic Campaigns

Marked differences exist between A1 and A2. The names of the geographical sites on A1 are mostly unknown, and those that are considered known are too far apart to belong to one region. In contrast, the sites mentioned on A2 are located only in Central Palestine, between Aphek and Anaharath. When comparing the courses of both campaigns, the disproportionate nature of the two routes is striking, as the locations on A1 are distant and scattered, while the sites on A2 are nearby and closely positioned.[98] Moreover, every early campaign of Thutmose III through his illustrious eighth campaign into Mesopotamia, which represents the maximum extent of Egypt's expansionism, pushed further into foreign territory. In contrast, A1 and A2 followed exactly the opposite trend, going from an itinerary *further away from* to one *closer to* Egypt.

Change in Foreign-Policy after the Second Asiatic Campaign

Another oddity of A2 is that after its conclusion, the Egyptian army—established by Thutmose III as the fifteenth-century-B.C.'s most elite fighting force—went into virtual hibernation. Its previous policy of aggressiveness toward Mitanni became one of passivity and the signing of peace treaties. The reason for this new policy is missing from the historical record, but Amenhotep II evidently was the pharaoh who first signed a treaty with Mitanni, subsequent to A2.[99] Redford connects this event to "the arrival (after year 10, we may be sure) of a Mitannian embassy sent by [Mitanni's King] Saussatar with proposals of 'brotherhood' (i.e., a fraternal alliance and renunciation of hostilities)."[100] Redford adds that "Amenophis II seemed susceptible to negotiations" and that he "was apparently charmed and disarmed by the embassy from 'Naharin,' and perhaps even signed a treaty."[101] Yet such a treaty is completely out of character for imperial Egypt and this prideful monarch, especially since "the pharaonic state of the Eighteenth Dynasty could, more easily than Mitanni, sustain the expense of periodic military incursions 800 km into Asia."[102] Support for Amenhotep II being the first to sign a pact with Mitanni is found in the actions of Thutmose IV: "Only by postulating a change of reign can we explain a situation in which the new pharaoh, Thutmose IV, can feel free to attack Mitannian holdings with impunity."[103] Why would Amenhotep II do the unthinkable, and opt to make a treaty with Mitanni?

This mysterious reversal in foreign policy would remain inexplicable if not for the possibility of a single, cataclysmic event. If the Egyptians lost virtually their entire army in the springtime disaster at the Red Sea in Year 9, a desperate reconnaissance campaign designed to "save face" with the rest of the ancient world and to replenish the Israelite slave-base would be paramount. Certainly the Egyptians needed time to rally their remaining forces together, however small and/or in shambles their army may have been, and it would explain a November campaign that was nothing more than a slave-raid into Palestine as a show of force. The Egyptians could not afford to live through the winter without the production that was provided

---

[98]Vandersleyen, *L'Egypte* 2:324-25.

[99]Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel* 163.

[100]Ibid., 164.

[101]Ibid.

[102]Ibid., 165.

[103]Ibid., 164.

by the Hebrew workforce, and they could not allow Mitanni or any other ancient power to consider using the winter to plan an attack on Egyptian territories, which seemed vulnerable. If this scenario represents what actually transpired in ANE history, however, tangible proof is needed to verify its veracity.

VI. Loss of the Egyptian Slave-base

According to Num 1:45-46, the Israelites' post-exodus male population over 20 years old totaled 603,550, not including the 22,000 Levite males of Num 3:39. When women and children are added, they would have well exceeded 2,000,000.[104] That many Israelites probably provided the backbone of the Egyptian slave-force, considering their rigorous labors (Exod 1:11-14). To most Egyptology students, however, the exodus-narrative is little more than a fanciful folktale designed to impress Jewish children with grand illusions of a glorious ethnic past. The virtual absence of historical and archaeological evidence to verify the Israelite occupation and mass exodus from Egypt bolsters this skepticism. One prominent Egyptologist suggests,

> [T]o the historian, [the exodus] remains the most elusive of all the salient events of Israelite history. The event is supposed to have taken place in Egypt, yet Egyptian sources know it not. . . . The effect on Egypt must have been cataclysmic—loss of a servile population, pillaging of gold and silver (Exod. 3:21-22, 12:31-36), destruction of an army—yet at no point in the history of the country during the New Kingdom is there the slightest hint of the traumatic impact such an event would have had on economics or society.[105]

But is there truly no hint of a traumatic impact on Egypt?

Absence of an Exodus-Account in Egyptian Records

Redford alludes to the most popular reason for rejecting the veracity of the exodus, namely that nowhere in Egypt's vast records is there any documentation of it. However, this dearth can be explained by the lack of Egyptian censuses and the tendency to write comparatively little about foreigners, especially slaves.[106] Nonetheless, the Hebrew slaves not only exited Egypt *en masse*, but they were responsible for the extermination of pharaoh's vast army, which—at the time—was the mightiest military force on earth. Yet the proud Egyptians would not be expected to document their own humiliating defeat, which would smear their records and tarnish the glorious legacy left behind by Thutmose III. Kitchen articulates this principle with an example from a later pharaoh: "No pharaoh ever celebrates a defeat! So, if Osorkon [I] had ever sent out a Zerah [the Cushite], with resulting defeat, *no* Egyptian source would ever report on such an incident, particularly publicly. The lack (to date) of external corroboration in such a case is itself worth

---

[104]John MacArthur, gen. ed., *The MacArthur Study Bible* (Nashville: Word, 1997) 198, note on Num 1:46.

[105]Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel* 408.

[106]A notable exception to this rule is the Hyksos, the western Asiatics who overtook Egypt and controlled her commerce. The Royal Turin Canon, a papyrus that derives from Ramesside times and reflects a king list that was begun during the Middle Kingdom, fixes a 108-year rule (*ca.* 1668 to 1560 B.C.) for the Hyksos (ibid., 107), who were driven out by the native Egyptians of the Seventeenth Dynasty. Yet such documentation is warranted as they played a prominant role in Egyptian history.

nothing, in terms of judging history."[107]

Such a non-reporting of personal defeat would be standard practice for Amenhotep II. Aharoni observes, "Amenhotep [II]—more than any other pharaoh—set up monuments to glorify his personal valor, passing over, however, some of the major but less complementary events of his campaigns, especially his defeats."[108] Amenhotep II spared no effort to portray himself as a great warrior who could pierce metal targets with his bow and arrow during shooting practice.[109] He combined strength with a cruelty intended to demoralize his enemies,[110] which the Amada Stele affirms: "His strength is so much greater than (that of) any king who has ever existed, raging like a panther when he courses through the battlefield; there is none fighting before him, . . . trampling down those who rebel against him, instantly prevailing against all the barbarians with people and horses."[111] A king with such enormous pride cannot be expected to have commissioned his scribes to preserve the exodus-tragedy in the annals of Egyptian history for subsequent generations to read and memorialize.

Booty Lists from Asiatic Campaigns of Amenhotep II and Thutmose III

Redford declares that "at no point in the history of the country during the New Kingdom is there the slightest hint of the traumatic impact [that] such an event" as the "loss of a servile population" must have had upon Egypt.[112] This bold declaration must be strongly contested. At the conclusion of both campaign narratives recorded on the Memphis Stele, the scribe meticulously listed the spoils, with their quantities, that were taken as plunder. By comparing the booty lists recorded after the conquests of Amenhotep II and Thutmose III, it will be seen whether A2 is distinguished among these campaigns, and if it might attest to the exodus or the post-exodus events.

The focus of A2 was upon spoils that Amenhotep II reaped. "A record of the plunder that his majesty carried off: 127 princes of Retenu; 179 brothers of princes; 3,600 Apiru; 15,200 Shasu; 36,300 Kharu; 15,070 Nagasuites/Neges; 30,652 of their family members; total: 89,600 people, and their endless property likewise; all their cattle and endless herds; 60 chariots of silver and gold; 1,032 painted chariots of wood; 13,500 weapons for warfare."[113] Regarding the "89,600" total prisoners, the sum is actually 101,128 if the individual numbers are added together.[114] The error may be nothing more than a mistake in addition, as the individual numbers are probably more reliable than the recorded sum.[115] Therefore, the number 101,128 is preferred over 89,600. Before contrasting A2 with its

---

[107]Kitchen, *Reliability of the OT* 11. The biblical text to which Kitchen alludes is 2 Chron 14:9-15.

[108]Aharoni and Avi-Yonah, *The Macmillan Atlas* 34.

[109]Hallo and Simpson, *Ancient Near East* 262.

[110]Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt* 218.

[111]Breasted, *Ancient Records* 2:310.

[112]Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel* 408.

[113]Hoffmeier, "Memphis and Karnak Stelae" 2:22; Pritchard, *ANET* 247.

[114]Pritchard laments, "Even though two of the figures give questionable readings, no clear alternatives will supply the total given on the stele" (*ANET* 247).

[115]"The total given, 89,600, is actually wrong, the correct total being 101,128!" (Hoffmeier, "Memphis and Karnak Stelae" 2:22).

predecessors, attention must be drawn to the confiscation of 1,092 chariots, which, along with the 13,500 weapons, would be critical for replacing the "600 select chariots and all the *other* chariots of Egypt" lost in the Red Sea (Exod 14:7).

The military campaigns of Thutmose III, which are described in *The Annals of Thutmose III*, also will be abbreviated: his first Asiatic campaign (T1), sixth (T6), and seventh (T7). The prisoners taken on the various campaigns are compiled as follows: A1 = 2,214 captives; A2 = 101,128 captives; T1 = 5,903 captives; T6 = 217 captives; and T7 = 494 captives.[116] The most glaring detail is obviously the disparity between the number of captives taken during A2 versus the other four campaigns, which together averaged 2,207 prisoners, or 2.2% of the prisoners taken during A2. Put differently, A2 yielded forty-six times more prisoners than all of the other campaigns combined! Why this tremendous disparity? Is it merely coincidental that such a vast number of prisoners was taken during the last Asiatic campaign of the Eighteenth Dynasty? If the exodus and A2 occurred in the same year, Amenhotep II would have had just cause to launch a November campaign, as he desperately would need to fill the enormous void left behind by the evacuation of the Hebrew slaves.[117]

Goal of Impressing the Kings of Egypt's Rival Empires
Other information on the booty lists may attest to the connection between the exodus events and A2.

> Now when the Prince of Naharin, the Prince of Hatti, and the Prince of Shanhar heard of the great victories that I had made, each one tried to outdo his competitor in offering gifts, from every foreign land. They thought on account of their grandfathers to beg his majesty for the breath of life to be given to them: 'We will carry our taxes to your palace, son of Re, Amenhotep (II), divine ruler of Heliopolis, ruler of rulers, a panther who rages in every foreign land and in this land forever.'[118]

Amenhotep II makes the fascinating statement that the King of Mitanni, the King of the Hittites, and the King of Babylon all "heard of the victories" that he had accomplished in southern Palestine. This reference to the effect of a military campaign upon kings of distant nations, all of whom ruled empires in their own right, is unique among contemporary Egyptian booty lists and annals.

Why was Amenhotep II so concerned with how these kings viewed his Year-9 conquests? Not many propositions suffice, especially considering the exceedingly limited scope of A2. Yet if he needed to save face after the devastating loss of his army, a victorious campaign could convince them of his continued ability to wage war successfully. Joshua notes that the Lord "dried up the waters" of the Red Sea expressly so that "all the peoples of the earth may know that the hand of the Lord is mighty" (Josh 4:23, 24). This goal was realized even 40 years after the exodus, as Rahab of Jericho testified that "all the inhabitants of the land . . . have heard how the Lord dried up the water of the Red Sea" (Josh 2:9-10), and the Hivites of Gibeon told Israel of "the fame of the Lord your God," since they "heard the report of Him and all that He did in Egypt" (Josh 9:9).

---

[116]Ibid., 21; Pritchard, *ANET* 239, 246; Hoffmeier, "The Annals of Thutmose III" 2:12.

[117]As Shea notes, "While some have questioned the very high number given here, if one looks at the needs for state labor right after the exodus, the number does not look so high after all" (Shea, "Amenhotep II as Pharaoh" 47).

[118]Ibid.; Hoffmeier, "Memphis and Karnak Stelae" 2:22. The Prince of Shanhar, or biblical Shinar, is equated with the King of Babylon (Pritchard, *ANET* 247).

Summary of Egypt's Losses after the Exodus

Thus Amenhotep II's boasting to his rival kings, the weapons and chariots taken as booty, and the disproportion of slaves taken during A2 together argue strongly in favor of a connection between A2 and Egypt's losses after the exodus. This circumstantial evidence obviously will not satisfy critics whose presuppositions militate against tying the exodus to A2. For objective onlookers, though, one important question is whether the booty-list reveals an Israelite connection to A2 and its material acquisitions: Is there tangible evidence that links the Israelites to A2?

VII. Appearance of 3,600 Apiru on the Booty List

Among the conquered peoples listed on A2 were 3,600 "Apiru," the Egyptian equivalent of the Akkadian "Habiru," a word that also appears in the Amarna Letters.[119] Who are the Apiru whom Amenhotep II captured during A2? Earlier biblical scholars unashamedly equated the Apiru/Habiru with the Hebrew word עִבְרִי (*'bri*, "Hebrew").

Subsequently, many have rejected equating the Apiru with the Hebrews, often arguing that "Apiru" has more of a sociological than an ethnic connotation. Beitzel advocates the "impossibility of (the) equation of Habiru and Hebrews in Biblical studies."[120] The fashionable scholarly opinion is that the Amarna Letters portray the Apiru as marauding brigands who seize, loot, burn towns, and generally ravage the landscape. Moreover, since the Habiru are found at different locations and times around the ANE, the term allegedly cannot refer to the Hebrews.[121]

Yet scholars have not completely abandoned the association of the Habiru with the Hebrews. Many who equate them say that perhaps "Habiru" originally designated groups of outlaws or was a derogatory expression, and only later it was used of the Hebrews as a distinct ethnic group.[122] But should one concede that the designation of outlaw-marauders actually preceded that of the ethnically distinct Hebrews? Though the present work cannot identify the limitations of the term "Habiru," whether or not the Apiru of A2 might be Hebrews must be addressed. Either way, the appearance of the Apiru on a formal list of Asiatic captives is quite unusual.[123]

Bryant Wood notes that "the [Amarna] Letters are taken up with . . . the hostilities of the *Habiru* in the hill country. The references to the *Habiru* in the Amarna Letters appear to be allusions to the mopping-up operations of the Israelites

---

[119]Hoffmeier, "Memphis and Karnak Stelae" 2:22.

[120]Barry J. Beitzel, "Habiru," in *ISBE*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 588-89.

[121]Hoffmeier, "Memphis and Karnak Stelae" 2:22. SA.GAZ, the Sumerian logographic equivalent of Habiru, and its variants are found in cuneiform texts from *ca*. 2,500 B.C. to the eleventh century B.C.. In light of this, many are unwilling to associate the Apiru of the fifteenth century B.C. with the Hebrews. However, Abram was known as a Hebrew in the twenty-first century B.C. (Gen 14:13), so the solution to the dilemma is that the two non-guttural consonants found in the tri-consonantal root of *'bri*, the exact consonants that appear in Akkadian and Ugaritic (*br*, possibly meaning "cross over, go beyond"), are also used in "Eber" (Gen 10:21), the ancestor of Abram from whom the word undoubtedly derives. Thus Abram is one of numerous Eberite peoples, all of whom are known as Habiru due to their retention of Eber's ancient namesake (R. F. Youngblood, "Amarna Tablets," in *ISBE*, vol. 1 [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979] 108; Beitzel, "Hebrew (People)," in *ISBE* 2:657).

[122]Ibid.

[123]Pritchard, *ANET* 247.

at this time, but no individual *Habiru* is mentioned by name."[124] At least one Egyptologist also considers that the Apiru "are synonymous with the Hebrews mentioned in the Amarna correspondence; by Amenhotep II's time, they seem to have become integrated into the societies to which they had emigrated, playing marginal roles as mercenaries or servants, as in the events described in *The Taking of Joppa*. In Egypt, they appear during the reign of Thutmose III as wine-makers in the Theban tombs of the Second Prophet of Amun Puyemre (TT 39) and the herald Intef (TT 155)."[125] While Apiru served in Egypt as winemakers during the days of Thutmose III, there is no record of Egyptians having captured any as slaves before A2, which is consistent with the biblical record. In his discussion of A2, Aharoni concludes, "Apiru-Habiru = Hebrews."[126]

The popular designation of the Habiru as a band of marauding brigands faces a major obstacle in that 3,600 Apiru were captured on A2. Hoffmeier, calling this number "a rather large figure,"[127] elsewhere notes, "If the large numbers are to be believed, Apiru/Habiru were not just small bands of marauders in Amenhotep's day."[128] This number far exceeds that of a loosely-organized gang of bandits. Wood correctly concludes that "[t]he *'apiru* of the highlands of Canaan described in the Amarna Letters of the mid-14th century B.C. conform to the biblical Israelites."[129]

Beitzel, who zealously opposes the association of the Apiru with the Hebrews, states, "[T]he Amarna Hapiru seems to be composed of diverse ethnic elements from various localities."[130] Yet the dispersion of the Apiru throughout Canaan is expected if they are the 2,000,000+ Israelite settlers (Josh 11:23). Beitzel's claim is unfounded, because nothing in the Amarna Letters requires that the Apiru be ethnically diverse. Hoffmeier underscores the certainty of the Apiru's ethnic homogeneity: "It is clear from the occurrence in the [Memphis] stele of Amenhotep II that they were identified as a specific group like the other ethnic groups taken as prisoners by the king."[131] Two items support this homogeneity.

First, they were listed among the ethnic groups on the booty list of A2. "Listing the habiru alongside of other ethnic groups from Hurru, Retenu, and the Shasu suggests that the Egyptians may have viewed the habiru as a distinguishable ethnic group."[132] The Apiru appear third on the list, preceded by princes and brothers of the princes, and followed by three names with geographic connotation: the Shasu, who were Bedouin to the south of Palestine; the Kharu, who were "Horites," residents of Syro-Palestine; and the Nagasuites/Neges, who dwelled in Upper Retenu, near Aleppo.[133] *The Annals of Thutmose III* confirm the Kharu's ethnicity. Since the Kharu are listed among peoples with armies and horses, along with Mitanni

---

[124]Bryant G. Wood, "One Thousand Years Missing from Biblical History? A Review of a New Theory," *Bible and Spade* 6/4 (Autumn 1993):98.

[125]Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt* 219.

[126]Aharoni and Avi-Yonah, *The Macmillan Atlas* 34.

[127]Hoffmeier, *Israel in Egypt* 124.

[128]Hoffmeier, "Memphis and Karnak Stelae" 2:22.

[129]Wood, "The Rise and Fall" 489.

[130]Beitzel, "Habiru" 2:588.

[131]Hoffmeier, "Memphis and Karnak Stelae" 2:22.

[132]Hoffmeier, *Israel in Egypt* 124.

[133]Pritchard, *ANET* 247.

(Naharin), their distinct ethnicity—and thus that of the Apiru—cannot be doubted.[134]

Second, their prominent position among the ethnic groups on the booty list of A2. The 3,600 Apiru are notably more numerous than the princes and brothers of the princes who appear before them, and notably fewer than the three people-groups listed after them.[135] The scribe of the Memphis Stele attributes the initial position to royalty, and then he names distinct ethnic groups, among which the Apiru appear first, despite their number being far fewer than that of the subsequent ethnic groups. This initial, prominent position among non-royal captives is easily explainable if these were Hebrews, and the exodus had occurred not seven months before A2.

How does the Bible account for the Egyptians' capture of 3,600 Hebrews when the main body of Israelites was wandering in the wilderness in the distant Sinai Peninsula under Moses' leadership (Num 14:33)? The date for A2 in November of the exodus year coincides with a silent period in biblical history. Exodus concludes with Israel near Mount Sinai, though Moses parenthetically adds a retrospective summary of how the Lord guided them during their subsequent journeys (Exod 40:36-38). Meanwhile, Numbers begins in the fourteenth month after the exodus (Num 1:1), about five months after A2 concluded. Therefore, A2 fits into this silent period, with no inherent conflict between the capture of the 3,600 Israelites—who probably left the Israelite camp and journeyed toward southern Palestine, near the travel route of A2—and the biblical events that transpired after the exodus.[136]

VIII. Amenhotep II and the Desecration of Hatshepsut's Image

Egyptian history itself may confirm Amenhotep II as the exodus-pharaoh. At the death of Thutmose II, the throne was given first to his son, Thutmose III, and later also assumed by his widow, Hatshepsut. Her rise to power came from her role as the child-king's regent; given his youthfulness, her self-appointment to the rank of coregent probably met little or no opposition within the royal court.[137] Sometime between Year 2 and Year 4 of Thutmose III, Hatshepsut assumed full royal titulary, making herself a female pharaoh of equal rank.[138]

Identifying Moses' Adoptive Mother

Moses evidently was born during the reign of Thutmose I, whose daughter, Hatshepsut, qualifies as a legitimate candidate for the pharaoh's daughter who drew Moses from the Nile River (Exod 2:5).[139] Was she old enough during her father's second regnal year, when Moses was probably born (*ca*. 1527 B.C.) to qualify as his Egyptian stepmother?

One scenario may preclude Hatshepsut from being the princess who drew

---

[134]Hoffmeier, "The Annals of Thutmose III" 2:9.

[135]Pritchard, *ANET* 247.

[136]Such periods of silence are not unusual. "The book of Numbers concentrates on events that take place in the second and fortieth years after the exodus. All incidents recorded in 1:1–14:45 occur in 1444 B.C., the year after the exodus. Everything referred to after 20:1 is dated ca. 1406/1405 B.C.," while there is a complete "lack of material devoted to this 37 year period" that intervenes between the second and fortieth years after the exodus (MacArthur, *Study Bible* 195).

[137]Hallo and Simpson, *Ancient Near East* 259.

[138]William Petty, "Redating the Reign of Hatshepsut," *KMT* 13/4 (Winter 2002-2003):51, 53.

[139]Rea, "Oppression and Exodus" 10.

Moses from the Nile. The chief wife of Thutmose I, Queen Ahmose, was called "the King's Sister," but never "the King's Daughter," a title given only to a princess, meaning that she may have been the sister or half-sister of Thutmose I. If this were true, a brother-sister marriage probably occurred after Thutmose I was promoted to heir apparent, as such political matches that consolidated a would-be successor's claim to the throne were standard procedure in ancient Egypt.[140] Perhaps, then, Hatshepsut was born after Thutmose I was coronated (*ca.* 1529 B.C.), and thus was a little over twelve years old when she married her (half-) brother (*ca.* 1516 B.C.). This would make her under three years old at Moses' birth, at which age she could hardly venture down to the Nile, let alone draw out an infant-bearing reed basket.

There is no proof that Hatshepsut was born after her father's accession, though, and she could have been the daughter of Amenhotep I. In addition, the uncertainty about when Thutmose II's reign began means that he may have served as co-regent with his father, Thutmose I, for several years. Hatshepsut thus would have been old enough to draw Moses out of the Nile during her father's second regnal year, so she is a legitimate candidate for Moses' Egyptian adoptive-mother, since her father was already over 35 years old when he assumed the throne.

All the evidence points to Hatshepsut as the most likely candidate for Moses' stepmother, because her blood-sister, Princess Akhbetneferu, died in infancy, because Lady Mutnofret—according to existing records—never bore a daughter to Thutmose I,[141] and because Exod 2:10 states that after "the child [Moses] grew, she [his mother] brought him to Pharaoh's daughter, and he became her son." Therefore, Moses' Egyptian stepmother lived long enough *after* she retrieved him from the Nile, increasing the likelihood that an account of this "daughter of Pharaoh" (Exod 2:5) would be documented somewhere in the Egyptians' detailed records, a qualification held by Hatshepsut alone.

The Defacer of Hatshepsut's Image

Some indeterminable time after Hatshepsut's death, someone attempted to obliterate any historical record of her. Many inscribed cartouches of her were erased, while her busts were smashed or broken into pieces, perhaps by workmen dispatched to various sites throughout Egypt. In some cases, the culprits carefully and completely hacked out the silhouette of her image from carvings, often leaving a distinct, Hatshepsut-shaped lacuna in the middle of a scene, often as a preliminary step to replacing it with a different image or royal cartouche, such as that of Thutmose I or II.[142] At Karnak, her obelisks were walled-up and incorporated into the vestibule in front of Pylon V, while at Djeser-Djeseru her statues and sphinxes were removed, smashed, and cast into trash dumps.[143]

According to most Egyptologists, this massive effort to destroy all records of Hatshepsut was launched by Thutmose III, with a predictable motive: out of sexist pride, he attempted to eliminate every trace of this dreaded female pharaoh's rule, intending to rewrite Egyptian history to portray a smooth succession of male rulers

---

[140]Tyldesley, *Hatchepsut* 65, 77.

[141]Ibid.

[142]Ibid., 79. For pictures of Hatshepsut's image and cartouches hacked-out of various monuments and statutes, see http://www.nbts-ru.org/EN/DPet/HatPic.html, accessed 02/27/06.

[143]Tyldesley, *Hatchepsut* 114-15, 216.

from Thutmose I to himself.[144] "Wounded male pride may also have played a part in his decision to act; the mighty warrior king may have balked at being recorded for posterity as the man who ruled for 20 years under the thumb of a mere woman."[145] But several factors weaken the theory that Thutmose III was the perpetrator.

First, that Thutmose III defaced her image is inconsistent with how he otherwise related to her memory. A scene on the dismantled Chapelle Rouge at Djeser-Djeseru portrays Hatshepsut, and the inscription identifies her: "The Good God, Lady of the Two Lands, Daughter of Ra, Hatshepsut."[146] Thutmose III, who is pictured steering his barque toward Deir el-Bahri, actually completed the Chapelle Rouge, added the topmost register of decorations in his own name, then claimed the shrine as his own. Also, Hatshepsut's name is still preserved in her Monthu temple at Armant, which Thutmose III enlarged. Furthermore, Thutmose III planned the construction of his own temple to Amun, which was to be built Deir el-Bahri, a site that Hatshepsut built up greatly, including massive terraces and here own temple next to the one that he subsequently built.[147]

Second, if he did it, Thutmose III waited at least 20 years after her death before desecrating her image. That he would wait until over 20 years after she had departed to initiate an anti-feminism campaign out of hatred seems impossible. "While it is possible to imagine and even empathize with Thutmose III indulging in a sudden whim of hatred against his stepmother immediately after her death, it is far harder to imagine him overcome by such a whim some 20 years later."[148]

Third, if Thutmose III was the culprit, as proven by his construction project at Karnak, he must have had sufficient motive to attempt to prevent her from living eternally. According to Egyptian religion, removing the name or image of a deceased person was a direct assault on his/her spirit and amounted to a total obliteration from which there was no return. This act against Hatshepsut was an attempt to "condemn her to oblivion—a fate worse than death for an Egyptian."[149] Thus the extermination of Hatshepsut's image from the earth was indeed a drastic step: the removal of her spirit from its perpetual existence in the afterlife.[150] Such seems far too severe to fit the motive of mere sexism.

Fourth, if Thutmose III was the culprit, why were there also attacks against the name and monuments of Senenmut, the foreign chief-advisor of Hatshepsut who disappeared from the record in or after Hatshepsut's nineteenth regnal year (*ca.* 1488/7 B.C.)? Occasionally his name was violated while his image remained intact, but some of his statues were smashed and physically thrown out of temples.[151] This

---

[144]Hallo and Simpson, *Ancient Near East*, 259, 261; Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel*, 156; Tyldesley, *Hatchepsut*, 216.

[145]Tyldesley, *Hatchepsut*, 225.

[146]Ibid., 219.

[147]Ibid., 219-20; Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt* 216.

[148]Tyldesley, *Hatchepsut* 220, 224-25. Bryan asserts that the dishonoring of Hatshepsut began *ca.* Year 46 or 47, and that this event may have paved the way for the joint rule with Amenhotep II, but she provides no support for her conclusions (Betsy M. Bryan, "The Eighteenth Dynasty Before the Amarna Period," in *The Oxford History of Ancient History*, ed. Ian Shaw [New York: Oxford University, 2000] 248).

[149]Grimal, *History of Ancient Egypt* 216.

[150]Tyldesley, *Hatchepsut* 216.

[151]Ibid., 206, 222.

attack upon her *male* chief-advisor's image can hardly be justified if Thutmose III was motivated purely by anti-feminist hatred.

Several options are offered to justify this extreme act committed by Thutmose III. (1) He wanted to atone for the offense of a female pharaoh against *maat* ("justice, truth"), a word used to describe the continuity in the universe that derived from the approval of the gods.[152] (2) The unorthodox coregency might have cast serious doubt on the legitimacy of his own right to rule, so he wanted to ensure both the legitimacy of his reign and his legacy. Neither option, however, addresses why Thutmose III would wait to start his anti-Hatshepsut campaign until at least twenty years after his sole rule began. Certainly he did not learn of the compromise that Hatshepsut's reign was to the state of *maat* only after he was an aged king; likewise, after twenty years of sole rule, his reign was secure, and his successful campaigning already had solidified for him a lasting legacy.

No Egyptologist has answered satisfactorily the nagging question of who was responsible for the widespread campaign to obliterate Hatshepsut's image from Egypt's annals and what was the motive for such a severe act. Whoever was responsible carried out the act only after Year 42 of Thutmose III, meaning that the desecration occurred no earlier than *ca.* 1464 B.C. Also, to envision that the culprit lived long after both Hatshepsut and her memory disappeared from the earth is difficult, since elapsed time would tend to diminish motive. Accordingly, two possible scenarios could incriminate Amenhotep II as culpable.

First, Amenhotep II contributed to the campaign to destroy Hatshepsut's image, but he was not the initial perpetrator. Tyldesley observes, "It is perhaps not too fanciful a leap of the imagination to suggest that Thutmose III, having started the persecution relatively late in the reign, may have died before it was concluded. His son and successor, Amenhotep II, with no personal involvement in the campaign, may have been content to allow the vendetta to lapse."[153] Tyldesley does not explain why Amenhotep II would continue this campaign without personal involvement. Bryan agrees that "Amenhotep II himself completed the desecration of the female king's monuments," adding that "when [he] had finished his programme of erasures on the monuments of Hatshepsut at Karnak, he was able to concentrate on preparations for the royal jubilee at this temple."[154]

Second, Amenhotep II was the sole culprit in the campaign to destroy Hatshepsut's image. The responsible individual likely possessed pharaonic authority, and one legitimate motive for Amenhotep II to have committed this act is Hatshepsut's rearing of Moses as her own son in the royal court (Acts 7:21). After the Red Sea incident, Amenhotep II would have returned to Egypt seething with anger, both at the loss of his firstborn son and virtually his entire army (Exod 14:28), and he would have just cause to erase her memory from Egypt and remove her spirit from the afterlife. The Egyptian people would have supported this edict, since their rage undoubtedly rivaled pharaoh's because of their mourning over deceased family members and friends. The nationwide experience of loss also would account for the unified effort throughout Egypt to fulfill this defeated pharaoh's commission vigorously. A precedent exists for Amenhotep II's destruction of her monuments early in his reign: "At Karnak Hatshepsut left . . . the Eighth Pylon, a new southern gateway to the temple precinct. . . . Ironically, evidence of Hatshepsut's building

---

[152]Ibid., 8, 225.

[153]Ibid., 224.

[154]Bryan, "Eighteenth Dynasty" 250-51.

effort is today invisible, since the face of the pylon was erased and redecorated in the first years of Amenhotep II."[155] Perhaps Year 9 was when it all began.

IX. Conclusion

Now it is possible to answer the questions posed earlier. Could the eldest son of Amenhotep II have died during the tenth plague, which must be true of the exodus-pharaoh's son? The answer is yes. In fact, none of Amenhotep II's sons claimed to be his firstborn, and one Egyptologist theorizes that the eldest son died inexplicably during childhood. Did Amenhotep II die in the Red Sea, as the Bible allegedly indicates regarding the exodus-pharaoh? No, he died in usual fashion, and his mummified body is still preserved. Yet this does not conflict with the Bible, since no biblical text explicitly states that the exodus-pharaoh died there with his army.

Can any of Amenhotep II's military campaigns be related to the exodus events? Yes, his second Asiatic campaign coincides extremely well with the exodus events, and many of the details related to it and Egypt's post-exodus future cannot be explained without these connections. Can the loss of over two million Hebrew slaves, certainly Egypt's "slave-base" at the time, be accounted for in the records of Amenhotep II's reign? Yes, the loss of the Israelite slaves can be accounted for by Amenhotep II's acquisition of 101,128 slaves in Canaan during his second Asiatic campaign, the only such campaign of its era that was launched in late fall and took many captives. Is there any evidence to confirm that Amenhotep II interacted with the Hebrews after they left Egypt? Yes, Amenhotep II captured 3,600 "Apiru" (Hebrews) during his second campaign, which was launched just under seven months after the exodus. Despite attempts to disprove the association of the Hebrews with the Apiru of the New Kingdom, more evidence favors their being the same people.

If Amenhotep II is the exodus-pharaoh, could the obliteration of Hatshepsut's image from many Egyptian monuments and inscriptions be attributed to backlash from the exodus events? Yes, Amenhotep II surfaces as the most logical candidate for the pharaoh who ordered this nationwide campaign of desecration. If Hatshepsut indeed was Moses' Egyptian stepmother—and she is the most legitimate candidate—Amenhotep II and all of Egypt had adequate motive to remove her image from Egypt and her spirit from the afterlife. These answers identify Amenhotep II as the most legitimate candidate for the exodus-pharaoh, but that biblical chronology of that era functions as a canon with which Egyptian history may be synchronized.

Hopefully, the principal purpose of this article has not been lost in the extensive historical detail in it. In this analysis of the exodus-pharaoh and ancient Egyptian history, the arguments of those who compromise biblical historicity proved unable to undermine biblical inerrancy. Compromising the Bible's inspired historical framework will invariably lead to the demise of its reliability as an accurate source for determining doctrine and enhancing spiritual growth. Conversely, "to connect the book more directly with ancient history can only enhance its theological meaning."[156] Though the strongest argumentation cannot remove negative presuppositions of those with doubts about biblical inerrancy, such argumentation can strengthen the faith of those with a high view of the Bible's accuracy.

---

[155]Ibid., 240.

[156]Shea, "Amenhotep II as Pharaoh" 42.

BOOK REVIEWS

Chad Owen Brand and R. Stanton Norman, eds. *Perspectives on Church Government: Five Views of Church Polity.* Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2004. xiii + 353 pp. $19.99 (paper). Reviewed by Dennis M. Swanson, Seminary Librarian.

The issue of church polity is perhaps one of the most divisive issues in local churches in America. Churches have split over the issue of "elder rule" versus some form of congregational rule. Churches in episcopal systems have seen their congregations locked out of church facilities by denominational leaders who did not like the actions of a particular local congregation. In presbyterian systems, local congregations have had local church-discipline decisions with biblical warrant reversed by synod and general assembly courts.

Congregations and their leaders wonder what is the "biblical" form of church government, how should they be organized, and how should decisions be made. This is a foundational issue for a local church that seeks to conduct its affairs in a manner that pleases God.

Historically, several forms of church polity have developed, and many variations and nuances exist within those forms. A local church struggling with its own organization or a new assembly wondering how to "get off on the right foot" is often left with a "blithering array of competing models, all of which lay claim to biblical authenticity" (22) and are defended by respected evangelical leaders, pastors, and theologians. One work that escapes the "blithering" category is this "five-view" work. Five options of polity are presented clearly, forthrightly, and in a generally irenic manner. Five respected evangelical leaders present their case for local church polity. They and the positions they affirm are as follows:

- Daniel Akin, President of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, defends "The Single Elder-Led Church: The Bible's Witness to a Congregational/Single-Elder-Led Polity," (25-86).
- Robert L. Reymond, Professor of Theology at Knox Theological Seminary, defends the "Presbytery-Led Church: Presbyterian Church Government," 87-156).
- James Leo Garrett, Jr., Professor of Theology at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, defends the "Congregation-Led Church: Congregational Polity," 157-208).
- Paul F. M. Zahl, Dean and President of Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry, defends "The Bishop-Led Church: The Episcopal or Anglican Polity Affirmed, Weighed, and Defended" (209-54).

- James R. White, Director of Alpha and Omega Ministries, defends the "Plural Elder-Led Church: Sufficient as Established— The Plurality of Elders as Christ's Ordained Means of Church Governance" (255-96).

As normal in such a view book, responses by the other contributors appear at the end of each major presentation. The work includes useful indexes (name, subject, and Scripture) and a clear introductory chapter by the editors dealing with key issues and a brief survey of the history of church polity.

The contributors uniformly present clear definitions, biblical defenses, and generally offer detailed research. The publisher opted to use endnotes instead of footnotes, which often interrupts important points that the contributors were making. Each author supports his position from Scripture and with a wide array of material. For instance, Garrett has 318 notations which cover 19 pages of material.

Akin's contribution is superior to the others. He is current in his scholarship, and while though making an affirmative case for his position, still acknowledging room for flexibility (73). Reymond details Presbyterianism and defends it, in large part, as a means of maintaining church and ministry "balance." He states, "[I]t provides the most trustworthy, just, and peaceful way for the church to determine its principles, its practices, and its priorities and to resolve its differences" (135). Reymond's point that a congregational model has "too many ministers and too many churches that are accountable to no one" (ibid.) is well stated; however, he weakens his position considerably by attributing the tragedy of Jonestown and the scandals of Jim Bakker, Jimmy Swaggart and Jesse Jackson directly to a congregational model (136). In doing this, he likewise fails to note that Presbyterianism, as a system, was not able to deal with the liberalism that eventually led to the reorganization of Princeton Seminary in 1929 and the wholesale departure from orthodoxy of several Presbyterian denominations.

Thoroughly noted and detailed, the article by Garrett is more of a laundry list of quotations and people who have supported some form of congregationalism. His criticism of "mega-churches," the ministry of John MacArthur, and Dallas Theological Seminary, as part of the "crisis" or "major erosion or overt rejection of congregational polity" (190) is a tired old canard. However, his point that individual members need to be more active in the affairs and ministries of their churches (192) is worthwhile.

In presenting the Episcopal model, Zahl centers on the Anglican Church, which is not a major force in American evangelicalism. His presentation is clear and perhaps one of the best affirmative presentations of that system this reviewer has encountered. However, it would have been helpful had he expanded his horizons to include the Methodist, Lutheran, and perhaps even the Roman Catholic schemas.

The final presentation by James White on the plurality of elders is perhaps the most disappointing in terms of presentation. His argument is often pedantic and has an air of "my way or the highway" to it. He utilizes *Sola Scriptura* in such a manner that he makes it clear that a rejection of his position on polity is a *de facto* moving away from or rejection of the *Sola* as well. His notations are weak (he uses only 11 footnotes), and he offers little affirmative support. In fact, his is the only article that fails to cite or quote any supporting source outside Scripture.

Other points of disagreement and issues could be mentioned, but for the most part, the individual authors dispatch these in their responses to one another. A

couple of issues deserve mention, however. In assessing the Congregational model, Akin appears to correct Garrett's assertion that John MacArthur is Presbyterian (196), but points to a reference that he identifies as "Note 99," which has no bearing on that point. In fact, in the section discussing MacArthur (whose ministry Garrett views as a major reason Baptist churches have moved toward "elder rule," [191]), Garrett makes no claim that MacArthur is a Presbyterian.

This book, though covering a large swath of evangelical church polity, is not complete. It has no discussion of a minimalist polity such as in Plymouth Brethren assemblies, and as already mentioned, no discussion of the non-Anglican systems that practice the Episcopal model. Further, it has no discussion of inherent weaknesses in each system and how, on a practical level, those are overcome. Also, it has no discussion of how one might practically implement one system or the other if starting from scratch, how one might move a congregation from one model to another, or under what circumstances such a change might be a good or bad idea.

This is an important work and a valuable contribution to the literature of polity and is recommended highly. That being said, this reviewer agrees with the great Anglican expositor and theologian, Bishop J. C. Ryle, who stated, "There is not a text in the Bible which expressly commands churches to have one special form of government, and expressly forbids any other" (Ryle, *Knots Untied* [reprint; Moscow, Idaho: Charles Nolan, 2000] 234). The diversity of polity within local churches that God has chosen to bless in history make it clear that outside biblical commands that everything should be done "properly and in an orderly fashion" (1 Cor 14:40), that godly men be given the task of local church leadership (1 Tim 3:1-13; Titus 1:6-9), and that those leaders must dispatch their duties with humility before God (1 Pet 5:2-3), the structures of church polity may vary to meet the needs of a local assembly.

A. Andrew Das. *Paul and the Jews.* Library of Pauline Studies. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003. xvi + 238 pp. $24.95 (cloth). Reviewed by Paul R. Thorsell, Associate Professor of Bible, The Master's College.

Paul and the Jews continues Andrew Das' critique of and alternative to the "new perspective" on Paul, begun in his *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant.* The former volume focused on Paul's view of the Mosaic Law and its relation to Israel's covenant. The "new perspective," while of heuristic value for Pauline scholarship, misconstrued Paul's polemic against the Law as focused one-sidedly on the ethnic particularities of *torah* observance. This second volume addresses Israel's continuing role in God's purposes according to the apostle from Das' "newer perspective."

Das treats Paul's discussion of the Jews and the Law in Galatians in his second chapter. He cogently argues that Paul addressed Gentile Christians ("you") who were being influenced by Jewish Christians ("they") to be circumcised and follow the whole of the Mosaic Law. Paul's apocalyptic worldview informs his conclusion that the arrival of Christ and the Spirit has brought the era of the Law to a close. Das suggests the intriguing thesis that Paul distinguished two Abrahamic covenants in Galatians 4—one connected with the Law and one with the Spirit. Far

more probable, in this reviewer's estimation, the two covenants in Galatians 4 are the new covenant and the Mosaic covenant. Paul identified Isaac (= Christians) born by the Spirit (under the new covenant) as the true heir of Abraham rather than Ishmael (= Jews) born of the flesh (under the Law).

Chapters four and five address Israel's role in God's plan, focusing particularly on Romans 9–11. He connects Paul's notion of election closely with God's choice of Israel. In chapter four, three solutions to the question of Israel's place in God's purpose are proposed and rejected. Das masterfully dismantles Krister Stendahl's thesis that two covenants are in view—one saves Jews and the other Gentiles. Likewise rejected are the solutions that "Israel" in Romans 11 is the elect of all ages or the Jewish remnant of all ages. Chapter five comprises Das' own solution. Eschatological salvation is never apart from Christ (contra Stendahl), nor is it apart from Israel's mediation (contra replacement theology): "God's eschatological plan revolves entirely around Israel" (110). Gentiles are blessed with Israel and are united with Israel without the categories of Jew and Gentile losing significance.

Das' book, *Paul and the Jews*, interacts with materials in which the "new perspective" is argued, but arrives at a different conclusion. "New perspective" interpreters will need to interact with Das' proposed construction of Pauline theology; "old perspective" interpreters will need to examine whether Das' thesis has elements they can embrace. Despite the recent proliferation of works on Paul's view of the Law and Israel, Das' contribution will remain substantial and noteworthy for some years.

Walter A. Elwell and Robert W. Yarbrough. *Encountering the New Testament: A Historical and Theological Survey.* 2d Edition. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005. 446 pp. $44.99 (cloth). Reviewed by Keith Essex, Assistant Professor of Bible Exposition.

After only seven years of the volume's use, Walter Elwell and Robert Yarborough have updated their basic-level undergraduate NT survey, *Encountering the New Testament* [see *TMSJ* 10 (1999):291-93]. The authors state that in this second edition of their text, they have sought "to correct vague wording, update bibliography, rewrite outdated sections, and add material where the previous edition was culpably brief" (11). However, no thoroughgoing revamping has occurred because the earlier work seems to have been generally effective in classroom use. Therefore, the second edition follows the same pattern as the previous work.

The text continues with the same divisions as the first edition. After an introductory chapter on "Why Study the New Testament?" (19-35) come four parts: "Encountering Jesus and the Gospels" (37-190), "Encountering Acts and the Earliest Church" (191-250), "Encountering Paul and His Epistles" (251-344), and "Encountering the General Epistles and the Apocalypse" (345-85). An epilogue concludes the main text, and is now entitled "Matters to Ponder" (387-94). An extremely valuable glossary of key terms in NT study is still included (395-406). The main content of each chapter is again supplemented by sidebars that contain primary sources, quotes, and contemporary concerns, and focus boxes that present

practical application of the chapter's material. For those who have a marked copy of the first edition and/or use it in teaching, an added benefit of this second edition is that it follows with only slight alterations in the pagination of the original edition.

In keeping with the authors' purpose, the second edition has only a few variations. The majority of the added material in the main text is found in the following new sections: "So Many Translations" (30), critical issues in each chapter concerning a Gospel (84, 95-96, 105, 114-15), "Themes in Acts" (211), and "General Epistle Summary" (373). A new sidebar, "Corruption in the Church" (230), is a further addition. A great amount of the rewriting is found in the focus boxes; twelve of the twenty-five have been changed in the second edition (30, 84, 132, 187, 203, 219, 246, 269, 322, 340, 370, 393). The bibliographies have also been updated and a few new footnotes have been added to reflect works not available in 1998 when the first edition appeared. In the main text, the authors now recommend P. Stuhlmacher's *Revisiting Paul's Doctrine of Justification* as a response to the "new perspective" on Paul instead of T. Schreiner's *The Law and Its Fulfillment* (261), although Schreiner's work is still recommended in the bibliography for further reading on Paul (271). The visual content has not been significantly revised. The chapter summaries and review questions remain unchanged from the original work.

Because this second edition is basically the same as the original, the judgments passed on the original review remain. The textbook continues to be pedagogically sound, visually oriented, with a good introduction to the historical background of the NT and a satisfactory discussion of the purpose, structure, and major themes of each NT book. However, three weaknesses are still present. First, the authors view the church in continuity with the OT people of God; for them, the church is the new Israel (21, 203, 266). Second, the book is weak in warning the beginning student concerning the dangers associated with critical methods used in NT study. Third, the presentation is a little on the "lite" side when compared to the NT surveys of Gundry [see *TMSJ* 15 (2004):120-21], Lea and Black [see *TMSJ* 15 (2004):123], and Tenney. But it seems that this second edition of *Encountering the New Testament* will continue to find a prominent place in the undergraduate study of the NT, so teachers and pastors must be aware of its content and impact.

Graeme Goldsworthy. *According to Plan: The Unfolding Revelation of God in the Bible*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002. 251 pp. $22.00 (paper). Reviewed by Keith Essex, Assistant Professor of Bible Exposition.

The majority of American evangelicals were first introduced to Graeme Goldsworthy, former lecturer in Old Testament, biblical theology, and hermeneutics at Moore Theological College, Sydney, Australia, through his book, *Preaching the Whole Bible as Christian Scripture* (Eerdmans, 2000). The volume had a great impact, including being named book of the year for 2000 by *Preaching* magazine. In the words of its author, the book aimed "to provide a handbook for preachers that will help them apply a consistently Christ-centered approach to their sermons" (ix). Goldsworthy bemoaned the fact that very little was said about biblical theology in

books on expository preaching. For him, biblical theology was one implication of the evangelical view of the Bible, and he believed that seeing the big picture of Scripture was necessary for effective biblical preaching. He wrote, "To the evangelical preacher, then, I would address one simple but pointed question, . . . How does this passage of Scripture, and consequently my sermon, testify to Christ?" (29). The answer was for the preacher to know salvation history as the context for the biblical text at hand. The context of salvation history is found through the study of biblical theology. The latter half of the book gave the practical application of biblical theology to preaching (133-256). However, the foundation of effective expository preaching was not only the preacher's knowledge of biblical theology, but also his hearers' understanding of the same. Thus, Goldsworthy encouraged expositors to train their congregants in biblical theology as he had done, using a course of study that had subsequently been published in 1991 in Australia and Great Britain as the book, *According to Plan: The Unfolding Revelation of God in the Bible* (132). Because of the impact of *Preaching the Whole Bible as Christian Scripture* among American evangelicals, the earlier work, *According to Plan*, has been published for the American market.

Goldsworthy introduces *According to Plan* as "a biblical theology for ordinary Christians" (7). The work is a beginner's guide, and the author has kept the terminology simple, with many charts, summaries at the beginning of each chapter, and study guide questions at the conclusion of each chapter. The book divides into four parts. Part One asks why Christians should be concerned with biblical theology (15-25). The writer introduces some of the practical situations and problems in understanding and applying the Bible that are answered by relating them to the one message of the Scripture which is the concern of biblical theology. Part Two is a discussion of how biblical theology is done (27-78). The author shows how God has made Himself known through Christ and Scripture. The proper presuppositions (see list on 45) and methods of interpretation one uses in approaching the Bible as God's revelation are special concerns addressed in these pages. Part Three is the heart of the book where the what, the content, of biblical theology is described (79-234). Here, Goldsworthy spells out what for him is the major theme of the Bible, the gospel of Jesus Christ, and the other significant themes associated with it. These themes are developed progressively as they are in Scripture from creation to the consummation in the eternal state. Part Four is a short introduction to where the content and method of biblical theology can be applied (235-44). The subjects of knowing God's will and life after death are used as examples of how study of the Bible can be enhanced once the big picture of Scripture has been grasped. The book concludes with a subject index (345-46) and a Scripture index (247-51).

Goldsworthy's presentation has a number of noteworthy features. First, the importance of and presentation to the ordinary Christian of basic biblical truth must be emphasized. The volume is a model of how to educate the beginner in good theology in a simple way without 'dumbing down' the content. Second, the writer's commitment to the authority of Scripture and the reader's need to receive it by faith as God's Word are well stated. Third, the centrality of the gospel to proper biblical understanding and a firm statement of the subject matter of the gospel can be affirmed as foundational for the Christian. Fourth, the reminder of the Christo-centric nature of the scriptural revelation is helpful. Finally, the challenge of

isolating the major themes and their development throughout the Bible is a needed emphasis. The author's simple, yet profound, statement of his understanding of the content of biblical theology will be helpful to all Christian believers, even those who may disagree with him at points.

Nevertheless, some statements made by Goldsworthy need to be questioned. First, as to the basic method employed in biblical study, the writer states, "In doing biblical theology as Christians, we do not start at Genesis 1 and work our way forward until we discover where it is all leading. Rather we first come to Christ, and he directs us to study the Old Testament in the light of the gospel" (55). The grid of biblical understanding, for this author, is developed from the NT and the OT is then read through this grid. Second, a result of this type of reading of the OT is a denial of literalism in the interpretation of OT prophecies (67-69). This is affirmed because Jesus and the NT writers understood the OT prophecies through the principle of "typology." Although such terms as land, exodus, and temple have specific correspondence to literal realities in the OT, they are seen in the NT as fulfilled in Jesus Christ, not literally, but typically. In the words of the author, "*Literalism* involves the very serious error of not listening to what the New Testament says about fulfillment. It assumes that the fulfillment must correspond exactly to the form of the promise" (67). In contrast to Goldsworthy, the present reviewer would affirm that biblical theology should proceed from Genesis 1 and OT prophecies should be understood literally. The resulting content of biblical theology will be premillennial in orientation instead of the amillennial approach that Goldsworthy states. Much in the areas of God's authority, man's rebellion, God's redemption of believing sinners, and the blessings of union with Christ is profitable. Yet along with the agreement, the fundamental difference as to the present spiritual inauguration of kingdom and its consummation in the new Jerusalem being the totality of biblical fulfillment of OT prophecies is inevitable.

Along with Goldsworthy, the affirmation that both expositors and hearers should have a big-picture understanding of the Bible can be made. However, for this reviewer, *The Greatness of the Kingdom* by Alva J. McClain, which begins at Genesis 1 and works forward and takes the OT prophecies literally, is a better starting point for both expositors and congregants than *According to Plan*.

Justo L. Gonzalez. *Essential Theological Terms*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2005. xii +187 pp. $24.95 (paper); and Henry W. Holloman. *Kregel Dictionary of the Bible and Theology*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2005). 600 pp. $21.77 (cloth). Reviewed by Dennis M. Swanson , Seminary Librarian.

In the ever-changing theological landscape, new terms are appearing (and disappearing) at a faster rate than at any time in history. At the same time even terms that seem to be established in the evangelical mind are being altered, either by wholesale or by slight nuance. It is important that the pastor's library have solid reference works to help him understand accurately the meaning of theological terms.

In *Essential Theological Terms*, the author, a long time professor and prolific writer in church history, has undertaken to provide definitional clarity to

about 300 theological terms and phrases. He acknowledges that "theological language evolves" (xi) and understands that this work will eventually become dated, but hopes that the book will provide "the essential theological vocabulary necessary for a budding theologian to be in dialogue with the theology of centuries past" (xii). In this task the author has largely succeeded.

The work is laid out in a normal dictionary format with a listing of article titles and page numbers in the front. However, it includes no other indexes, which would have been of help to the reader. The articles are generally detailed (some nearly a full page in length) and reflect the author's refreshingly clear writing style. The strength of the work is the underlying expertise of the author in historical theology. That the same publisher produced the *Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms* (by Donald K. McKim) only a few years ago is interesting. That work and this one deal with the same type of material (the cover motif for both is similar), and this reviewer could find no entries by Gonzalez that were not also in the earlier work. The articles in this work are often more detailed than McKim, but it has about 200 fewer entries.

Gonzalez is neither conservative in his theology nor seemingly friendly to evangelical theology. His entry on "Fundamentalism" (66), though giving the basics of its origination, makes a link between Christian fundamentalism and Islamic fundamentalism, an egregious misrepresentation of Christian or biblical funda-mentalism. The idea that all "fundamentalisms" are "bad" has even become popular with some evangelical leaders. Another entry on "Dispenationalism" is equally misguided. Gonzalez states, "[M]ost biblical scholars dismiss dispensationalism as uninformed and as a misguided interpretation of Scripture" (46). He then goes on to state that dispensationalism does enjoy "adherents among the masses" and uses the popularity of the *Left Behind* novels to support his assertion about a lack of credibility in dispensational theology.

However, despite obvious lacks, the author gives some definitional clarity to a good number of terms that have arisen in a few decades, as well as those for standard terms and movements. The entries, however, lack any bibliographic notations, a disadvantage for the reader desiring to do more research.

Though the author has produced a worthwhile book that provides a useful reference for students or busy pastors, the intermediate size of the articles is somewhat unsatisfying. It has neither the breadth of terms that the "ready reference" style of the work of McKim affords, nor does it have the depth of information that, for instance, the far superior *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* (Baker, 2d ed., 2001) offers. The high price of this book is also somewhat unappealing given its relative brevity.

Although slightly different in focus and scope, the second book of this review, the *Kregel Dictionary of the Bible and Theology*, is a superior investment.

Holloman, longtime professor of systematic theology at the Talbot School of Theology has produced an excellent dictionary of "over 500 key theological words and concepts" (subtitle) that is unique in the recent reference literature. The articles are generally quite detailed with several being over two pages in length. Many but not all have an introductory bibliography. The beginning of the work has a set of abbreviations, which is more important than normal as the author acknowl-edges that they are not the "designations normal to biblical scholarship" (5). The

articles themselves have the useful feature of offering the biblical terms in separate sections at the end of the articles. The Hebrew and Greek words are given along with transliterations and the word meanings are detailed. All the articles have extensive biblical references.

One might question the title of the book in relation to the content. Though called a *Dictionary of the Bible and Theology*, it is probably more accurately a dictionary of "Biblical Theology." It has no articles on traditional theological terms such as "Calvinism," rather the entry points are the biblical terms (e.g., "Election," "Justification," and "Predestination") related to those positions. Little attention is given to historical development of the terms, and allusions to historical theology are often simply illustrative (e.g., "Deism," 178). This is not to say the work ignores current issues in theology; however, they are developed from within the framework of the biblical terminology (e.g., the issues related to "Open Theism" are developed within the article on "God" [171-78]; the issues related the Christological controversies are examined within the article on "Incarnation" [230-34]; the classic definition of "creationism" as it relates to the origin of the soul occur within the article on "Soul, Spirit" [509-13, one of this work's excellent articles]; issues related to the creation of the earth and universes is dealt with under "Creation" [88-93]). Publishers' space limitations are understandable, but this book would have been greatly enhanced with a subject index, and in light of the massive amount of biblical references contained in the articles, a Scripture index would have been of inestimable value.

Within the articles, Holloman is thoroughly even-handed in presenting the differing interpretations (e.g., millennial and rapture views, classic vs. progressive dispenationalism) and practices (e.g., baptism and communion). The articles are clear and engaging, and have a generous use of "see also" references to point the reader to additional information.

This is one of the best reference works of its kind to be produced in many years. It is a thoroughly refreshing biblical exposition of theological concepts that reflects the author's breadth and depth of study. It deserves a place at the right hand of every pastor and student of the Bible as a significant and major contribution to the reference literature for biblical studies. It cannot be recommended highly enough.

Wayne Grudem. *Evangelical Feminism & Biblical Truth*. Sisters, Ore: Multnomah, 2004. 858 pp. $29.00 (paper). Reviewed by Richard L. Mayhue, Senior Vice-President and Dean, Professor of Pastoral Ministry and Theology.

Dr. Grudem first gained worldwide visibility on this subject matter with the publication of *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* (Wheaton, Ill: Crossway, 1991), co-edited with John Piper (see my review in *TMSJ* 2/1 [Spring 1991]:108–10). This latest work, written exclusively by Grudem, finished as a finalist in the Theology/Doctrine category for the 2005 Gold Medallion Book Awards given by the Evangelical Christian Publishers Association.

EFBT represents over a decade of Dr. Grudem's updated research and ongoing dialogue with those who take issue over the "complementarian" understand-

ing of male/female roles in the home and church. An extensive bibliography (books and articles), eight appendixes (especially studies of κεφαλη and αυjθεντευω), and three indexes (Scripture, name, and subject) make this volume exceptional in its usability and value. Though the contents reflect Grudem's commendable scholarly research and clear thinking, he also presents the material in an extraordinarily well-organized format and highly readable prose.

The heart of the volume resides in chapters 3-12, which thoroughly answer 118 arguments that evangelical feminists have rendered over the years in denial of "completarianism" and in favor of "egalitarianism." Grudem proves masterful in his refutation of the arguments. Yet, he maintains an unusually irenic and charitable spirit in so doing, for which he is to be commended in light of the volatility associated with many materials written on this topic. Grudem unquestionably deserves to be categorized as "comprehensive and fair."

Chapters 1-2 contain a positive view of men and women in their similarities and differences as created by God. The biblical truths of equality in value (both male and female created in the image of God) and variety in home and church roles (as revealed by the Creator in Scripture) receive a balanced treatment. Chapters 13-14 question evangelical feminists' real allegiance to the full authority of Scripture and project the unorthodox results if they do not.

EFBT should be read by anyone who wants to understand both Scripture and the current debate on this theme. I highly recommend this new volume by Dr. Grudem as the appropriate follow-up to and extension of the discussion in the earlier volume, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*.

John D. Hannah, *Charts of Modern and Postmodern Church History*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004. 160 pp. $29.99 (paper). Reviewed by Larry D. Pettegrew, Professor of Theology.

As the author remarks in the introduction to this series of charts, "The value of history has fallen on difficult times in contemporary culture. Postmoderns have demonstrated a tendency to disregard the past as a useless and even debilitating relic, something akin to unwanted dreams and painful experiences" (11). This book is dedicated to helping correct this regrettable situation, even in evangelical churches.

The author is department chairman and distinguished professor of historical theology at Dallas Theological Seminary. The book is actually book three in a three-part series on church history—the previous two dealing with ancient and medieval church history, and the Reformation and Enlightenment church history.

This series of charts is divided into three sections: The National Period of American Church History; The Modern Period of American Church History; and The Postmodern Period of Church History. There are a total of 133 charts, diagrams, maps, and explanatory captions. The book includes, for example, such charts as "Developments Within Nineteenth-Century American Theology"; "The Birth of Modern Missions Movement"; "The Theology of Jehovah's Witnesses"; "The History of American Evangelicalism"; "Liberal Theology and Evangelical Theology: A Comparison"; "The History of the Charismatic Movements in

America"; "The Church Growth Movement"; and "Postmodernism and Authority."

Included with the book is a CD-ROM PowerPoint presentation that makes the charts all the more valuable. The teacher is thus enabled to use the book to see the charts at an easy glance, and then choose the particular charts that will help his PowerPoint presentation.

The book is highly recommended as an excellent way to help teachers in Sunday School classes, Bible institutes, colleges, and seminaries communicate more precisely the facts and insights of church history.

Martin Hengel. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*. Trans. Mark E. Biddle. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002. xvi + 153 pp. $24.99 (paper). Reviewed by William D. Barrick, Professor of Old Testament.

LXX and patristics scholars will find this volume a stimulating read. Martin Hengel is emeritus professor of NT and ancient Judaism at the University of Tübingen, Germany. He is the author of over fifty published books including *The 'Hellenization' of Judea in the First Century After Christ* (reprinted; Wipf & Stock, 2003), *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels* (Trinity Press International, 2000), and *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity* (reprinted; Wipf & Stock, 2003). Robert Hanhart, the third director (1961-1993) of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen, contributed the "Introduction" for this volume (1-17). A collection of indexes closes the volume (129-53).

Canonicity is the primary focus of the essays in *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture*. Hengel originally presented his essays to an ecumenical group of Protestant and Catholic theologians working on the interconfessional differences with regard to the development of the OT canon. Scholars identify the two developing Old Testaments as the Palestinian (following the Masoretic tradition) and the Alexandrian. Protestant churches adhere to the former while the Roman Catholic Church has followed the latter with its inclusion of apocryphal or deuterocanonical books. Hanhart believes that the Palestinian canon had already been established before being translated into Greek (4-5). He observes that the early Christian community was concerned about the canonicity of LXX portions that were in disagreement with or absent in the Hebrew original (6, 10). Both the Christian and the Jewish communities diverge in their treatment of the Tetragrammaton (יהוה) in their respective LXX manuscripts. Jewish LXX manuscripts transmit the Tetragrammaton itself rather than the Greek translation kuvrio" followed in LXX manuscripts of Christian origin (7). Hanhart concludes that the Jewish employment of אדני for the Tetragrammaton preceded the Christian adoption of kuvrio" (8).

Both Hanhart and Hengel agree that the Christian community defended differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts by claiming divine inspiration for the Greek translation (11, 52-53). Though Hanhart appears to assume the existence of a full Palestinian canon of the OT in the pre-LXX community, Hengel argues that some of the books attributed to the Palestinian canon only became part of it

following the Alexandrian canon's development. Hengel first examines the *Letter of Aristeas* and the accretion of legends around the translation of the LXX (25-41). Next, he establishes the existence of a Christian LXX (41-56). One of the pieces of evidence that he presents for a distinction between Jewish and Christian LXXs is use of the codex for Christian documents as compared to the scroll for Jewish (41).

Hengel's second major essay ("The Later Consolidation of the Christian 'Septuagint Canon,'" 57-74) examines the absence of a fixed order of the canonical books of the OT. He argues that the debate over the apocrypha in the Reformation occurred because the dispute had not been resolved in the early church (66). Disputed books included Esther, Canticles, Qoheleth (Ecclesiastes), and Daniel. Unfortunately, Hengel himself raises questions about these books. In his opinion, Canticles is probably a "profane love poem" (92), Qoheleth is "semi-cloaked under a pseudonym" (93), and Daniel was written around 165 B.C. (95; obviously, after the fulfillment of its prophecies in chap. 11). For this reason, the evangelical reader will find Hengel's seemingly cavalier treatment of Scripture frustrating and disappointing.

Next, Hengel examines the origin and development of the Jewish LXX (75-103). He observes that LXX texts at Qumran demonstrate the existence of a Jewish LXX, since the Essenes were characteristically antagonistic to all influences from Hellenistic culture (82). For this reviewer, one of Hengel's most fascinating suggestions is that the apostle Paul may have produced his own Greek translation of the OT for some of his citations from Isaiah, Job, and 1 Kings (83, 89).

The final essay deals with the origin of the Christian LXX and its additions (105-27). In it he reveals that he accepts a late date around A.D. 130 for Peter's second epistle in the NT (108). He also concludes that the "question of *why* the Old Testament attained in the church precisely the form present—still not completely uniformly—in the great codices of the fourth and fifth centuries is essentially insoluble" (112). As to *how* the canon for the Christian LXX's books was finalized for the Christian church, Hengel hypothesizes that the cause was probably the existence of a community archive or library in Rome with connections to Alexandria (122-23). In his final paragraphs he goads the reader by questioning the consistency of closing the OT canon at all, if the biblical canon must remain open for the NT (125-26).

Kent and Barbara Hughes. *Disciplines of a Godly Family.* Revised edition. Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2004. 256 pp. $17.95 (cloth). Reviewed by Michael A. Grisanti, Associate Professor of Old Testament.

Kent and Barbara Hughes have effectively served the congregation of College Church in Wheaton, Illinois for a number of years. As the parents of four children and the grandparents of nineteen, they draw from a wealth of experience as well as from a lifetime dedicated to the study of God's Word. This volume originally appeared with the title, *Common Sense Parenting*, and was published by Tyndale House Publishers in 1996. Crossway's release of this revised edition offers readers a number of simple, practical ideas about how to rear a godly family and

have fun in the process.

The chapters are categorized under three headings: Building a Family (establishing a heritage, promoting family affection, starting family traditions), Spirituality (cultivating the soul, praying with dedication, pursuing family ministry, instilling healthy self-regard [not self-esteem]), and Everyday Living (using appropriate discipline, teaching good manners, fostering life-long enrichments). Each chapter ends with application questions. Almost 90 pages are devoted to an extensive appendix that covers a host of practical issues like aids to Christian education for use in the family, resources for celebrating Advent, and instructions on conducting a Christian Passover. Among other topics, it provides suggestions for making a prayer notebook, offers common-sense tips regarding discipline, suggested reading lists for children, ideas for assembling a home movie library, selected Hughes family recipes, and answers to common questions.

As with any practical book, not all suggestions offered by the Hugheses will fit a given family's approach to parenting. Regardless, as a parent of eight children, this reviewer found encouragement in the Hughes' commitment to rearing a godly family and doing it with a joyful heart. For parents who labor under a heavy load of ministry and/or employment, a warm exhortation to devote themselves to this God-given task, as well as the provision of a number of enlightening suggestions, makes this book a potential blessing. For those in the ministry, devotion to the accurate and relevant preaching of God's Word cannot replace consistent parental involvement in the lives of their children. As the Hughes point out, "the truth is, a pound of parent is worth a hundred pounds of preaching" (62).

Carter Lindberg, ed. *The Pietist Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.* Oxford: Blackwell, 2005. xvi + 282 pp. $39.95 (cloth). Reviewed by Paul R. Thorsell, Associate Professor of Bible, The Master's College.

Carter Lindberg's *The Pietist Theologians* stands as the next volume in Blackwell's series surveying the major theologians of the Christian church. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are the focus of the current volume. Sixteen chapters by as many authors introduce the reader to the lives and thoughts of selected "pietist theologians" of those centuries.

But who are these "pietist theologians"? Therein lies the book's fundamental ambivalence. Are these the significant theologians of Pietism? Some certainly are (Spener, Francke, Arnold, Zinzendorf, Bengel). Is there a concrete historical movement that can be labeled "Pietism"? In the introduction, Lindberg notes the lack of scholarly consensus on this question. Are these representative theologians of an era that can appropriately be labeled "pietist"? If so, the omission of some significant theologians (Amyraut, Grotius, Quenstedt)—even some theologians with notable contributions to individual spirituality (Edwards, Law, Owen)—is inexplicable. The inclusion of others (Gerhardt, Guyon) who can only remotely be called "theologians" is also puzzling.

Despite this ambivalence, the book contains a wealth of information and

insight into the variety and connection of theological thought during this era. Wallmann's chapter delightfully details the significant influence of Johann Arndt's *True Christianity* on European and American Lutheranism. Lovelace points out the ongoing correspondence that took place in the early eighteenth century between the American Puritan Cotton Mather and the German Pietist August Francke. Durnbaugh cites the influence of the quixotic Jane Leade on the Anglican William Law, continental Theosophists, and Count Zinzendorf. Jung describes Johanna Petersen as a millenarian advocating a future, Jewish-centered millennium more than a century before John Darby's nascent dispensationalism. Overall, Lindberg's *The Pietist Theologians* fills in significant gaps in understanding the theology of the period.

J. G. McConville. *Deuteronomy.* Apollos Old Testament Commentary. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002. 544 pp. $44.99 (cloth). Reviewed by Michael A. Grisanti, Associate Professor of Old Testament.

McConville is a British scholar who has distinguished himself in Deuteronomy studies. This volume is one of the first two offerings in the new Apollos Old Testament Commentary. The series "takes its name from the Alexandrian Jewish Christian who was able to impart his great learning fervently and powerfully through his teaching (Acts 18:24-25)" (9). The series hopes to work with one foot firmly planted in the universe of the original text as well as communicate the meaning and practical application of Deuteronomy to a modern audience.

In his introduction to the book, McConville proposes that the book consists largely of Moses' speeches (19), which are surrounded by 3rd person narration. He suggests that in the context of the ancient world, Deuteronomy should be seen "as a radical blueprint for the life of a people, at the same time spiritual and political, and running counter to every other social-political-religious programme" (21). Though McConville critiques the critical consensus about the composition of Deuteronomy, he clearly affirms that his commentary "does not defend Mosaic authorship" (39). On the one hand, he does not discount the evidence cited by numerous conservative evangelical scholars that points to a 2nd millennium background for Deuteronomy. On the other hand, he affirms that this kind of evidence "broadly supports the relatively early date that I advocate" (40). The frustrating part is that McConville has chosen "not to try to date the book exactly" (40) and offers no precise idea what "relatively early date" he refers to.

The commentary on Deuteronomy proceeds section by section through the book. Although McConville provides no over-arching outline of the book (which is a weakness), one can identify the major pericopes he identifies. Each pericope receives treatment under five headings. After McConville's own translation of the text, he provides a section dealing with textual issues ("Notes on the Text"), sometimes relating to text criticism and others to morphology, syntax, or word meanings. After he deals with "Form and Structure" issues, he devotes the most pages on that pericope to his "Comment" section, generally arranged by smaller verse units. He concludes his treatment of a pericope with an "Explanation" section

in which he summarizes the message of the verses discussed.

The volume concludes with a thorough bibliography (30 pages, single spaced) that is abreast of recent scholarship on Deuteronomy as well as a helpful set of indexes (Scripture references, authors, and subjects). These concluding features add to the value and potential impact of the volume on those interested in working in Deuteronomy studies.

The primary weakness of the volume, the absence of an analytical outline, does not erase the significance of McConville's work. Such an outline would help the reader understand or recognize decisions McConville made about the flow of the book's message. In spite of the few concerns cited above, the commentary deserves a place on the shelf of any student who desires to understand the message of Deuteronomy.

Doug McIntosh. *Deuteronomy*. Holman OT Commentary. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2002. xiii + 386 pp. $19.99 (cloth). Reviewed by Michael A. Grisanti, Associate Professor of Old Testament.

This commentary, as well as others in the same series, seeks to provide its readers with a user-friendly resource that will primarily help lay-people who are teaching the Bible in their local church or in individual and group Bible studies. After an introductory chapter that introduces the reader to the authorship of Deuteronomy (accepting Mosaic authorship and a date of composition of ca. 1406 B.C.), the recipients and the themes of Deuteronomy, McIntosh provides a commentary on each chapter of the book. Each chapter of the commentary has ten components: a stimulating quotation, a summary statement for the chapters under consideration ("in a nutshell"), an introductory illustration to catch the attention of the audience, a verse-by-verse commentary (albeit brief), an overview of principles and applications that arise from the passage at hand, life application, a suggested prayer, a consideration of details not covered by the commentary section ("Deeper Discoveries"), giving attention to certain key words, phrases, and themes of the Bible, a teaching outline or plan, and several issues for discussion. The commentary section has interspersed throughout helpful summary statements at each main point as well as at the end of the chapter ("supporting idea" and "main idea review"). A glossary of key terms and a brief bibliography conclude the volume.

This reviewer has only used a handful of the volumes in this series and with mixed success. The present volume is one of the better volumes in the series. A reader who understands the limitations of space available to the author can read this commentary and gain a better feel for the message of Deuteronomy. For those who are searching for illustrations, appropriate quotes, and summary principles, McIntosh offers potential help to the preacher.

One of the major disadvantages of this commentary on Deuteronomy, a book that gives primary attention to the Mosaic Law, is that it does not offer the reader any suggestions on how the Mosaic Law does or does not apply to the believer of today. The applicational thoughts offered by the author are generally valid, but would have been strengthened by giving some attention to that issue.

The editor of the series and the author of each volume are pursuing a very commendable goal, i.e., providing an understandable treatment of each biblical book for lay-people.

Calvin J. Roetzel. *Paul: A Jew on the Margins*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2003. xii + 116 pp. $14.95 (paper). Reviewed by Paul R. Thorsell, Associate Professor of Bible, The Master's College.

My initial—and favorable—acquaintance with Calvin Roetzel, long-time scholar of Paul, came from his monumental work, *Judgement in the Community* (Brill, 1972). Although written prior to the revolution in Pauline studies set off by E. P. Sanders, Roetzel's early tome was weighty and persuasive. The present volume is neither. *Paul: A Jew on the Margins* is a collection of four previously published articles. The best of the four (chap. three) reprises the old Bultmann/Käsemann discussion on Paul's use of apocalyptic. Roetzel takes the chapter to explore Paul's use and reworking of Jewish apocalyptic categories. All four articles are reworked to emphasize Paul's status as "marginal Jew." Two new chapters are appended to these four: "Paul—A Jew on the Margins" (hence the title) and "Paul as Mother: A Metaphor for Jewish-Christian Conversion?" The first introductory chapter portrays Paul as living at the margins of both Judaism and Christianity; the second probes Paul's use of feminine maternal imagery to embrace the humility of Christ. Neither is persuasive. Roetzel's volume is, in my estimation, a sad example of what happens when socio-political rhetoric hijacks biblical studies.

Mark F. Rooker. *Studies in Hebrew Language, Intertextuality, and Theology*. Texts and Studies in Religion 98. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 2003. xiii + 264 pp. $109.95 (cloth). Reviewed by William D. Barrick, Professor of Old Testament.

Mark Rooker is professor of Old Testament and Hebrew at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, N.C. His previous books include *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel* (JSOTSup 90, Sheffield, 1990) and *Leviticus* (New American Commentary, Broadman & Holman, 2000—see review in *TMSJ* 12/1 [Spring 2001]:123-24). *Studies in Hebrew Language, Intertextuality, and Theology* is a collection of twelve essays by Rooker. Four essays deal with diachronic linguistics, one (the only essay not previously published) with textual criticism, two with intertextuality, two with the interpretation of Gen 1:1-3, and three on the theology of the Flood, the Law, and the Conquest.

Diachronic linguistics is one of Rooker's fortes and the subject of his first book on the language of Ezekiel. Therefore, the reader will not be surprised that the first three essays deal with the same topic. "The Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew" (3-18) introduces the topic by sketching the history of linguistics and its application to biblical Hebrew. "Ezekiel and the Typology of Biblical Hebrew" (19-44) examines Robert Polzin's characteristics of Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH).

Rooker demonstrates that most of the characteristics in Polzin's list are legitimate, though a few are questionable (25) due to misinterpretation of the data (27), failure to normalize text sampling length (28), and deficiencies in the use of ratios (29). Rooker concludes that Ezekiel is a better model for the transition state of Hebrew between Early Biblical Hebrew and LBH than the Priestly (P) document claimed by documentarians (44). "Diachronic Analysis and the Features of Late Biblical Hebrew" (45-57) presents four representative elements of LBH drawn from orthography, morphology, and syntax. Rooker then utilizes these evidences of LBH to argue against the exilic or post-exilic dating of Isaiah 40–66 in one of the volume's most significant essays ("Dating Isaiah 40–66: What Does the Linguistic Evidence Say?" 59-73).

Making its first appearance in a publication, "Old Testament Textual Criticism" (75-97) offers a conservative approach that every student of the OT should read. Rooker defines textual criticism (75), explains its need (76-77), describes its witnesses (78-85), provides a concise history of the text (86-90), and evaluates local text theory vs. linear development (90-92). After discussing the practice of textual criticism (93-96), he concludes that the Masoretic Text is "the best witness to the original text" (96).

"The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Ezekiel" (101-11) and "The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Hosea" (113-33) deal with intertextuality. For Ezekiel's citations and allusions to prior biblical materials, Rooker examines connections to Leviticus 26 in Ezekiel 4–5, Zephaniah 3:1-4 in Ezekiel 22, and portions of Numbers 18 in Ezekiel 44. He concludes that Ezekiel's exegetical methods (promise-fulfillment, use of OT passages as a mode or vehicle of expression, and typological exegesis) are basically the same as those employed by NT writers (110-11). Rooker discusses Hosea's references to the creation, Abraham, and Jacob narratives in Genesis, as well as the exodus narratives in Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy (114-22). He also handles references to Joshua, Judges, and the book of Kings (122-24). As one would expect, Hosea's use of Deuteronomy eclipses his references to the Decalogue and other legal texts from Exodus and Leviticus (124-30). Like other Hebrew prophets, Hosea drew heavily from Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 (130-31). Such usage of prior texts demonstrates an accepted canon even in the eighth century B.C. (133).

Two essays focus on Gen 1:1-3 ("Genesis 1:1-3: Creation or Recreation? Part 1," 137-49 and "Part 2," 151-71). In these studies Rooker carefully analyzes the gap theory (a.k.a. restitution theory), the initial chaos theory, and the precreation chaos theory. In "Part 1" he correctly rejects the gap theory on grammatical grounds (138-40) and adopts a modified initial chaos theory after careful exegetical analysis (140-49). "Part 2" presents an effective detailed response to Bruce Waltke's precreation chaos stance (*Creation and Chaos* [Portland, Ore.: Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, 1974]).

"The Genesis Flood" (173-202) defends the universality of Noah's Flood (178-79). While Rooker presents the basic arguments pro and con for the two most popular views regarding "the sons of God" and "the daughters of men," it is disappointing that he does not indicate his own preference (179-81). Most of the essay is given over to a careful consideration of the structure of the Flood narrative (183-94). It concludes with brief discussions of six timeless theological truths drawn

from the Flood narrative (196-202).

The next essay, "The Law and the Christian" (203-19), is an excerpt from Rooker's *Leviticus* commentary (see *TMSJ* 12/1 [Spring 2001]:123-24). The final essay, "The Conquest of Canaan" (221-27) appeared in the *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Zondervan, 1997; see the review in *TMSJ* 9/1 [Spring 1998]:120-23). Although he holds to the early date for the exodus, Rooker provides very little in the way of argumentation in this essay, since its emphasis is theological.

Rooker's essays could be gathered from the various publications in which eleven of the twelve first appeared, but there is a distinct advantage to having them within one cover. The expense of this volume and its limited printing make it prohibitive, if not unavailable, for most students and many teachers. It is already listed as "unavailable" on Amazon.com. Libraries should take pains to obtain it for their collections, so that their patrons might be edified by Rooker's careful scholarship and sound interpretative stance. Unfortunately, such scholars are all too infrequently published. Seminarians and pastors alike should read Rooker as an encouragement to sound evangelical scholarship and as an antidote to liberal trends that dominate much of OT studies today. This is the type of book that well-known evangelical presses ought to be publishing in their academic lines at more accessible prices. This professor, for one, would make it required reading in an OT introduction course.

David M. Stec. *The Targum of Psalms: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 16. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 2004. xv + 254 pp. $89.95 (cloth). Reviewed by William D. Barrick, Professor of Old Testament.

Scholars have not subjected the Targums of Psalms (TgPss) to study with the intensity they have investigated Targums of the Torah and the Prophets. Indeed, published studies on TgPss have been sparse. From 1872 until 2004 only about twenty found their way into print. This volume is the first publication of an English translation of TgPss. David M. Stec is research associate for the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* and a lecturer at the University of Sheffield in England. In addition to this volume, he has published *The Text of the Targum of Job: An Introduction and Critical Edition*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

In the "Introduction" (1-24), Stec provides pertinent information regarding the date for TgPss, its character, the themes in its Midrashic and Aggadic additions, its relationship to the Targum of Job, its translation techniques, its relationship to the Masoretic Text (MT), its language, and its manuscripts. This reviewer found the discussions regarding translation techniques (11-14) and comparison to the MT (15-18) particularly interesting. Among the discernible translation techniques are double translation, anthropomorphisms, reverential devices, explanatory additions, and etymological association. Taking into account translation techniques and the theological and exegetical concerns of the targumist, TgPss supports the MT in the

preponderance of occasions in which there are variant textual traditions (15, 18).

For each psalm, Stec first presents his translation of TgPss. Italics indicate Mishnaic and Aggadic additions. Secondly, a modest but informative textual critical apparatus follows the translation. Notes dealing with matters of text and translation comprise the third section. A majority of these notes address the MT reading. The following excerpt from Ps 87:1-3 (165) illustrates the contributions of Stec's work:

1. A psalm[a] *uttered* by the sons of Korah. A song *that is founded upon the word of the fathers of old.*[1] 2. The LORD loves the gates of *the houses of study*[b] *that are fixed in* Zion more than all the *synagogues*[2] *of the house* of Jacob.[3] 3. *Words of glory*[4] are spoken concerning you, O city of God. *For ever.*[5]

Apparatus, Psalm 87
[a] *twšbḥ*; M ì[110] Ìm *šbḥ*; lacking in B C.
[b] Crn to *bty mdršy'*, with B; ì[17] pm *mdršy'*; C *mdršym*; M *mwqdš'* "of the sanctuary," ì[110] *mqdšy'*, "of the sanctuaries."

Notes, Psalm 87
[1]MT "its [or his] foundation is in the holy mountains." The translation of TgPss represents an effort to find an antecedent for the pronominal suffix in MT.
[2]*bty knyšt'* for MT *mšknwt*, "tents."
[3]Cf. *Midr. Teh.* 87.4: "The king has a palace in every province, but which palace is best loved by him? The palace which is in his own province. Hence *The Lord loveth the gates of Zion*. The Holy One, blessed be He, said: I love the synagogues and houses of study. But what do I love even more? Zion, for it is my own palace" (Braude, 2:76).
[4]*myly dyqr* for MT *nkbdwt*, "glorious things." The TgPss rendering might also be translated "glorious things," but the translation given above is intended to show that TgPss uses a different construction to represent the sense of MT.
[5]MT *selah*.

All abbreviations employed in the apparatus and notes are explained fully in the front material of the volume (xiii-xv). One element is missing that could make this edition even more user friendly and informative: the inclusion of the actual Aramaic text for each psalm. Readers then would be able to immediately evaluate Stec's translation independent of separate volumes.

Stec's volume provides for scholars and laymen alike a previously unavailable window on Jewish exegesis of the Psalms. End materials include an "Index of Scriptural and Rabbinic Passages" (245-51), an "Index of Modern Authors" (252), and a "General Index" (253-54). Such indexes supply readers with additional means for accessing information. In fact, a check of the indexes reveals that Stec included only two collations with the New Testament (131; Eph 4:8 at Ps 68:19) and the Qumran manuscripts (76; 1QM 5:7 at Ps 35:3). Given the fact that Psalms was extremely popular with both NT writers and the Qumran community, it is a disappointing omission.

Douglas A. Sweeney. *The American Evangelical Story*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005. 208 pp. $17.99 (paper). Reviewed by Larry D. Pettegrew, Professor of Theology.

   The number of books published in the last forty years on the history of fundamentalism and evangelicalism is amazing. Not too many years ago, about the only book available was written by a theological liberal trying to disparage fundamentalism. But here is another fine, well-informed, well-written historical survey of evangelicalism.

   Douglas Sweeney is associate professor of church history and the history of Christian thought, and director of the Center for Theological Understanding at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. He begins his study with a survey of definitions of evangelicalism, including the rather well-known definition by David Bebbington that characterizes evangelicalism as a movement based on conversionism, activism, biblicism, and crucicentrism. Sweeney defines the movement as follows: "Evangelicals comprise a movement that is rooted in classical Christian orthodoxy, shaped by a largely Protestant understanding of the gospel, and distinguished from other such movements by an eighteenth-century twist" (24). Evangelicalism's uniqueness, Sweeny says, is best defined by its adherence to "(1) beliefs most clearly stated during the Protestant Reformation and (2) practices shaped by the revivals of the so-called Great Awakening" (24).

   Chapter two describes the eighteenth-century revivals, with the contributions of the Puritans, Pietists, and Moravians, as well as the key revivalists—John Wesley, George Whitefield, and Jonathan Edwards. Chapter three surveys the theological developments after the Great Awakening, including a brief look at the major parties (New Lights, Old Lights, Old Calvinists, and the New Divinity), the rise of the denominations, and the Second Great Awakening. Chapter four surveys the rise of evangelical missions.

   Perhaps the most unusual chapter in the book describes the racial issues of evangelicalism. Sweeney writes, "The pages that follow offer a brief narrative history of the relationship between black and white evangelicals during the formative years of the evangelical movement, focusing closely on early white outreach to slaves and the subsequent rise of independent black denominations" (109).

   Sweeney next surveys the rise of the Holiness, Pentecostals, and Charismatic movements, identifying the contributions of such people and organizations as Phoebe Palmer, Asa Mahan, the Keswick Convention, Charles Parham, the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship, Pat Robertson, the Calvary Chapel movement, and the Vineyard Christian Fellowship. A charismatic (apparently combined with neo-Pentecostals in the author's understanding) is defined as "those who have taken Pentecostalism into the mainline as well as into the realm of nonaligned congregations" (149). Sweeney points out that the impact of the Charismatic movement on the evangelical movement has been huge. In the author's words, "[D]ue to the success of Calvary Chapel and the Vineyard (among other, similar groups), Pentecostal worship practices have infiltrated the mainline. Wimber alone published scores of the popular 'praise songs' now used in corporate worship on nearly every part of the globe. Moreover, his California-style charismatic liturgy—with its pop music, open collars, and come as-you-are informality—has effected a massive

change in the way most of us 'do church'" (151).

Sweeney ends his study with a survey of the fundamentalist and neoevangelical movements. He insightfully says that the story that the rise of dispensationalism ended evangelicals' interest in social action "is full of hyperbole." Though kernels of truth in the story as it is usually told are present, and though the kernels heightened the fundamentalists' differences with liberals, "many dispensationalists showed more love to the poor than social gospel partisans (who sometimes talked a better game than they actually played)" (164).

Of course, the interpretation of historical events can sometimes be debatable. In the split between the fundamentalists and the neoevangelicals in the middle of the twentieth century, for example, Sweeney seems to blame "right-wing fundamentalist leaders" in the South who turned their backs on Billy Graham for the "rift in the evangelical world" (177). One could certainly argue that it would seem to be more accurate to blame Billy Graham himself for this rift because of his decision in the 1950s to include theological liberals in the leadership of his crusades. Sweeney does at least mention that new approach of cooperative evangelism that Graham followed, beginning with the 1957 New York crusade.

Overall, this is fine survey of the history of the evangelical movement. It shows the big picture with clarity, and by its nature invites the reader to learn more about an interesting movement within Christianity.

John H. Walton and Andrew E. Hill. *Old Testament Today: A Journey from Original Meaning to Contemporary Significance*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004. xx + 412 pp. $49.99 (cloth). Reviewed by Keith Essex, Assistant Professor of Bible Exposition.

John Walton and Andrew Hill are both teachers of Old Testament at Wheaton College. They previously collaborated on the well-received *A Survey of the Old Testament* [see *TMSJ* 14 (2003):338-40]. Both have contributed to the *NIV Application Commentary Series*, Walton penning the commentary on Genesis and Hill on 1 & 2 Chronicles. The authors claim that this commentary series has established an approach to the biblical text that has received wide appreciation and acclaim. In the commentaries, the Bible is approached from three perspectives: original meaning, bridging contexts, and contemporary significance. The writers state, "Using these headings, the [biblical] text's meaning and significance could be traced from the original author and audience to our contemporary setting. This approach allows us to understand the content of the Bible as well as its message, theology, and relevance for today" (xi). Therefore, in this textbook Walton and Hill have decided to use that threefold process as their way to communicate the story of the OT to beginning students. They write, "Our vision for this book is that we would be able to introduce students to the Old Testament by going beyond the basic content to help them know just what they are supposed to do with it and what it is supposed to mean to them" (xiii). The authors have written this book as the foundation of a semester course in OT (xvi-xviii).

The main content of the text begins with a unit on "Fundamentals" (2-23).

The reader is oriented to the story line (i.e., the content) of the OT from the Garden of Eden to the post-exilic period as the basis of the plot line (i.e., the message to be believed). The Bible is God's story intended to help people know Him and, as God's revelation, is to be accepted as authoritative. The reader of the OT must become acquainted with both the historical and cultural background of the texts and the methodical approaches to the study of the texts in order to understand the face value of the text, that is, the way the author wanted to be understood by his audience. The three principle factors in determining face value are literary genre, cultural background, and the exact revelatory focus of the text at hand. The authors make clear that the principles of hermeneutics are to guide the exegetical process in seeking to arrive at a proper interpretation of an OT text (17). However, this seems to be contradicted in the glossary where hermeneutics is defined as "The application of rules and procedures for determining the meaning of written texts" (402). The unit concludes with an overview of how the OT text came to be written, with confidence in the OT text validated by its acceptance and use by Jesus.

The heart of the volume is found in the next five units that are broken down into three chapters each (24-380). Each unit is focused on one of the main sections of OT literature: Pentateuch, Historical Literature, Prophets, Wisdom Literature, and Psalms. The units begin with a summary of basic orientation, the revelation of God given, key verses, unit outline, and key terms. The first chapter of each unit discusses original meaning. The threefold focus of those chapters is the story line, historical background, and literary parallels from the ANE. A unit's second chapter presents bridging contexts. Here, the focus is the purpose of the individual biblical books, their theological perspectives as seen in their major themes, and the resulting plotline or message. It is here that overarching principles are articulated that will be the basis for contemporary application. The third chapter of each unit interacts with the contemporary significance. The chapters begin with a contemporary scenario that leads into a recapitulation of the timeless principles that can be applied to the case study. Then other principles and their present relevance are presented. Throughout the chapters in each unit, time lines, maps, pictures, sidebars, and callouts have been used. Each unit concludes with study questions and resources for further study.

The final unit of the text is the epilogue (382-97). Here the authors summarize some important issues: how the plot line of the OT is continued in the NT, how the OT and NT relate to and interpret each other, and the salvation of the OT Israelite. Three important resources conclude the volume. First, there is an appendix for reading through the OT (398-99). The authors here present what they believe are 150 of the most significant chapters of the OT. The student is to presume that these are the particular chapters to read if he does not have time to read the whole of the OT in a semester course. Second, a glossary of key terms with their definitions is presented (401-4). Finally, an index provides information on where in the text the discussion of different subjects is found (405-12).

Walton and Hill are to be commended for distilling and summarizing so much information germane to the study and application of the OT. However, it seems that the sheer volume of material makes the textbook impractical for a beginning student not already acquainted with the OT, the very reader for whom the authors have prepared this work. Can a beginning reader really master the content

(i.e., story line) of the OT in 35-40 hours of classroom instruction, along with the historical background, the ANE literature, the purpose and themes of each OT book, and the principles to be applied to the contemporary Christian? This volume seems best suited for the reader who already has a good understanding of the OT and seeks to think through the big picture again as a prelude to personal application and expository ministry of the OT.

Carolyn Weese and J. Russell Crabtree. *The Elephant in the Boardroom: Speaking the Unspoken About Pastoral Transitions.* San Francisco: Josey Bass, A Wiley Imprint, 2004. xviii + 220 pp. $19.95 (cloth). Reviewed by Dennis M. Swanson, Seminary Librarian.

In an era where the average tenure for a Protestant pastor is somewhere between two and three years, congregations and their leaders obviously need to have resources for making good pastoral transitions, mainly in hope that fewer of them would occur. The subtitle for this book is "How to Think About and Create a Strategic Succession Plan for Your Church." The authors apparently bring a significant amount of experience and expertise to the task. Both are executive directors of their respective ministry consulting firms: Weese heads "Multi-Staff Ministries," and Crabtree, "Holy Cow! Consulting." Also, Weese lists an administrative position in a large Presbyterian church in her background, and Crabtree indicates that he served as a pastor in "small, medium and large churches" (209) without giving specific information.

The work is part of the *Leadership Network Publication* series from The Leadership Network of Dallas, Texas. The series has centered on works from emerging church authors such as Brian McLaren, James H. Furr, Reggie McNeal, Milfred Minatrea, and others and has become a key series of works from that movement. In a revealing statement, the book states,

> The Leadership Network's focus has been on the practice and application of faith at the local congregational level. Churches and church leaders served by Leadership Network represent a wide variety of primarily Protestant faith traditions that range from mainline to evangelical to independent. All are characterized by innovation, entrepreneurial leadership, and a desire to be on the leading edge of ministry (211).

Their web site, www.leadnet.org, gives more information about the organization and its goals, but not even one biblical reference or any sort of doctrinal position was discovered there. The purpose of Leadership Network is given: "Our mission is to identify, connect and help high-capacity Christian leaders multiply their impact." It is also somewhat odd that a secular publisher, Jossey-Bass, would pick up a religious or Christian series of books.

The work has an excellent subject index, but no bibliography and no indication that the authors cite significant sources. It has no footnotes, endnotes, or anything other than a few passing references to two authors (Ken Blanchard, 17, and Peter Drucker, 106) and two others (Linda Karlovec, 13, 150, and Ron Rand, 23).

The authors also apparently assume their readers will immediately recognize the latter two, giving only the profession of Karlovec and no information at all about Rand.

The writers take an egalitarian approach to pastoral roles, acknowledging that, "We are ever mindful of the fact that women and men fill the pastoral and lay leadership roles in the church today; therefore we have tried to be inclusive throughout the text" (9). Such "inclusiveness" tends to manifest itself in the book by an annoying shift from masculine to feminine pronouns, sometimes within the same context.

The writers begin with an assumption, without offering support, that most churches do not have a plan for pastoral transitions and that, for the most part, they are unwilling to discuss the issue until it is too late (2). The book begins with the "story" of Meadowbrook Church and its pastor, Pete, who decides after a ten-year ministry to look for a new church and depart. He does, and leaves nothing but chaos in his wake (2-5). The authors present that scenario as "typical" of churches and something that needs to be addressed. They then present their perspective on how pastoral transitions should take place. They state, "Succession planning is the second most important need in every church in the country (well trained and committed pastoral and lay leadership that is culturally relevant being the first), and few if any do it well" (5). That these are the two most important needs in "every church in the country" is dubious and really exposes the most significant weakness in the book.

Another glaring problem with the work is the complete lack of biblical references, discussion of ecclesiology, and theological perspective of any kind. Except for a couple of passing references in Chapter One ("Principles of Transition: Jesus Style"), it has only a single reference in the remainder of the book, a brief quotation from a verse in Proverbs (117). The only other place where Scripture appears is in brief quotations that appear at the top of each chapter heading. Despite the assertion on the dust jacket that the authors are "firmly rooted in Biblical principles," no evidence of a biblical principle is apparent. If the authors have developed some principles on pastoral transitions, they fail to share them.

Another disturbing problem is the omission of the biblical requirements and qualifications for pastors. The key passages in Titus 1 and 1 Timothy 3 are not referenced. The authors present a model church in the following terms:

> When the church configured its staff it chose a staff heavy in lay professionals and light in ordained clergy. It then offered a significant body of training to both staff and ministry leaders. Staff members were trained in total quality management, with skills in teamwork, collaborative decision making, problem solving, customer service, coaching, strategic planning, listening, confrontation, assertiveness, rational emotive self-management, gift assessment, and personality inventory. Ministry leaders were given similar training, with more emphasis on strategic thinking, goal and objective development, prayer and accountability. A churchwide organization of ministry leaders was put in place that met quarterly to set goals, evaluate progress, celebrate victories, learn from mistakes, and receive ongoing training (170-71).

Though replete with management fads and buzzwords, this "model" church contains no mention of training in the Scripture, a theological core, or the ability to preach

and teach the Bible. In another place the authors give what they view as the six most important things to ask pastoral candidates: "discover their knowledge of the best practices in six critical areas: Worship, Adult learning, Youth ministry, Fundraising, Mission, Evangelism" (184).

Likewise the work has no discussion of the biblical role and mandate for the local church. In terms of ecclesiology, the authors seem unaware of denominational differences within Protestantism and even that there is an essential difference between Catholicism and Protestantism in terms of the local church and its actual operation. Though it is true that they are writing a "generic" work designed to have a broad appeal across denominational and associational lines, the overall work is so generic that it has almost no practical value.

This review could enumerate other problem areas, but the above suffice. The book could have been a useful tool for local churches and their leaders to manage and even plan for pastoral transitions. Unfortunately, the lack of core theological and biblical principles related to pastoral ministry and pastoral qualifications renders it useless.

Michael Wilcock. *The Message of Psalms 1–72*. The Bible Speaks Today. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2001. 255 pp. $16.00 (paper); and *The Message of Psalms 73–150*. The Bible Speaks Today. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2001. 287 pp. $16.00 (paper). Reviewed by William D. Barrick, Professor of Old Testament.

The Bible Speaks Today is a series of expositions committed to presenting readable and accurate exposition of the biblical text and relating it to contemporary life. The series aims at a melding of the commentary with the sermon. With this goal in mind, Michael Wilcock successfully expounds the Psalms in his two volumes. *The Message of Psalms* confronts readers with convicting and challenging expositions. They will not consult these volumes primarily for solution to interpretative problems. Rather, they will read them for personal growth in life and faith. Expositors will find great examples of exposition. In this regard the volumes remind this reviewer of James Montgomery Boice's excellent three-volume *Psalms* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996). Wilcock is the British Boice. Formerly he served as director of pastoral studies at Trinity College, Bristol. He has retired from many years of pastoring in the U.K. In this same series he previously authored the volumes on Luke (1984), Revelation (1984), Chronicles (1987), and Judges (1993).

Throughout *The Message of Psalms*, Wilcock cites the original Hebrew text. His exposition is based on the Hebrew, not isolated from it. While being eminently readable, he manages to link the reader with the Hebrew text and with key commentaries on the text. Wilcock meets interpretative challenges head on, as in his handling of the exposition of Psalm 22 (*Psalms 1–72*, 78-85). One by one, he evaluates the views that David, Hezekiah, and Jeremiah wrote this psalm about their own personal experiences. In the end, he demonstrates the inability of any of the three to embody fully the experiences the psalm describes. As with Psalm 2, Wilcock takes a clear messianic stance regarding Psalm 22, while allowing David to author

it on the basis of some personal experience utilized as a springboard to speak of the greater son of David.

Another difficult topic in expounding the Psalms involves the imprecatory psalms. Wilcock's treatment of this problem in connection with Psalm 35 (*Psalms 1–72*, 119-24) is superb, because it deals with the major issues and also makes six specific practical points for the expositor. Where many commentators resort to theories of editing to resolve problems or to deny Davidic authorship to psalms attributed to David in psalm headings, Wilcock sticks by the text. For example, in his discussion of the seemingly disjointed structure of Psalm 55, he declares, "But there is no need either to suppose a complex and sophisticated poetic structure for it, or to assume obtuse editors whose work needs to be cut up and rearranged. David's frame of mind is quite enough to account for its violent changes of tone" (*Psalms 1–72*, 200). Thus, Wilcock is more dependable on this issue than Gerald H. Wilson who makes room for Psalm 55 to be post-Davidic or even post-exilic (*Psalms Volume 1*, NIV Application Commentary [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002], 55-56—for a review of Wilson's volume, see *TMSJ* 14/2 [Fall 2003]:356-59).

Most expositors would consider Psalm 119 a great challenge because of its length. Wilcock's exposition (*Psalms 73–150*, 193-219) would probably require three or four 40-minute sermons, but it is remarkably concise without sacrificing either interpretative depth or practical application. It is a good example of his expository skills. Consistently he identifies the key Hebrew terms highlighting each stanza (e.g., *derek* in the *Daleth* stanza, *zākar* in the *Zayin* stanza, *hēleq* and *hesed* in the *Heth* stanza, and *ṭôb* in the *Teth* stanza; *Psalms 73–150*, 197, 200, 201, 203).

Throughout the two volumes the reader will find frequent references to great hymns related to individual psalms. Many illustrations are Anglocentric, but the American expositor will still find them applicable to his own cultural setting. Although this review has been very positive, no commentary or exposition is perfect. This reviewer was disappointed with the absence of detailed exposition for an occasional psalm (e.g., Ps 67; *Psalms 1–72*, 232-34), but that is the exception rather than the rule. Wilcock demonstrates an inadequate understanding of the Hebrew verb system when he speaks of "the perfect tense as a once-for-all event" and the imperfect as "the continuous tense" (*Psalms 73–150*, 124); see the review of Gary V. Long, *Grammatical Concepts 101 for Biblical Hebrew* (Hendrickson, 2002) in *TMSJ* 14/1 [Spring 2003]:126-27). References to grammatical elements, however, are relatively infrequent in Wilcock's expositions.

Too few recommendable commentaries for Psalms exist. Wilcock's volumes make a considerable contribution for which expositors on both sides of the Atlantic will be grateful. This reviewer highly recommends that expositors have *The Message of Psalms* in their libraries. Informed laymen and pastors alike will find these volumes stimulating and uplifting.