

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Caribbean Journal of Evangelical Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_caribbean-journal-theology_01.php

ISSN: 0799-1711

PROFESSIONAL
THEOLOGICAL
JOURNAL FOR
THE CARIBBEAN
COMMUNITY

CJET

VOLUME
15

2016

Caribbean Journal of Evangelical Theology

CONTENTS

Page

1	THE ALLUSION OF THE SMALL HORN IN DANIEL 7 AND 8 Richard Beckford
31	TOWARDS A THEOLOGY OF SERVANTHOOD Christopher Newton
47	A CARIBBEAN THEOLOGY OF THE ENVIRONMENT (Part 1) Teddy Jones
77	1 CORINTHIANS 11: 1-16: A RHETORICAL READING D V Palmer
95	Book Review: <i>Geared to Live</i> . Sasha-Kay Campbell
101	Book Review: <i>Encounter with the New Testament</i> Abson Joseph
105	VALEDICTORIAN 2015 Anne Boodho

**THE ALLUSION OF THE
SMALL HORN IN
DANIEL 7 AND 8**

by
Prof. Richard Beckford
Lecturer
Southeastern Caribbean
College (St. Lucia)

Introduction

The historical setting and composition for the visions of Daniel 7–12 have been unanimously accepted in scholarship as the time of the rise and reign of Antiochus IV

Epiphanes. John Collins posits that “since the enlightenment scholars have viewed the book as a collection of imaginative tales¹ and visions that reflect the fears and hopes of beleaguered Jews in the Hellenistic period.”² However, the latter part of the book (chapters 7–12) is also viewed as prophetic literature, composed during the exilic period, envisioning an indefinite future fulfillment.³ This prophetic outlook of an indefinite future fulfillment is embraced by some scholars, although a few adherents see chapters 7 – 12 as apocalyptic literature.⁴ Consequently, this division among

¹ The tales constitute chapters 1–6 while the visions are chapters 7–12.

² John J. Collins, Peter W. Flint and Cameron Van-Epps, *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reflection*, vol 1 (Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002), 1. In this work Collins alluded to Robert Dick Wilson who held to a traditionalist view of Daniel. He left Princeton and formed Westminster Seminary.

³ Medieval Scholar Saint Jerome, 20th century scholar E. B. Pusey and modern scholar Joyce Baldwin are a few of the adherents to this view.

⁴ According to Society of Biblical Literature, *Semeiai*, a journal that studies the method of a particular genre. An extensive work was done in *Semeia* 14 by a group of scholars including John J. Collins. It was within this journal that a workable definition was submitted for the genre (apocalyptic literature) which is now widely accepted: “a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages

scholars has implications for their composition theories. On one hand, it implies that both tales and visions were composed at the same time while on the other hand, it infers that the composition and redaction of both were done at different times. Bernard Anderson opines that those of the exilic composition see “the book as a happy hunting ground for those who are fascinated by ‘Biblical Prophecy’ and who look for some mysterious blueprint of the future hidden in pages.”⁵

Evidently, the adherents to the view of an exilic setting and composition rely on the internal evidence of the book to support their claims; notably, chapters 1–6 (set during the period Babylonian period). Even though the contents of chapters 1–6 depict a Babylonian setting, post nineteenth century scholarship continues to suggest that chapters 7–12 were composed during the Hellenistic period. It has even suggested that the “visions arise directly out of a re-reading of the tales, and were composed as a contemporary application of the message of the stories to which they were intended to form a sequel or supplement.”⁶ If the contents of the visions are re-readings of the tales in a later period then a comparison of the visions/symbols with the contents of supposedly contemporary literature of the Hellenistic period may prove worthwhile to the discussion of the specific time of composition and the historical setting of the entire book. Therefore, this study is an attempt to examine the allusion of the small horn in Daniel with the

eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world” (John J. Collins, “Apocalypse: Towards the morphology of a genre: introduction,” *Semeia* no. 14 (January, 1979): 9).

⁵Bernard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1957), 516.

⁶Phillip R. Davies, “Eschatology in the Book of Daniel,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 17 (1980): 34.

contents of 1–2 Maccabees, suggesting and clarifying a historical parallel between the two works.

A major motif of the apocalyptic literature is crisis which is demonstrated through the deeds of the antagonist. Evidently, the visions and their interpretations of the small horn referenced in the historical apocalypse of Daniel 7 and 8 verify the period of crisis experienced by the Jews at the hands of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Carol Newsom opines that “the violations of the temple and the disruption of cultic life along, with the violence against the people, are concretely the matters that provoke the sense of crisis in the Antiochene edition of Dan 7.”⁷ This article will provide a comparison of the description of the small horn in chapters 7 and 8 with the redacted historical records of 1 and 2 Maccabees. Prior to this, I will introduce the small horn that is presented in the Aramaic and Hebrew corpus of Daniel while making a detailed literary analysis of the pivotal chapter 7. Undoubtedly, this survey of chapter 7 will place the small horn in its proper literary setting which will incorporate references to the Aramaic corpus, specifically Daniel 2 and 4, while alluding to the subsequent Hebrew corpus, principally Chapter 8.

The Vision of the “Small Horn” in Chapters 7 and 8

The imagery of the small קרן (*qeren*, horn)⁸ originates in the description of the fourth beast in chapter 7. Newsom attests that the

⁷Carol A. Newsom and Brennan W. Breed, *Daniel: A Commentary*, (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 241.

⁸קרן – In the Aramaic text of Daniel, this feminine noun denotes: (1) a musical instrument in Daniel 3:5,7,10 and 15; (2) a body part of the fourth beast in the animal apocalypse in Daniel 7. The second one is the understood meaning for Daniel 7. In the Hebrew Bible, the word carries a multiplicity of meanings. First, it is associated with the physical bone structure protruding from an animal (Genesis 22:13). This bone feature was used by individuals to carry oil (1 Samuel

symbol of the horn is connected to the ancient Near East setting, namely the “Mesopotamian horned crown worn by deities.”⁹ She argues that although early Seleucid kings were attracted to this image and used it as they showcased themselves on their coins, this may not have been the source of its Danielic use.¹⁰ קרן (*qeren*) is used in the Aramaic corpus of Daniel extensively in chapter 7 as the horn(s) of the terrifying fourth beast. While the visionary

16:1; 1 Kings 1:39) and an instrument that would be blown to initiate the attacks of an army (Joshua 6:5, 6). Second, the קרן was a notable feature of the altar of burnt offering and the reference was mainly in but not confined to the Pentateuch (Exodus 27:2; 29:12; 30:2; 37:25-26; 38:2; Leviticus 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34; 8:15; 9:19; 16:18; 1 Kings 1:50; 2:28; Psalm 118:27; Jeremiah 48:25; Ezekiel 43:15, 20; Amos 3:14). Third, it was metaphorically used to express how a group or individual would ruthlessly suppress others. In Moses blessing of Israel in Deuteronomy 33, Ephraim and Manasseh are characterized as “horns of the bull/wild ox that would “make progress” (the verb נגה indicates that this progress is warlike and destructive in nature, *BDB*, 618). The same denotation is evident in 1 Kings 22:11, 2 Chronicles 18:10, Psalm 22:21 and Ezekiel 34:21. Fourth, it means strength, might or power; this is construed in Hannah’s prayer in 1 Samuel 2:1 and 10 where she noted that her “strength/horn” is exalted in the Lord and “the Lord shall exalt the power/horn of the anointed one.” Additionally, David affirms that God is the “horn” of his salvation who rescued him from his enemies (2 Samuel 22:3 and Psalm 18:2). This notion of strength, whether divine or human, is replete in the Psalms, notably Psalms 75:5, 10; 89:17, 24; 92:10; 112: 9; 132:17; 148:14. In addition, there is a similar use in the prophetic literature in Lamentations 2:3, 17; Amos 6:13 and Micah 4:13. Fifth, the word is used symbolically in the visions of Zechariah 1 and Daniel 8 referring to earthly kings/kingdoms. In the Zechariah 1:18-21, it stands as a symbol for four entities that would scatter Israel; while in Daniel 8, the horns are the key images/figures in the animal apocalypse that originate from the image of the goat. Consequently, it appears that the third and fourth meanings of the word listed above are conveyed in the symbolic use in the visions of Zechariah and Daniel.

⁹Newsom, 225.

¹⁰*Ibid.*,225.

contemplated the initial ten horns he saw, his attention was captured by a small horn. F. Louis Hartman and A. A. Di Lella suggest that the small horn is a secondary insertion to the text while Newsom asserts that it is “an interpolation to address the situation under Antiochus IV Epiphanes.”¹¹ Davies’ conclusion is worth considering. He insisted, “It is by no means conclusive but probable, that before the present inelegant vision about an eleventh king of the fourth kingdom there existed a vision about a fourth kingdom only.”¹² Evidently, the vision of the small horn finds its root in the vision of this fourth kingdom and particularly it is a growing horn.

The *Peal* verb that is used to describe the movement of the small horn is סלקת (it arose),¹³ implying that the small horn grew as it took its place among the other horns; in order for this horn to take its place of prominence three other horns were removed. The said horn had two telling features that distinguished it from the others; it had eyes like human eyes and spoke arrogantly.¹⁴ Scholars have

¹¹F. Louis Hartman and A.A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, (New York: Doubleday, 1977), 214 – 217. Hartman and Di Lella provide a wholesome discussion on the subject matter, discussing the grammatical and structural issues that give rise to their conclusion that a glossator inserted the small horn in verse 8 while no longer alluding to the small horn but an eleventh horn in the remaining text. Along with other scholars, they contend that the use of the Aramaic אלו instead of ארו (used in the other verses of the chapter) in verse 8 for “behold” and its use with the past tense verbs and not participles indicates an addition to the original literature/primary literature.

¹²Phillip R. Davies, *Daniel*, (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985),60.

¹³ In verse 8, there is the usage of the *Piel* Perfect, סלקת 3fs “it came up.”

¹⁴In chapter 7:8, this phrase מְמַלְלֵי רַבְרָבָּיִן denotes “insolent words” (Holladay 420).

agreed that the first feature speaks to the human identity of the “small horn,” specifically its haughtiness.¹⁵ The second feature is repeated in 7:11 and 20 to describe the horn that started off as small. Interestingly, additional actions are attributed to this horn in Daniel’s repetition of the vision of the fourth beast in verses 19 – 22. The horn was not merely a boastful speaker but it “made war against the holy ones and prevailed against them.”¹⁶ John Goldingay rightly observed that “the wickedness of the small horn becomes explicit.”¹⁷ Evidently, this wicked quest was for a period because in verses 11 and 22 the horn experiences judgment at the arrival of the Ancient of Days.

The other explicit mention of the קרן (*qeren*) is found in chapter 8. Collins affirms that “the image is borrowed from chapter 7 but fits the context nicely.”¹⁸ Similar to chapter 7, the horn initially is described as small but it experienced extraordinary growth towards three geographical locations (south, east and the beautiful land).¹⁹ The growth towards the “beautiful land” is

¹⁵John J. Collins in his commentary notes that the haughtiness in this text can be compared to that found in Isaiah 2:11; 5:15; Ps 101:5; John J. Collins, Adela Y. Collins and Frank M. Cross, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) 299.

¹⁶Daniel 7: 21 - Two *Peal* participles are used to state the action of the horn against the ‘holy ones’ (1) וְקָרְנָא דִּמְזֵן עֲבָדֵיהּ – this horn made war (2) וַיִּכְלָה לְהוֹן – he prevailed against them.

¹⁷John Goldingay, *Daniel*, (Texas: Word Books, 1989), 179.

¹⁸Collins, 331.

¹⁹הַעֲבִירִי – Noun “beauty or honor” + definite article; According to *BDB*, it is used metaphorically to denote the beautiful heritage of a land (840). Therefore, Israel specifically; Judah is being referenced, primarily the city of Jerusalem.

solidified by the use of the phrase in verse 10, ותגדל עד צבא השמים (wahigdal ad-tsevahashamayim, it became great as far as the host of heaven).²⁰

As the horn grew, it overpowered the host and stars of heaven and this conflict is likened to the war it made against the holy ones in chapter 7. Unlike chapter 7, its arrogant speech is not referenced, only that he “acted arrogantly against the prince of host.” This arrogance is characterized in two ways; in that it took away the regular burnt offering and removed the place of the sanctuary.²¹ The visionary elaborated on the subsequent acts of the grandiose horn which was allowed to conquer the host along with their regular burnt offering due to their wickedness. Another distinction between the horn of 7 and 8 is the depiction of it in the latter as an eradicator of truth.²² Strikingly, the demise of this horn in the vision of chapter 7 is not explicitly evident in the vision of chapter 8; it is only recorded in the interpretation. To understand this difference and the characteristics previously mentioned, an examination of the broader literary structure, primarily chapter 7, must be undertaken.

²⁰ ותגדל עד צבא השמים גדל – *Qal Imperfect 3fs*, “it became great” + *waw* consecutive followed by preposition עד used in a spatially terminative sense “as far as” + noun masculine צבא “host.” This is followed by the plural noun השמים+ definite article “the heavens.” So literally, it is translated “it became great/ grew as far as the host of the heavens.”

²¹Dan. 8:12.

²²Dan. 8:12.

Chapter 7: The Literary Context of the Vision of the “Small Horn”

Chapter 7 is the final segment of the Aramaic portion of Daniel that began in chapter 2:4b, and it is the first section of the apocalyptic corpus. This unique placing of the chapter has led scholars such as Collins, Hartman, and Di Lella to applaud its literary significance to the whole book of Daniel.²³ In accordance with chapters 1–3 and 5–6, chapter 7 begins with a narrator, but the bulk of the narration in this chapter is a record of Daniel’s dream. The narrator submits a brief introduction, then subsequently Daniel’s dream and its interpretation is presented in verses 1–27.

Daniel recounted that while he was on his bed he “had a dream and visions of his head.”²⁴ The verb employed in verse one is the Aramaic ܚܙܐ (*chazāh*) which can either mean to see or perceive.²⁵ In its use in other Aramaic literature, specifically Ezra 4:14 and Daniel 2:8, it alludes to physical sight or recognition. However, the extensive use of the verb in the Aramaic corpus is found in Daniel 2, 4, and 7.

In chapters 2 and 4, the word is associated with Nebuchadnezzar who had two dreams in both chapters where he saw various images. Similarly, the same word is used in reference to Daniel’s many sights of images within his dream in chapter 7:1, 2, 4,

²³Hartman, Di Lella, 208; Collins, 277. These commentators cite the philological connection with the folk tales and the thematic link with the vision of chapter 2; but in regards to genre, it is the first part of the apocalypse literature.

²⁴Dan. 7:1.

²⁵Holladay, ܚܙܐ 405.

6, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 21. The posture of both men while seeing these visions is similar; they were seen while upon their beds (2:1; 4:10 & 7:1). Goldingay's summary statement that chapter 7 is "the report of a dream or a nocturnal vision"²⁶ may prove worthwhile to the discourse. Clearly, Nebuchadnezzar was sleeping while he saw his first dream but as to whether or not he or Daniel were conscious in the other references is unclear.

Daniel submits that he saw a dream and visions, and the dream is spoken of in the singular and the Aramaic form is חלם (*hālam*), which is used predominantly in chapters 2, 4 and 7. It appears from these chapters that the dream contains the visions; possible evidence is found in 4:6 of the BHS. The construct noun חזווי (*chezrē*), that means visions, is used with the absolute noun חלמי (*chelmī*) that means dreams.

This construct phrase implies that the visions are contents of the dream. However, doubt is cast on the MT's construct by the LXX use of *akouson* (listen) which equates to the Aramaic שמע (*shemā*) that means to hear. Additionally, the author's statement regarding Daniel's recording of the dream in 7:1b gives support to the view that the visions are the contents of the dream. This record by Daniel which started in verse 2b and continues to verse 28 is comprised of the visions of his head, and he no longer uses חלם (*chelem*) in the chapter. Therefore, it is highly likely that, like Nebuchadnezzar in chapters 2 and 4, Daniel's dream was the source of his many visions. Hartman and Di Lella rightly conclude that "only in this first apocalypse (ch. 7) and in ch. 2 is the "vision" said

²⁶Goldingay, 146.

to have come in a “dream” - another indication of the close connection between ch. 7 and ch. 2.”²⁷

The Aramaic noun חזו (chezū, vision)²⁸ is employed multiple times within Daniel chapter 2, 4 and 7. As stated above it is often in reference to the contents of the dreams of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel, and the term regularly appears in the construct state with the noun ראש (rēsh, head)²⁹ as וחזוי ראשה (wechez rērēshē, visions of his/my head). The descriptions of the visions showcase remarkable and extraordinary imageries and sceneries that are both earthly and extraterrestrial.

For Nebuchadnezzar the dominant scenery of his visions is an earthly description of the images of a statue (ch. 2), a tree and holy watcher (ch. 4), but there is the mention of heaven in 4:11, 13 and 15. This allusion to heaven is unlike the visions of Daniel in chapter 7, which has a detailed description of a transcendent scene in verses 9–10 and 13. Like the visions of Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel also is privy to an earthly description of beasts and holy ones.

Daniel’s earthly features comprise of four successive beasts which are different from each other. Goldingay refers to this portion as an “allegorical animal vision introduced by a fragment of myth that is recapitulated and expanded in vv 19–21.”³⁰ They are described as a lion with eagles’ wings, a bear with three tusks, a leopard with four bird wings and four heads on its back, and a fourth

²⁷Hartman and Di Lella, 211.

²⁸Holladay, 405.

²⁹Ibid., 420.

³⁰Goldingay, 146–147.

beast with great iron teeth (4–7). Based on his visions, the latter beast had ten horns and three of them made way for another horn which is described as זעירה (*zeērah*, small)³¹ and it “had eyes like human eyes and speaking arrogantly.”³²

The vision switches from the focus on the earthly beasts to a transcendent setting comprised of thrones, specifically the throne of the ועתיק יומין (*weatīq yomīn*, Ancient of Days).³³ The throne room record is not limited to a description of the throne but includes the appearance of the Ancient of Days (עתיק יומין *atīq yomīn*) and the multitude that were also present attending to him. It seems that the heavenly scene collides with the earthly one in verse 10b, after the “court sat in judgment and the books were opened.” Immediately following this record, the seer makes reference to seeing the small horn making his magniloquent noise, and he also states the destruction of one beast and the revocation of the dominion of the others.³⁴ Another character is highlighted in the remainder of the vision that begins in verse 13b, namely כבר אנש (*kebar enash*, like a son of man).³⁵ His relationship with the Ancient of Days (*atīq yomīn*) and the earthly setting occupy the rest of the visions.³⁶

³¹Holladay, 404.

³²Dan. 7:8, NRSV.

³³ועתיק יומין – The adjective is in its construct state along with the noun in the absolute state. It is translated literally as old/ancient of days or advanced of days.

³⁴ It appears that the ancient of days who is the convener of the heavenly court of judgment initiated and removed the kingdoms from the beasts.

³⁵כבר אנש – construct noun בר (son) and preposition כ (like) followed by the absolute noun אנש (man). The phrase is literally “like a son of man.”

Unlike in the Aramaic section of the book of Daniel, the noun חזה (*chazah*, vision) is used in the singular in the Hebrew portion. Additionally, חזה (*chazāh*) is not used in tandem with חלם (*chelem*, dream) or ראש (*rēsh*, head) in the subsequent chapters, and it is only used with חלם (*chelem*) in chapter 1:17.³⁷

This dissimilarity in semantic construction distinguishes chapter 7 from chapters 8–12 and makes it similar to chapters 2 and 4. Hence, these distinctive semantic features may have their roots in the philological difference between the texts; the Aramaic corpus consists of chapters 2:4b–7:28, while the Hebrew section is chapters 1:1–2:1-4b and chapters 8–12. Evidently, chapter 7 can be paralleled with chapters 2 and 4, from a literary perspective, revealing some critical differences among the chapters.

³⁶The figure of the כְּבִר אֱנוֹשׁ and his relationship with the עֲתִיק יוֹמִין has received considerable interpretation in ancient and modern scholarship. This work will not seek to engage the vast material on this subject available. Collins' excursus in his commentary gives a healthy detailed exploration of the כְּבִר אֱנוֹשׁ (1993, 302-310). The "son of man" is presented to the "ancient of days" and everlasting dominion and kingship is given to him. The seer does not state who presented him to the "ancient of days" and the symbolic language used (on clouds of heaven) adds to the ambivalence of the character. However, the attendant does not make explicit reference to the "son of man" within the interpretive cycle and it appears that the only verses that allude to the "son of man" are 8 and 27. These verses imply that the kingdom will be given to the "holy ones of the Most High." The significance of the "son of man" figure for this thesis is the close proximity in the literature with the small horn. This may suggest that the author of Daniel 7 had an expectation to see the "son of man" arise during the period of the small horn.

³⁷Dan. 1:17, "Daniel had insights into dreams and visions."

There is a recurring literary pattern within the structure of chapters 2, 4, 7 and 8 that is uniquely developed in each chapter. First, the pattern begins with the chief character of the narrative, Nebuchadnezzar or Daniel, seeing a dream/vision. In chapters 2 and 7, this character is introduced by the narrator, but in chapter 4, the account begins with a letter from Nebuchadnezzar to his empire. In chapter 8, there is no narrator and the account of the vision begins in the first person.³⁸ This extensive use of the first person to relay the contents of the visions is apparent in chapter 7, but it occurs after the character is introduced by a narrator. Evidently, the use of the first person is notable in the letter of Nebuchadnezzar in chapter 4, but the first person is limited in chapter 2 because of its predominant narrative style.

Second, the pattern showcases the character's quest for understanding of the vision. In chapter 7, the seeker approaches a nameless transcendent attendant of the vision; while in chapter 8, Gabriel³⁹ was told to grant him understanding. There is a similar quest for understanding in chapters 2 and 4, but the messengers required to give interpretation are earthly and are not a part of the vision; they are characters within the narrative. Noteworthy, is Collins' observation that the interpreter of the tales became the visionary of the apocalypses and this constitutes a significant difference between chapters 2 and 4 with chapter 7.⁴⁰ Remarkably, prior to this pursuit to gain clarity to the images of their visions, both Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar experienced fright caused by the

³⁸ Dan. 8:1, "In the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar a vision appeared to me, Daniel, after the one that had appeared to me first."

³⁹ גַּבְרִיֵּאל – noun masculine proper name (man of *El*), an archangel in Daniel 8:16 and 9:21 cf. Luke 1:19" (*BDB*, 150).

⁴⁰ Collins, 277.

visions.⁴¹In addition, in chapter 2 Nebuchadnezzar was troubled in thoughts while in chapter 4, he experienced fear. Daniel was also troubled in his thoughts in chapter 7 because of his vision resulting in a change of his demeanor; “his face became pale.”⁴² However, in chapter 8, Daniel is not only terrified by the contents of his vision but also by Gabriel.

Third, the pattern ends with the interpretation of the visions which highlights the meaning of the images and symbols. With regards to the content of the interpretation, chapters 7 and 8 find common ground insofar as the revelation of the Kingdoms of Media and Persia and Greece are concerned. However, scholars do agree that the four kingdom schema seen in chapter 2 is echoed in chapter 7. Montgomery states that “the vision in chapter 7 is a reminiscent replica of the image in chapter 2.”⁴³ In addition, he argues that there is an “explicit reminiscence of the malignant character of the fourth kingdom in chapter 2:40.”⁴⁴

Newsom agrees saying, “this chapter takes up the model presented in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream and reworks it in different symbolic terms, making more explicit the role of divine judgment and the Jewish identity of the eternal kingdom that succeeds Gentile rule.”⁴⁵ The difference that Collins highlights is the allusion of the

⁴¹The Aramaic word used to describe Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel’s terror is בָּהַל which means ‘to frighten’ (4:2, 6 and 7:15, 28).

⁴²Dan. 7:28.

⁴³James A. Montgomery, *A critical and Exegetical Commentary on the book of Daniel* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1927), 283.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, 283.

⁴⁵Newsom, 211–212.

antagonistic little horn in chapter 7 symbolizing the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁴⁶ Hartman and Di Lella suggest that this is possible because “the story of chapter 2 was most likely written in the 3rd century B.C., long before the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes; however, chapter 7 was written during the persecution of the Jews under Epiphanes.”⁴⁷ Collins provides a strong conclusion on the matter stating that “such allusions could not be identified with the confidence in chapters 1-6, but they play an important part throughout chapters 8–12.”⁴⁸

In chapter 7, the visions are recounted in verses 1–14, while the interpretation is given in verses 17–27. Unlike chapter 8, chapter 7 is not clear as to whether the receiver understood the interpretation or not; the narrator commented, “He kept the matter in his mind.”⁴⁹ It is possible that Daniel may have reflected on the various interpretations of the visions, but by the use of the singular noun, **ומלתא** (*ūmiltā*, the matter),⁵⁰ it is best to conclude that he was still pondering the **חלם** (*chelem*) with its various contents. It appears that in order to resolve this problematic feature, the composer clearly states in chapter 8:27b Daniel’s ignorance, “but I was dismayed by the vision and did not understand it.” The interpreter’s final charge to Daniel in chapter 8 to **סתם החזון כי לימים** (*səṭōm hechāzōn kī layāmīm*, keep close the vision that (is) in regard to many days) is not found in chapter 7, but in the subsequent vision of chapters 10–

⁴⁶Collins, 277.

⁴⁷ Hartman and Di Lella, 208 – 209.

⁴⁸Collins, 277.

⁴⁹Dan. 7:28b.

⁵⁰**ומלתא** – noun in the determined state meaning “the matter.”

12, specifically 12:9. The two visions of chapters 9 and 10–12 show evidence of the features of the pattern mentioned above, but the narrative structure is different from the visions of chapters 7 and 8.

Within this interpretative cycle of chapter 7, there appears to be a summary section in verses 17–18. This synopsis of the visions is an indication of the major emphasis of the author which is clearly evident in verse 18 and repeated in verse 27; the holy ones will take possession of the earthly kingdoms. Even though Daniel received this overview he was still interested in knowing more about the fourth beast, its ten horns and the small horn that made war and was triumphing over the holy ones. So, verses 19–22 and 23–27 were smaller portions of the literary pattern evident within the chapter and the main emphasis was on the demise of the little horn due to the realities of the transcendent setting impacting the earthly scene.

Daniel’s “Small Horn” Compared with Antiochus IV Epiphanes of 1 and 2 Maccabees

The allusion of the arrogance of the small horn in Daniel chapters 7 and 8 is attested by the authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees who credited this trait to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The arrogant speech of the small horn in the vision Daniel 7:8 is interpreted as “arrogant speech against the Most High.”⁵¹ In 1–2 Maccabees, there is no explicit reference to insolent speeches against the deity of the Jews by Antiochus IV Epiphanes. However, Antiochus’ letter in 1 Maccabees 1:41–51 can be construed as overt arrogance against the “Most High” of the Jews.

The contents of the letter highlighted a culturally superior complex that was exhibited in denial of indigenous religious expression. This is interpreted by the Jews, specifically the authors

⁵¹ Dan. 7:25.

of Daniel, and 1 and 2 Maccabees, as arrogance against the God of Israel. The end of the letter in 1 Maccabees 1 is further evidence of Antiochus' pompous speech where he asserted that "whoever does not obey the command of the king shall die."⁵² Although there is no explicit mention of Antiochus' audacious speech towards the God of the Jews in 1–2 Maccabees, there is a direct reference of such a vocal posturing towards the Jews. In 2 Maccabees 9, the author records Antiochus's failed attempts at conquering the temple and the city of Persepolis in the region of Persia which deflated his ego. This embarrassing expedition and news of the unsuccessful plight of Nicanor and the armies of Timothy against Jerusalem enraged Antiochus against the Jewish people. He was adamant that the Jews would suffer for his defeat in Persepolis, so the author quotes his audacious remark, "When I get there I will make Jerusalem a cemetery of Jews."⁵³

In addition, this letter along with the contents of 2 Maccabees 6:1–17 clearly harmonize with the allusion found in Daniel 7:25 that emphasizes the small horn's campaign to institute religious domination. This is indicated by the author's use of the two nouns זמנין (*zimmīn*, holy time or feast)⁵⁴ and ודא (*wedath*, law)⁵⁵ that are preceded by the *Peal* imperfect verb רבסו (weyisbar, he will

⁵² 1 Macc. 1:50.

⁵³ 2 Macc. 9:4b.

⁵⁴ זמנין – In this context the noun signals "holy time or feast" (Holladay, 404).

⁵⁵ ודא – This noun denotes law and further references can be seen in Ezra 7.

seek)⁵⁶ and the *Haphel* infinitive construct לְהַשְׁנִיחַ (*lehashnayah*, alter).⁵⁷ Undoubtedly, Antiochus IV's zealous mission of Hellenism is brought into focus and, while promulgating this agenda within his entire kingdom, he showed scant regard for the deities of these peoples and the religious practices and customs that have been established between them and their gods. This alleged letter cited by the author of 1 Maccabees is a royal decree to the entire Kingdom "that all should be one people."⁵⁸ In Antiochus's philosophy, this oneness could only be achieved if the other nations gave up their "particular customs."⁵⁹ The author of 1 Maccabees referred to this as an "adoption of a religion where they sacrificed to idols and profaned the Sabbath."⁶⁰

Antiochus IV sent a letter to those in Jerusalem and the cities of Judah stating the following: "follow customs strange to the land, to forbid burnt offerings and sacrifices and drink offerings in the sanctuary, to profane sabbaths and festivals, to defile the sanctuary and priests, to build altars and sacred precincts and shrines for idols, to sacrifice swine and unclean animals and to leave their sons uncircumcised.

⁵⁶ וַיִּסְפֹּר – וַיִּסְפֹּר peal imperfect 3ms "he will strive/seek" + *waw* conjunction.

⁵⁷ לְהַשְׁנִיחַ – לְהַשְׁנִיחַ *Haphel* Infinitive Construct + preposition לְ used to indicate purpose or intention; literally the translation is "to alter." Therefore, the subject of the clause will seek to alter the holy seasons and law.

⁵⁸ 1 Macc. 1:41.

⁵⁹ 1 Macc. 1:42.

⁶⁰ 1 Macc. 1:43.

They were to make themselves abominable by everything unclean and profane [thing], so that they should forget the law and change all the ordinances.”⁶¹ Clearly, one can see the direct alterations of the festivals and laws of the Jews. Further account of this religious overhaul is found in 2 Maccabees 6:1–11; the author writes in verse 6 that “people could neither keep the Sabbath, nor observe the festivals of their ancestors.”

Goldingay suggests that the significance of “the changing of the times” is not necessarily addressing the change to the Jewish religious system but it “denotes the taking of decisions regarding how human history unfolds and in particular how one regime follows another.”⁶² He believes this decision is an affront to God who “fixes decrees.”⁶³ Although the motif promoted by Goldingay is important in understanding the apocalypse, it fails to address the contents of the letter that indicate the significance of the religious alterations to the Jewish writings. Collins highlights this significance well by suggesting “the point at issue was apparently the suppression of the traditionally Jewish observances and their replacement with pagan rites, rather than a change in the calendar of the traditional cult.”⁶⁴

The content of the letter in 1 Maccabees 1 supports the claim of the Maccabean author that Antiochus IV Epiphanes forbade the worship practices of the Jews within the temple, specifically forbidding burnt offerings and sacrifices. This historical claim by

⁶¹1 Macc. 1:44–49.

⁶²Goldingay, 181.

⁶³Goldingay, 181.

⁶⁴Collins, 322.

the author is alluded to in the vision of Daniel 8 in verse 11–12 where the small horn took the תמיד (*tamīd*, burnt offering).⁶⁵

Newsom points to the significance of this reference in Daniel because “it was the most frequent and the most important of the required sacrifices of the temple.”⁶⁶ In the vision of chapter 8, the act against the *tamīd* (תמיד, burnt offering) was seen as arrogance against the prince of the host⁶⁷ and in the interpretation of this specific act in verse 25; it is portrayed as the king rising up against the prince of princes. Interestingly, the visions and interpretations of chapters 7 and 8 hint that the notion that religious alterations and domination of the small horn were allowances; the small horn was not operating exclusively.

In chapter 7:25, it is noted that the holy ones, along with their sacred seasons and law, were “given into his power.” In the verse, the *Hithpaal* verb employed, ויתיהבון (*wehithyahabūn*, they will be given),⁶⁸ in its passive, form indicates that the small horn was acted upon by a subject, but the author does not state who is allowing this to happen. Likewise, in chapter 8:12, the author uses

⁶⁵תמיד – The noun masculine singular implies continuity and in Daniel 8 “it speaks of daily (morning and evening) burnt-offering” (*BDB*, 556).

⁶⁶Newsom, 265.

⁶⁷Hartmann and Di Lella make an insightful observation on the prince of the host; “The Prince of the host is the true God of the Jews who rules over his heavenly bodies as his creatures; he is the Prince of princes (v. 25) and the “God of gods” (2:45) (Hartmann and Di Lella 236).

⁶⁸ויתיהבון – יהב “they will be given” *hithpaal* imperfect 3mp.

the *Niphal* verb !tNT (*tinnathēn*, it was given)⁶⁹ to convey the same thought, speaking specifically to (or about) the host and the regular burnt offerings.

Similar to chapter 7, the subject in chapter 8 allowing this to happen is not mentioned, but the use of the phrase *בפשׁה* (*bepasha*, transgression)⁷⁰ in 8:12 is a strong indicator that the author is suggesting that the acts of the small horn are divine judgment on the transgressors. Therefore, the author(s) of Daniel 7 and 8 are not exonerating the small horn from the blasphemous acts, but they want their readers to understand that the religious domination is punishment from YHWH. This point of view is frequently communicated in 1 and 2 Maccabees. In 1 Maccabees 1:11–15, the author highlighted the acts of the ‘lawless sons’ (*ui`oi/para, nomoi*)⁷¹ who persuaded many to covenant with the Greeks (“Let us go and make a covenant with the Gentiles round about us, for since we separated from them many evils have come upon us”).⁷²

They took this proposal to Antiochus IV in the early period of his reign, and it was approved; “he authorized them to observe the

⁶⁹תִּנְתָּן – נתן, “it was given” *Niphal* imperfect 3fs.

⁷⁰בִּפְשָׁה – פֶּשַׁע “transgression”, noun masculine singular + preposition בְּ acting as a *bethcausa*; so the translation is “because of the transgression.” BHS suggests that it is probably *הַפְשָׁה* (the transgression) because of the LXX’s use of *ai`a`martiai/* (sins) or *a`marti,a* (sin).

⁷¹*ui`oi/* – noun “sons,” with plural adjective *para, nomoi*—“lawless or contrary to the law”(BDAG, 769); literally sons of lawlessness.

⁷² 1 Macc. 1:11.

ordinances of the Gentiles.”⁷³This covenant was initiated by Jason the High Priest, brother of Onias, according to 2 Maccabees 4:7–22. However, in the preceding chapters, the author highlights contrasting actions by Onias the High Priest who sought to preserve temple practices, and notably he was divinely aided.

After the death of Seleucus, Antiochus IV Epiphanes became king and Jason negotiated with him, which led to the introduction of the Greek way of life to the people. Jason offered money to the king on a few occasions because he wanted to secure citizenship in Antioch for the people of Jerusalem and build a stadium in Jerusalem. This was approved and Jason erected a Gymnasium near the temple. Jason embraced the Greek customs and abandoned the Jewish ones. The people welcomed the Greek way of life with enthusiasm, and even the priests abandoned their sacred duties. According to 1 Maccabees 1:14 and 15, they lost interest in the temple services and neglected the sacrifices, and they despised anything their ancestors had valued while they prized the splendors of the Greek culture.

Like the author(s) of Daniel 7 and 8, the author of 2 Maccabees explicitly connected these acts of transgression with the oppression of Antiochus IV Epiphanes on the Jews. Evidently, this is observed in his comments after he recounts Antiochus’ entrance into the temple. He states, “Antiochus was elated in spirit, and did not perceive that the Lord was angered for a little while because of the sins of those who lived in the city, and that this was the reason he was disregarding the holy place.”⁷⁴

⁷³ 1 Macc. 1:13.

⁷⁴ 2 Macc. 5:17.

This divine punishment is commented on further in 2 Maccabees 6 after Antiochus sent out his letter commanding surrender to Hellenization. The author affirms, “Now I urge those who read this book not to be depressed by such calamities, but to recognize that these punishments were designed not to destroy but discipline our people.”⁷⁵ In the subsequent verses, the author encouraged his readers that the punishment is temporary due to YHWH’s kindness, and this mention of a time-frame is paralleled with the Daniel 7:25b and 8:14.⁷⁶

Occasionally, the authors of 1 Maccabees 1:21–24 and 2 Maccabees 5:15–21 connected the arrogance of Antiochus IV Epiphanes to his entrance of the temple and removal of its furniture. This act would ultimately lead to the allusion of the overthrow⁷⁷ of

⁷⁵ 2 Macc. 6:12.

⁷⁶In chapter 7:25, by the phrase is used to refer to the timeframe עַד־עֵתָא. According to Holladay עַד־עֵתָא can either mean time or year and with the preposition עַד it can best be translated ‘during a year,’ ‘two years’ and ‘half of a year’. Collins asserts that “the calculations of 8:14; 12:11, 12 can be understood as attempts to specify the length of this period more exactly” (Collins, 322). With that said, if the text in 7:25b is accepted as *post eventu* there may seem to be some inaccuracies with the time period of three and a half years because the devastation of the temple at the hands of Antiochus IV Epiphanes started on the 15th day of Chislev 167 B.C.E (1 Macc. 1:54) and ended when Judas rededicated it on the 25th day of Chislev 164 B.C.E (1 Macc 4:52). Montgomery presents a healthy solution, “it may be suggested that three and a half years is a current phrase for half a sabbatic lustrum as we may say ‘half a decade,’ ‘half a century,’ etc” (Montgomery, 314). Hartmann and Di Lella concludes that “half a septennium may be taken simply as a symbolic term for a period of evil since it is merely half the ‘perfect’ number seven.”

⁷⁷וְהִשְׁלַחְתָּ – שִׁלַּח “his sanctuary was removed/overthrown” hophal perfect 3ms. The verb is followed by מְקוֹן מִקְדָּשׁוֹ, literally “his sanctuary place.”

the temple cited in Daniel 8:14. Collins cautions that “because the temple was not torn down by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the reference may be to the desecration of the altar.”⁷⁸ Newsom adds, “The parallel account in 2 Macc 10 says nothing about destruction, only about pagan structures that had been built there (v. 2); it is likely 1 Maccabees is a melodramatic exaggeration; thus “throw down” in Dan 8:11 is also probably used in a metaphorical sense.”⁷⁹

Incidentally, according to the author of 2 Maccabees 5, the desecration of the temple was preceded by internal conflict within the Jewish priestly ranks, led by former High Priest, Jason. Consequently, Antiochus thought that the civil uprising was a revolt against him in Judea so he stormed Jerusalem.

He was led by the High Priest Menelaus and entered the sanctuary and took the sacred objects of worship and gifts which other kings had given to add to the splendor of the temple. In 2 Maccabees 6:2, it is alleged that the king charged the Jews to rename the temple in Jerusalem “the temple of Olympian Zeus.”

Further, on the fifteenth day of Chislev in 167 B.C.E., a Gentile altar was built on the altar of burnt offerings, and many other sacrilegious acts were carried out in the temple. In poetic style, the historian of 1 Maccabees 1 stated, “Her [Jerusalem’s] sanctuary became desolate like a desert; her feasts were turned into mourning, her Sabbaths into a reproach, her honor into contempt; her dishonor

Therefore, “his (the prince of host) sanctuary was removed/overthrown from (its) place.”

⁷⁸Collins, 334.

⁷⁹Newsom, 265.

now grew as great as her glory; her exaltation was turned into mourning.”⁸⁰

The author of 2 Maccabees 5:15 employed the verb *katetolmēsen* (to expression presumption, arrogance, kateto,lmhsen)⁸¹ to highlight his contempt for Antiochus’ entrance into “the most holy temple in the entire world.” This disdain and hatred towards Antiochus, specifically his arrogant posture which led to the desolation of the temple, is clearly seen in 2 Maccabees 9:7–8, “Yet he did not in any way stop his insolence, but was even more filled with arrogance, breathing fire in his rage against the Jews; Thus he who only a little while before had thought in his superhuman arrogance that he could command the waves of the sea, and had imagined that he could weigh the high mountains in a balance, was brought down to earth and carried in a litter, making the power of God manifest to all.” Therefore, Antiochus’ arrogance alluded to in Daniel is not limited to his speech but is evident as well in his deeds of desolation against the sacred temple of the Jews in Jerusalem.

Antiochus IV’s desecration of the temple was accompanied by his destructive crusade against the Jewish people. As noted earlier, this began after he perceived that a rebellion had started in Judah during the assault of Jason on Jerusalem. In Daniel 7:21, the

⁸⁰1 Macc. 1:39 – 40.

⁸¹This verb is derived from kataiolma,w that means “to dare or presume” (*Lexham Analytical Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Logos Bible Software).

seer referenced it in his accounts, “As I looked, this horn made war with the holy ones and was prevailing over them.”⁸²

This is understood within the interpretation of this vision in 7:25 as the king “wearing out⁸³ the holy ones of the Most High.” Conversely, the visions of chapter 8 portray the small horn in this destructive manner, “he shall grow strong in power, shall cause fearful destruction, shall destroy the powerful and the people of the holy ones.”⁸⁴ Detailed reports of Antiochus’ murderous feats are found in 1 and 2 Maccabees, and these reports agree that the invasion of Jerusalem was preceded by his journey to the South in Egypt as he made war against Ptolemy as in the vision of Daniel 8:9. In 169 B.C.E., Antiochus IV, along with his army, slaughtered eighty thousand Jews and sold forty thousand into slavery.⁸⁵

The author of 1 Maccabees 1 lamented: “he shed much blood; Israel mourned deeply in every community, rulers and elders groaned, young women and young men became faint, the beauty of the women faded; even the land trembled for its inhabitants, and all the house of Jacob was clothed in shame.”⁸⁶ This was the beginning of an intense period of persecution of the Jews that lasted for years

⁸²Two *Peal* participles are used to state the action of the horn against the “holy ones” (1) וְקָרְנָא דְכֹן עֲבָדָה – this horn made war (2) וַיִּבְלֶה לְהוֹן – he prevailed against them.

⁸³יִבְלֶה – בִּלָּה, “wear out” (Holladay 399) or figuratively “harass continually” (BDB 1084), *Pael* imperfect 3ms.

⁸⁴Daniel 8:24. In addition, the author states in verse 25, “without warning, he shall destroy many.”

⁸⁵1 Macc. 1:20 – 28 and 2 Macc. 5:11 – 14.

⁸⁶1 Macc. 1:24b – 26, 28.

until the revolts of the Maccabean brothers.⁸⁷ These revolts resulted in the temporary restoration of the temple in Jerusalem and clearly they marked the beginning of the expectant judgment upon the small horn as seen in Daniel 7.

In the visions of Daniel 7, the visionary sees judgment upon the antagonist of this apocalypse by the heavenly protagonist. Interestingly, in verse 11 it was the beast that was killed and not the small horn. The mode of death within the vision is by fire and Collins explains that “hellfire becomes the standard place and mode of eschatological punishment from this time on.”⁸⁸

With that said, it appears the visionary expected the demise of the small horn along with the fourth beast; in verse 22, the oppressive acts by the small horn are interrupted by the coming of the ancient one of days. This is interpreted in verse 26 as the revocation of the small horn’s dominion which would “be destroyed until the end.”⁸⁹ The “end” referenced here indicates the eschatological expectation of the author of Daniel 7, marked by the demise of the oppressor at the hand of the heavenly protagonist who

⁸⁷In 1 Macc. 1, the author was careful to mention those who resisted the religious reforms of the king which resulted in their deaths. Similarly, the author of 2 Maccabees highlighted the martyrdom of Eleazar, a scribe (chap 6:18 – 31) who chose to die instead of eating pork/unclean meat. In addition, the same author relays the story of a woman and her seven sons who chose a similar fate rather than to eat pig’s meat. This passive resistance would lead to aggression instigated by Mattathias the father of Judas Maccabeus.

⁸⁸Collins, 304.

⁸⁹וְלִהְיוּבְדָה עַד־סוֹפָא אבד – “to be destroyed” *Hophal* infinitive construct + preposition לְ + conjunction *waw*; literally “to be destroyed.” This is followed by the noun סוֹף “end” + the preposition עַד with a temporal use (speaking of time) “until” (Williams 119).

in turn presents his kingdoms along with others to the “people of the holy ones.” This allusion to the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes is clearly recorded in 1 and 2 Maccabees. Indeed, the author of the latter book concurs with Daniel 7 that the death of Antiochus was a divine judgment.

In 2 Maccabees 9, the author reported that prior to Antiochus IV death, he retreated from the region of Persia after the people of Persopolis withstood him and his army. Coupled with this defeat and the report that Judas Maccabeus outwitted and defeated Nicanor and Timothy, Antiochus IV Epiphanes in his fury sought to inflict vengeance on the Jews. According to the author in 2 Maccabees chapter 9:5–12, it was during this time that the judgment of YHWH came upon him.

He was struck with a bowel ailment and he fell from his chariot, which brought much pain and a deterioration of his body. His body became repulsive to his army and he finally submitted, “It is right to subject to god; mortals should not think that they are equal to god.”⁹⁰A similar summation of his death is found in Daniel 8:25b, “but he shall be broken, and not by human hands.” Although the accounts of his death in 1 Maccabees 6:1–17 are somewhat similar (death is as a result of a physical ailment) to that of 2 Maccabees, the author of the former text does not attribute his death to divine activity.

The overt divine aid to the Jews accounted for in Daniel 7 should have marked the end that would usher in the reign of the holy ones over the worldly kingdoms. However, it is with this expectation that the vision of Daniel 7 parts ways with the historical records of 1 and 2 Maccabees. If the accounts of 1 and 2 Maccabees

⁹⁰2 Macc. 9:12.

are accurate, then after the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the dominion of the Seleucid kingdom was still in effect.

The son of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Antiochus Eupator and Demetrius continued to fight against the Jews who battled stoutly under the leadership of Judas Maccabeus and his brothers. Even though the Maccabees were able to restore the temple and establish a dynasty, it was short lived and the Romans continued their dominance over the Jewish people. Interestingly, the accounts in the visions of Daniel 8 emphasize the restoration of the temple and did not speak of kingdoms like chapter 7. So, it is possible the visions of the small horn in Daniel 7 and 8 were composed during different time periods, and the accounts in Daniel 8 show evidence of being composed closer to the period of the events of the life of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Conclusion

The significant role that the small horn played as antagonist in the historical apocalypse of Daniel is explicitly attested in the visions recounted in chapters 7 and 8. These two chapters revealed his rise to prominence among other horns of the vision and his conflict with the holy ones and the stars of heaven. These groups experienced his arrogance which was displayed through his elimination of the regular burnt offerings and violation of their temple. It was important to place the vision of the small horn within its proper literary context so an analysis of both chapters 7 and 8 was carried out, specifically on chapter 7. The study highlighted that chapters 7 is the conclusion of the Aramaic portion of Daniel which began in chapter 2:4b, and it is the first of the four visions in chapters 7–12.

Apart from its philological similarities with chapters 2 and 4, it also expounds the four kingdom schema evident in those earlier chapters but the addition of the small horn connects it thematically

to chapter 8 and subsequently with the visions of chapters 9 and 10–12.

A strong possibility exists that chapter 7 was an earlier manuscript with the content of the four kingdom schema but was redacted to incorporate the vision of the small horn. This was necessary because of the need to address the life setting or *sitz im leben* (Antiochus IV Epiphanes) which in the view of the composer/s of Daniel was the “last days/end.” Additionally, chapter 8 appears to be a later document than chapter 7 while the author added new material to speak to the specific happenings under Antiochus IV Epiphanes, namely, the desolation of the temple in Jerusalem.

The allusions of chapters 7 and 8 of the small horn that were paralleled with 1–2 Maccabees showed strong association with Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The arrogance of the small horn was identified as Antiochus’s religious domination of the Jewish people where he disregarded and desecrated their temple worship; by extension this was arrogance against the god of the Jews. Additionally, his arrogance resulted in mass destruction of the Jews and sent thousands into slavery.

With this said, the authors of Daniel and 1–2 Maccabees implied that Antiochus IV’s oppression was allowed by YHWH because of the transgression of the Jewish people and, according 2 Maccabees, these acts were led by the High Priest, namely Jason. These authors did not absolve Antiochus IV from his heinous and irreligious acts but made reference to the judgment he received at the hands of the God of the Jews; this judgment ushered in the expectation of deliverance.

**TOWARDS
A
THEOLOGY
OF
SERVANTHOOD**
by
Rev'd Christopher
Newton
(PhD, cand.)

Introduction

For many years now, the concept of servant-leadership has been much talked about in the organizations of this world. This is because people in “secular society” have come to realize the importance of a particular type of leadership that gives birth to, and sustains, organizational and financial success. This has precipitated a flood of

literature focussed on how things get done in organizations, a recurring concept being that of servant-leadership.

The need for such studies in the church has always been relevant, but unfortunately the church has not naturally embraced self-assessment and critique. As a result, the so called “secular” society has taken the lead in leadership studies. Having now realised our short fall, the church has been drawing from the findings of many of the studies done around leadership in institutions. The problem is that the nature of the church, in contrast to the rest of the world, demands that the fundamental principles and motivations that guide the people and programmes of the church be fundamentally different from that of the world.

The purpose of this paper is to present to you my reflections towards a Biblical understanding and application of servant-hood. It is divided into three main sections. The first is the definition, which includes what it is not, and what it is. The second; The Servant of God, argues that the believer who is called to be a servant, must first see himself as the servant of God. This includes essentials of becoming an effective servant of God. Thirdly, The Servant of

People, argues that the servant of God must also be the servant of people, and outlines pertinent considerations in this regard.

Definition of Servant-hood

Robert K. Greenleaf was the champion of the concept of servant-leadership for many years. He has passed on, but his works still find prominence in the quest of many to improve their organizations. Greenleaf's concept of Servant Leadership arose out of the need he saw in the institutions of society - churches, businesses, universities - to make a salient contribution to the leadership crises of the 1960s to 70s. The idea developed from his reading of Hermann Hesse's *Journey to the East*, where the departure of the servant Leo from a particular expedition precipitated the abandonment of that expedition. One of the members of the expedition later found out that the sponsors of the expedition was led by Leo, the man they all knew to be a servant, and realized that his presence had been vital to the expedition, as all was going well until the servant, who was the one who really kept them focussed and sustained them with his spirit and his songs, departed from them. In commenting on the servant, Greenleaf noted that:

Leo was actually the leader all of the time, but he was servant first because that was what he was, deep down inside. Leadership was bestowed upon a man who was by nature a servant. It was something given, or assumed, that could be taken away. His servant nature was the real man, not bestowed, not assumed, and not to be taken away. He was servant first. (Greenleaf, 1977, pp. 7-8).

This, for Greenleaf, is the servant leader. Such a person he sees as one who has a natural feeling of wanting to serve, to serve first, and the highlight of such a person is the care taken "to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served"(Greenleaf, 1977, p. 13). This he contrasts against the person who wants to be a

leader first, whether because of the feeling of need to have power, or for material possessions (Greenleaf, 1977).

He acknowledges that the notion of the servant as leader did not come to him from conscious logic, but as an intuitive insight as he contemplated Leo. Implicit in this confession, however, is the suggestion that scripture or Christian exposure played no part in the formulation of his notion of servant leadership. Greenleaf addresses his essays mainly to two groups: “young people who have a natural disposition to be servants and whose life-styles may yet be shaped by conscious choices, and those of their elders who want to help young people to realize their potential as servants”(Greenleaf, 1979, p. 9).

What it is not

Greenleaf defines servant and serving in terms of the consequences of the serving on the ones being served, or on others who may be affected by the action. In his definition of servant-leadership, he noted:

The servant-leader is servant first. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The best test is: do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?(Greenleaf, 1970)

He later added: “No one will knowingly be hurt by the action, directly or indirectly”(Greenleaf, 1998).

The positive of Greenleaf’s definition is that the nature of servant-leadership is that it is geared towards an objective that benefits persons other than the leader. The problem with it, and intrinsically so, is that it does not subscribe to God’s requirements of humanity. Any definition of servant-leadership that does not accept God’s definition of a servant, and particularly in relation to man’s

accountability to God, has missed the mark, and must be firmly rejected by God's people as a pattern for kingdom living.

What it is

Any definition of servant-leadership that will be applicable to the people of God must intrinsically include an understanding of the nature and constitution of God's people. This demands that our focus be not merely on servant-leadership, but on that which is Biblical. Issuing from this is the need for us not to seek to make the Biblical corpus say what we want it to say but to listen to its revelation in relation to our needs. What it says, in this regard, is that the focus of the church ought not to be on servant-leadership, but on servanthood. For this is what must be common among all God's people, whether He chooses you to be a supervisor of His people or a simple labourer in the vineyard of service.

I present to you, therefore, two definitions: Biblical servanthood, which is the inclusive term, and Biblical servant-leadership, which identifies Biblical servanthood within a particular context of privilege. Biblical Servanthood *is a lifestyle disposition, whereby a believer's attitudes, motives, and actions towards others, are governed by the fundamental belief that he/she is God's servant first, in all that he does, and that as a representative of Christ, his service to others, whether as leader, colleague, or follower, must be rendered in a spirit of obligation to the will of God, and to the greatest good of those individuals.* The second definition: Biblical servant-leadership, then, *is the practice of leadership, in whatever area of life, that flows from a disposition in which one sees himself/herself as a servant of God, with a divine obligation to relate to others within his context as a representative of Jesus Christ, and thus seeks to embrace Christ's view of, and attitude towards people in his efforts towards the accomplishment of goals and objectives dedicated to the glory of God.* What should already be clear in our minds is that this definition cannot be embraced by

all and sundry, for there is a fundamental distinction between the people of God and the world, as the things of the Spirit are spiritually discerned.

The framework that makes servanthood possible for the people of God is the example of the life and ministry of our Lord, Jesus Christ, and His promise of empowerment through the Holy Spirit. Paul's statement in Philippians 4:13 implies the tremendous possibilities available to each believer, when he said, "I can do all things through Him who strengthens me." Our Lord, Jesus, demonstrated to us the essence and extent of servanthood, as the scripture declares, "Have this attitude in yourselves which was also in Christ Jesus, who, although He existed in the form of God, did not regard equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a bond-servant, *and* being made in the likeness of men. Being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross." (Philippians 2:5-8 NASB)

I do believe that the overflow of attitude and disposition of true servanthood was most evident, when He agonized in the Garden of Gethsemane, when the crushing reality and the weight of humanity's sin began to bear down upon Him. He said "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done" (Luke 22:42 KJV). Here, I believe, the humanity of Christ was most evident in the scriptures, and so too was His obedience to the Father.

The Servant of God

This takes us to the first essential of servanthood; that you, as a part of God's people, where ever He affords you the privilege to serve, be it a supervisor or a simple labourer, see yourself as a servant of God first, above everything else. You could have been redeemed and taken to glory, but you were left here, and left here to

give God glory; for “you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for *God's* own possession, so that you may proclaim the excellences of Him who has called you out of darkness into His marvellous light” (1 Peter 2:9 NASB). There are two essentials that must be embraced if you are to excel in living the requirement of being God’s servant first: (a) You must demonstrate obedience, and (b) you must express love.

Demonstration of Obedience

Obedience refers to the observance of God’s revealed will, in your life, for the purpose of giving God glory. The Gospels, and particularly the book of Luke, which identifies Jesus as the Isaianic servant of God (Moore, 1997), present Him as the willing, obedient, enduring servant who paid the ultimate cost of allegiance to His Lord. In His relationship with the Father, Jesus Christ represented what God wanted man to be before the incarnation and what He wants man to become since the incarnation. Adam was made to be God’s servant (Genesis 1:27-28; 2:15, 19-20), to walk in obedience (Genesis 2:16-17), and to have fellowship and communion with Him (Genesis 3:8-9). Sin was allowed access to the relationship, and it damaged the relationship that God desired between Himself and humanity. Christ, in His redemptive work, has restored that relationship for us; but we need to preserve it by our obedience. This requires: (a) Knowledge of God’s will, (b) Self-mastery, and (c) Faith that God’s way is best.

Knowledge of God’s will. We must give ourselves over to the pursuit of knowing God’s will. How can you expect to make the right decision in respect of issues that face you on a daily basis if you do not know God’s will for His people, and for you, in that particular situation? And how can you expect to effectively lead God’s people, at whatever level, except in the way that meets with God’s approval. The servant of God must know God’s will.

Self-mastery. It seems to me that the greatest threat to a Christian is not Satan, as many of us suppose, rather, it is the self. In *The Imitations of Christ*, Book One, à Kempis (n.d.) noted, “DO NOT yield to every impulse and suggestion but consider things carefully and patiently in the light of God's will.” The natural cravings and desires that God gave to us must be kept in check if we are to be the best that we can be. If we master ourselves, with the power that is available to us through the Holy Spirit, can you comprehend how victorious we would be over Satan and his schemes? “He who is slow to anger is better than the mighty, And he who rules his spirit, than he who captures a city (Proverbs 16:32 NASB). Kempis further noted that,

A man makes the most progress and merits the most grace precisely in those matters wherein he gains the greatest victories over self and most mortifies his will. True, each one has his own difficulties to meet and conquer, but a diligent and sincere man will make greater progress even though he have more passions than one who is more even-tempered but less concerned about virtue.(à Kempis, n.d.) The servant of God must therefore master self.

Faith. The late New Testament Church of God minister, Rev. Mortimer Blair, in an interview with his granddaughter, Nadine Blair, aired years ago on Love 101, a Christian radio station, defined faith as “active confidence in a reliable God.” This is not inconsistent with the definition of Hebrews 11 (the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.), yet it highlights the importance of action as the fundamental expression of faith. “Without faith it is impossible to please God, for it is necessary for the one who comes to God to believe that He is, and is a rewarder of those who seek Him” (my translation of Hebrews 11:6). You must embrace the perspective that whatever God requires you to do in a particular situation, is the right thing, and the best thing, irrespective of the opinions and actions of others. Your faith will be

demonstrated by your obedience in actually doing that thing. The servant of God must therefore have faith.

Expression of Love

The second essential that must be embraced if you are to excel in living the requirement of being God's servant first, is Love; love towards God, and love towards God's creation. This is of primary importance to God, and fundamental to having communion with Him. It is a fact that within a master-servant relationship, there need not be any communion, for the master has tremendous authority over the servant. But God made man for the purpose of communion with Him, and this is only real when God's affection is reciprocated by man; when God's love is received and returned.

Love towards God. The *Sh'mā* or Shema passage of Deuteronomy 6:4-5 has been regarded, and endorsed by Christ (Matthew 22:37; Mark 12:30; and Luke 10:27), as the most important commandment from God. It reads, "You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might." This demands your greatest affection, your most intense attention, and your most willing submission. Your relationship and communion with God must not be only because God is awesome and a consuming fire, but because you love Him; because you have set your affection on Him. Only then can you say, like Joseph, in a situation of promising pleasure from Potiphar's wife – an opportunity for natural release of inherent libido; "It is no pleasure for me. How can I do this great wickedness and sin against God" (Genesis 39:9 KJV). The servant of God must therefore love God.

Love towards God's creation. The second of the two greatest commandments, Jesus noted, is "You shall love your neighbour as yourself" (Matthew 22:37; Mark 12:30; Luke 10:27). For the particular purpose intended, our emphasis here is on people,

but in Genesis, God put man over all His creation to care for it, and He expects His people today, in as much as we can, so to do. However, within the context of being God's arms extended to people, we are expected to love people.

I find the New Command that Jesus gave to the disciples in John 13:34 to be very revelatory in relation to the second great commandment. For, "You shall love your neighbour as yourself," begs the question as to who is my neighbour? It seems likely, as it is today, that many were supposedly giving love to their neighbour, but to those whom they themselves regarded to be their neighbours. Jesus' words to His disciples were, "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another, to the same degree that I have loved you, that you also love one another [my translation]." He repeated this in another setting, John 15:12, and clarified it by saying, "This is My commandment, that you love one another, just as I have loved you. Greater love has no one than this, that one lays down his life for his friends." I see this as an improvement on the second great command, in much the same way as Christ addressed adultery, when He said, "You have heard that it was said, 'You shall not commit adultery'; but I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman with lust for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart" (Matthew 5:27-28). The improvement therefore means that God's servant should be prepared to go where ever He sends, and to do whatever He requires His servant to be; that is, His arms extended, in the service of others, whether as a supervisor of many, or as a simple labourer in His vineyard. The servant of God must therefore have love towards God's creation.

The Servant of People

This takes us to the second essential of servant-hood. The major distinction between the two essentials is that the primary focus on Biblical servant-hood is that of being a servant of God. Without this focus, the concept is irrelevant and inapplicable, and

particularly because of the nature of human beings. The prophet Jeremiah tells us that, “The heart is more deceitful than all else and is desperately sick” (Jeremiah 17:9 NIV). It is no wonder then that humans are prone to doing things for others, under the pretence that we mean them well, when what we are really doing is establishing ourselves in one way or another. The distinction continues; that as a logical outcome of being a servant of God, Biblical servant-hood’s secondary focus is on being a servant of people. It has always been God’s way to use people to bless other people.

There are two fundamental considerations for being an effective servant of people. They are:(a) Love for people, and (b) Having a Biblical view of self. Both these considerations demand a particular emphasis on the vessel that God desires to use, so as to make adjustments to that vessel that will be consistent with, and easily facilitate, the smooth flow of God’s grace from Himself, through the privileged vessel, and to the recipients He so loves; the objects of His sacrifice in Jesus Christ.

Love for People

To effectively love people, we must have and put to use certain inner resources to compensate for the inconsistencies of being human. These resources are called virtues. Here we shall present four, not exhaustive by any means, but basic to facilitating the development of those whom God calls us to serve. They are (a) Humility, (b) Patience, (c) Endurance, and (d) Willingness to learn.

Humility.I present two aspects of humility, namely, that of how you view others, and that of how you view self. The latter shall be addressed in a later section. It would seem that humility has no real measurement outside of a relationship with others, for its opposites, such as pride and arrogance, are really only properly expressed in relation to people. However, if you are to offer godly service, at whatever level, you must have some understanding of

those whom you serve. If this is to happen, there must be some measure of self-disclosure on the part of those who are served. This will be best facilitated when you are prepared to meet them where they are, particularly when you are in a position of leadership. It has been said that “the aim of teaching is to get the learners from where they are to where you want them to be.” But to do this effectively, you must begin where they are. It is very important, therefore, in your service to others, to approach them for Christ’s perspective of them. Are they precious, are they worth making time for, are they worth listening to, can they contribute to your development, or do their best interest warrant some adjustments on your part? Again Kempis notes:

We must not rely too much upon ourselves, for grace and understanding are often lacking in us. We have but little inborn light, and this we quickly lose through negligence. Often we are not aware that we are so blind in heart. Meanwhile we do wrong, and then do worse in excusing it. At times we are moved by passion, and we think it zeal. We take others to task for small mistakes, and overlook greater ones in ourselves. We are quick enough to feel and brood over the things we suffer from others, but we think nothing of how much others suffer from us. If a man would weigh his own deeds fully and rightly, he would find little cause to pass severe judgment on others.(à Kempis, n.d.)

The servant of people must therefore practice humility.

Patience. One does not have to read the Gospels over and over to realize that an important part of the training of the apostles was the patience that Jesus demonstrated as He taught and mentored them. To love people is to operate from a commitment to doing all that you reasonably can to further their best interest. This often demands adjustments on your part, in order to deal with their slowness in grasping what you are delivering to them, or in appreciating you for what you are doing for them. Jesus had to

rebuke Peter a number of times, for Peter did not seem to grasp, as readily as he probably should, what Christ was teaching. But Christ was there for him, so much so that after Christ rose from the dead, in sending a message to His disciples to wait for Him, He singled out Peter, to ensure that he got the understanding that Jesus felt no less about him, in spite of his mistake. So too must Christian leaders be patient with those whom we serve, whether above us, below us, or on our level. The servant of people must therefore have patience.

Endurance. Endurance refers to that act, quality, or power of enduring hardships or stress. Hardships and stress may appropriately be regarded as coming with the territory of Christian service. “For our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers” (Ephesians 4:12). It is imperative, then, that our expressions of love for people involve a disposition towards endurance; and endurance of what they themselves may throw at us. For many persons, the worst thing that they could ever face in ministry is the sense of a lack of appreciation on the part of those who are served. But if you do not endure, how can you expect to achieve your objective? It is therefore a humbling but necessary process in the quest for Biblical servant-hood. The servant of people must therefore exercise endurance in dealing with people.

Willingness to Learn. Willingness to learn is perhaps one of the greatest challenges of leadership in the visible church. This is so, I believe, because the tradition of the church places a certain premium on those in leadership positions, so much so that some Christians may mistakenly presume that we deserve to be where God has privileged us to be. Recognize, therefore, that there is much to be learnt from those whom you serve, to enable you to be a better servant of God, and ultimately a truer servant of people. An instructive note is given in 2 Timothy 2:24-25, “And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all *men*, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves.”

Biblical View of Self

The Bible demands that we endeavour to see ourselves from divine perspective. We were all born as Adam and Eve's heritage; heirs to a nature of sin. God's judgment against sin puts all sinners at a base level of depravity, and on a course that leads to hell and the lake of fire. It is from this that all Christians have been delivered. This deliverance has come, not by humanity's initiative, but by that of the living God. "It is by grace through faith, not of works lest anyone should boast" (Ephesians 2:8). Now, if "the wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23), and "the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately sick" (Jeremiah 17:9), then we all do not deserve to be alive. So since we are alive, whether we are Christians or not, wealthy or not, healthy or not, educated or not, it is as a result of God's unmerited favour. In terms of the reality of God's sovereignty and man's accountability to Him, therefore, the only thing that separates us from the beggar on the street is the grace that God grants to us. Our exercise of leadership should therefore be characterised by (a) Inward humility, and (b) Dependence on God.

Inward Humility. In exercising the privilege granted to us to serve others, at whatever level, remember that it is a privilege that has been granted. "For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think *of himself* more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God has given to every man the measure of faith" (Romans 12:3), and this indeed is because all that we may ever be, is of necessity by the grace of God. A personal friend often reminded me that "the best of men are men at best." In commenting on humility, Kempis noted that,

It is often good for us to have others know our faults and rebuke them, for it gives us greater humility. When a man humbles himself because of his faults, he easily placates those about him and readily appeases those who are angry

with him. It is the humble man whom God protects and liberates; it is the humble whom He loves and consoles. To the humble He turns and upon them bestows great grace, that after their humiliation He may raise them up to glory. He reveals His secrets to the humble, and with kind invitation bids them come to Him. Thus, the humble man enjoys peace in the midst of many vexations, because his trust is in God, not in the world. Hence, you must not think that you have made any progress until you look upon yourself as inferior to all others. (à Kempis, n.d.)

Kempis' use of "inferior" is not in relation to essence, but certainly regarding one's stature. For we do not serve well those we do not deem worthy to be served. The servant of people must therefore practice inward humility.

Dependence on God. The Holy Scriptures are explicit in teaching that you "Trust in the LORD with all your heart and lean not on your own understanding; in all your ways submit to him, and he will make your paths straight" (Proverbs 3:5-6 NIV). It is all too easy, like Nebuchadnezzar, to claim credit for what God has accomplished in our lives. Often we allow our success in working with people to cloud our vision, and we presume that we hold the key to our successes. But achievements in the things of God have never been by man's might nor power, by our education or influence, by our wealth or stature. It has always been, and will always be by the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit. "The *thoughts* of God no one knows except the Spirit of God" (1 Corinthians 2:11), and it is the work of the Holy Spirit that makes us effective witnesses, according to Acts 1:8. Therefore, we should never presume that we have God's approval without our dependence on Him. The servant of people must therefore practice dependence on God.

Conclusion

Within the context of service among the people of God, the concept of servant-hood is rather more inclusive and appropriate, than that of servant-leadership. Biblical Servant-hood is a lifestyle disposition, whereby a believer's attitudes, motives, and actions towards others, are governed by the fundamental belief that he/she is God's servant first, in all that he does, and that as a representative of Christ, his service to others, whether as leader, colleague, or follower, must be rendered in a spirit of obligation to the will of God, and to the greatest good of those individuals.

Being a good servant of God, demands (a) obedience, which requires a knowledge of God's will, self-mastery, and faith that God's way is the right way; and (b) love, which is manifested through love for God, and love towards God's creation. The secondary focus of Biblical servant-hood is that of being the servant of people. This requires (a) love for people, which challenges one's humility, patience, endurance, and willingness to learn, and (b) a Biblical view of self, which requires humility and dependence on God. The servant of God must both present and represent God, not himself/herself.

References

- à Kempis, T. (n.d.). The imitations of Christ, Book one *Theological Journal Library CD ver. 2*
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Westfield, IN: Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1979). *Teacher as servant: A parable*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). *The Power of Servant Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc.

Moore, T. (1997). The Lucan great commission and the Isaianic servant.
Bibliotheca Sacra, 154(613), 47-60.

**A Caribbean
Theology of the
Environment
(Part 1)**

Rev Teddy Jones
Lecturer
Jamaica Theological
Seminary

Introduction

It is rather instructive that as I was in the throes of preparing this paper the world observed Earth Day 2015. According to Gnanakan (2004) on 22 April 1970 the first Earth Day, twenty million Americans went into the streets and into the parks and auditoriums to demonstrate for a

healthy, sustainable environment. That first Earth day claims to have achieved a rare political alignment, enlisting the support of all political parties in the US, rich and poor, urban dweller and farmers. (Gnanakan 2004, 15). Some forty-five years later the day passed by in the United States without much fanfare and in Jamaica even less of a whimper.

This is not to say that there is nothing substantial in place for environmental protection and policy in Jamaica, in fact far from it. There is the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA), Jamaica Environment Trust (JET), The Environmental Foundation of Jamaica, Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation, Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust, Negril Environmental Protection Trust and the Anti-Dumping and Subsidiaries Body, along with other civic groups that seek to keep before our consciousness the importance of environmental care.

Additionally, according to Taylor (2015), “At the national level, in 2011 Jamaica set up a ministry with climate change as part of its name and mandate. . . . It is fair, then, to say that some of the

pieces are falling into place, though one cannot claim that the efforts and initiatives are sufficient or even nearly enough.” In fact the anecdotal evidence suggests that the average citizen does not have such matters high on their list of priorities. This is borne out by Taylor (2015).

The Jamaican government commissioned a Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices Behavioural Survey in 2012 as part of its preparation activities under the Pilot Project for Climate Resilience. Of the National Household Survey sample, most people (82.6%) indicated that they had heard the term ‘climate change,’ with most (56.4%) also able to associate it with a variation in global climate, temperature or weather patterns. However, the majority also indicated that they did not know much or anything about the risk it posed to their community and that they had no idea or were not sure what could be done to prevent or lessen the effect of climate change on the community. It is clear that much more needs to be done to bring to the awareness of the citizenry the current realities that those who are in the forefront of research and capacity building readily recognize.

Taylor (2015) echoes the writer’s sense of urgency as he builds his case for a radical shift in our positioning on these matters. “Climate change is an issue of our times – one that the Caribbean cannot avoid contending with, preferably through voluntary action, now as opposed to later, and with a paradigm shift in thought and action equivalent to the shift necessitating it.”

As far as our religious preoccupations are concerned, the outlook is even more dismal. The absence of the voice of the church on environmental matters is very deafening. Douglas (2009) comments that, “While acknowledging the importance of climate

change and sustainable development issues, Jamaica's churches are not united in taking action to protect the environment.” Douglas (2009) represents an Environment Watch group. He states further, “Church leaders admit to the shortcomings of their institutions in this area, stating that concerns of unemployment, crime and HIV and AIDS in many of the communities they serve tend to overshadow issues involving the environment. Gary Harriott, general secretary of the Jamaica Council of Churches (JCC), said while stewardship of the environment is in keeping with their churches' theology, there was no concerted action on the matter.”

Harriott is cited as admitting that “It's one of those areas in which we want to become more intentionally engaged, although we don't have any particular programme at the moment.” Jamaica is arguably one of the most popular islands of the Caribbean. The natural beauty lures nature lovers from around the world in what is an increasingly lucrative form of tourism. At the same time there is a sense in which one needs to question the extent to which our citizens appreciate this and recognize the imminent dangers in light of the steady march of development projects.

Middleton (2013) recognizes this beauty and the threat to this beauty. He states, “The Caribbean is a region of tremendous natural beauty....Yet for all its undeniable natural beauty, the Caribbean is a region that is increasingly marred by pollution (for example unsafe levels of toxins in fish in the Kingston Harbour)... the ‘forest, waters [and] shining sand’ of the pristine Caribbean are becoming more and more compromised by the human footprint.” (Middleton 2013, p. 79). Taylor (2015) also voices this opinion, “The Caribbean is inherently climate sensitive – who we are and how we live is inextricably linked to climate.” This is described more specifically by Taylor (2015) as climate sensitivity.

“Understanding climate becomes important for the Caribbean given its inherent ‘sensitivity’ to climate change. By sensitivity, we mean that Caribbean countries – their economies, the daily ordering of the life of their people, and their natural systems – are extremely responsive to variations in climate on whatever timescale they occur (whether variability or change). In fact, the Caribbean is perhaps disproportionately sensitive to climate when compared to other regions of the world.” In light of this reality, it is incumbent upon us to carefully consider the current realities and chart a course of action.

This paper seeks to explore the nexus of environmental concern and sustainable development, using as cases in point the proposed Goat Islands development, and the disposal of garbage and untreated sewage in the gullies. This is towards establishing the rationale for a robust Caribbean theology of the environment. The two cases in point (Goat Island and Gullies) will be explored, followed by an examination of the Biblical basis for environmental issues to be a part of the ministry of the church in Jamaica as a segue into the building of the case for a Caribbean theology of the environment so as to set the stage for a multi-sector change in posture towards the environment aided and abetted by the church. I agree with Taylor (2015) that “Since the region’s sensitivity and vulnerability are pervasive, adaptation strategies must target all spheres of Caribbean life. This justifies a multi-sectoral approach to response strategies.”

Climate change in Jamaica

While the survey cited earlier shows a low level of awareness of climate change terminologies, I suspect that a greater number of persons would indicate that they are experiencing changes in the climate of the Caribbean. It is quite likely that most will agree that

the times are 'hotter now-a-days'. Jamaica Observer writer, Kimone Thompson (2015) reports on the voicing of concern for the environment by United Church clergy, Naggie Sterling.

Sterling is quoted as saying, "Right here on our little piece of rock, homes and buildings that were well within the legal distance from the shore now find themselves too near to the shoreline. Many of our beaches have simply disappeared, rainfall is becoming less and less and rising temperatures haunt us day and night." Sterling seems to be quite in agreement with what has been argued thus far in this paper. Thompson reports further: "Sterling argued that man, in general, has abused his role as steward of the Earth, which he said has resulted in extreme weather events such as more intense and more frequent hurricanes and longer, drier periods of drought that cause hunger, disease and displacement among vulnerable populations. He referenced the rising temperatures, rising tides, beach erosion, and decreasing rainfall associated with climate change."

Taylor (2015) makes an overwhelmingly compelling case for the reality of climate change in the region. He states, "The mean warming trend previously noted for the Earth over the past century is also evident in Caribbean temperature record." The fact that Jamaica is an island should peak our interest in the matter of sea level rise. In this regard, Taylor (2015) informs us that "Sea level rise is also resulting in beach erosion. Robinson et al. (2012) reported the net average shoreline recession for the Long Bay area in Portland, Jamaica, between 1971 and 2008 as 8.4m or about 23 cm per year. In addition, he says that a "study estimates that a 1-metre rise in sea level will affect some 8% of major tourism resorts in Jamaica while under a 2-metre rise, approximately 18% will be adversely affected.

To protect these resorts it is estimated that some 22 miles of coastal protection will be needed at a minimum cost of US\$92.3 million to a high of US\$993.8 million.”

A report on the impact of climate change produced by the Coastal Area Management Foundation (2012) conveys a similar note of concern for coastal areas: “The FAO (2011) cautions that climate change is projected to impact broadly across ecosystems, societies and economies, increasing pressure on all livelihoods and food supplies including those in the fisheries and aquaculture sector. Warnings of this nature have serious implications for coastal communities such as Old Harbour Bay. Climate change induced sea level rise which is expected to result in the loss of its land mass is predicted, to be around 101.9km² pending sea level rise and storm surges.”¹

The warnings from Taylor (2015) widen in scope: “In addition to coastal settlements and infrastructure, examples of other emerging vulnerable groupings and sectors that require attention under the new climate regime include endemic fauna and flora, outdoor workers, the homeless, the chronically ill, the elderly and very young, those suffering from respiratory problems, and small businesses. In the last 14 years (since 2000) Jamaica has been affected by 12 tropical storms, hurricanes or intense rain events. Each event has cost the country a percentage of its GDP for recovery efforts and, combined, they have resulted in losses and damage amounting to approximately \$128.54 billion”.

¹ http://www.ccam.org.jm/publications/agriculture-disaster-risk-management-plan-old-harbour-bay-st.-catherine/at_download/file).

The danger is not very far off, if we are to take Taylor (2015) seriously. He reports that Mora et al. (2013) try to determine the timing of ‘climate departures’ or the “year when the projected mean climate of a given location moves to a state continuously outside the bounds of historical variability”.

They suggest that disruptions in ecology and society may be tied to these dates. They show that unprecedented climates “will occur earliest in the tropics and among low-income countries, highlighting the vulnerability of global biodiversity and the limited governmental capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change”.

In some cases the climate departure date determined by Mora et al. (2013) is imminent. For example, temperature departures or the first year when even the coldest mean temperatures achieved thereafter is warmer than the warmest temperatures experienced to date, occur earliest in the tropics – in the early 2020s through to mid-2030s for the Caribbean. Of all cities analyzed, Kingston will be the second city to reach this threshold (in 2023). Other climate departures, they determine, have already been exceeded. Mora et al. (2013) found that ocean acidity already exceeded its historic bounds in 2008 (give or take three years).

At the time of writing of this paper there was a clear sense of the discomfiting humidity of the night’s air. This was confirmed by a report from the Meteorological Service during the nightly news on Television Jamaica (TVJ), which indicated that various sections of the island experienced temperatures in excess of 37 degrees Centigrade. This was notable because the previous high mark used as a benchmark was 34 degrees centigrade. Taylor (2015) argues

that “By the end of the century, the probability of extreme warm seasons is 100% and the magnitude of the warming is ‘large’ in comparison to historical warming. The warming is everywhere across the region and greater over the bigger islands (Cuba, Hispaniola and Jamaica).” Here we have scientific evidence to support what the anecdotal evidence has been indicating all along. Taylor (2015) further cautions that “In terms of human perception, the changes in temperature translate into days and (in particular) nights feeling hotter than they used to, a lack of significant nighttime relief from hot daytime temperatures, and a sense that the hot days and nights associated with summer are starting earlier and persisting longer in the year. The cumulative impact of warmer days and nights, higher sea levels, more intense rain events and more frequent hurricanes is the gradual but clear emergence of a new climate regime. The new climate regime is characterised by (i) unfamiliarity, (ii) unpredictability, and (iii) unreliability.”

There will be substantial increases in the frequency of days and nights that are considered hot in the current climate. For many Caribbean countries, hot days and nights by present standards occur up to 95% of all days by the 2090s (McSweeney et al. 2010). There will be substantial decreases in the frequency of days and nights that are considered cold in current climate. For many Caribbean countries, these events are expected to become exceedingly rare by the end of the century.

In building his case for the clear and present reality of climate change Taylor (2015) provides an idea of the economic implications. They are staggering. “In the face of changing climate, there is a cost to inaction. Some studies have attempted to quantify that cost. The Stockholm Environment Institute (Buono et al. 2008), for example, attempted an examination of the potential

costs to the Caribbean if greenhouse gas emissions continue unchecked. The Stockholm study projected costs based on three categories of climate change effects: (i) hurricane damage, extrapolated from average annual hurricane damage in the recent past; (ii) tourism losses, assumed to be proportional to the current share of tourism in each economy; and (iii) infrastructure damage due to sea-level rise and exclusive of hurricane damage, which is projected as a constant cost per affected household. Considering just these three categories, the study estimates that the Caribbean's annual cost of inaction will be US\$22 billion annually by 2050 and \$46 billion by 2100 or 10% and 22%, respectively, of the Caribbean economy in 2004. For Jamaica, the costs as a percentage of 2004 GDP are: 13.9% in 2025, 27.9% in 2050, 42.3% in 2075, and 56.9% by 2100 . Even if the numbers are conservative, the conveyed message is that inaction is costly.

As we examine the data presented by Taylor (2015) it becomes abundantly clear that we are courting danger while rocking ourselves to sleep. Taylor's summary statements speak volumes:

The picture that emerges, then, is one of a region whose future sustainability is threatened in the face of inaction. The goal of sustainable development, when seen as a balance of the traditional pillars – the economic, the social and the environmental – is significantly challenged under future climate change and in the face of inaction. Climate change will have a profound impact on the Caribbean region's geophysical, biological and socioeconomic systems and will deplete national budgets, compromise livelihoods and exacerbate poverty. Climate change has the potential to offset any gains made in the pursuit of priority development objectives such as food security, access to

basic services such as clean water, sanitary living conditions and energy, education, and combatting poverty. Among other things, climate change will transform the environment into a hazard and as such, economic development cannot be premised on it as is currently the case in many of the islands of the region. Jamaica's goal to become the place of choice to live, work, raise families, and do business by 2030 is under threat from climate change.

It must also be noted as Taylor (2015) indicates, "There are, likewise, some social groupings which will bear the disproportionate impact of climate change. The list of some of the most vulnerable is as alluded to before and includes the urban poor, subsistence farmers, the physically challenged, children and the elderly."

Sustainability

As we explore this nexus of environmental stewardship and economic progress, Lindsay-Nanton captures very well the dilemma before us. She argues "from a sustainable development perspective, land has various conflicting features. On the one hand, land as a scarce and fragile resource is an object for environmental protection. On the other, land is equally an asset for economic and social development. It has the capacity for wealth creation, for attracting and locating investment, and for opening up vital opportunities for the development of the financial sector" (Lindsay Nanton 2004, p. 313). The view of development held by Mahbub ul Haq is one that finds traction with her, "The objective of development is to create an environment for people to enjoy long, healthy and creative lives"(Ibid., 13). As far as she is concerned Jamaica has a major long term land management problem on its

hands, which is “the degradation of the limited land area due to a variety of factors, including overuse on account of high population pressures, deforestation and events such as fires.” (Ibid., p.314). The dilemma before the nation unfolds further as we examine the major income generating activities. As Lindsay-Nanton (2004) indicates, “Jamaica’s economy relies heavily on the exploitation of its natural resources. Indeed the country’s major sectors- tourism, mining and agriculture- all depend of natural resources.”

She continues to indicate that “the patterns of economic development and urbanization that have evolved over the years contributed substantially to the deterioration of the island’s fragile ecosystems” (Ibid., 282). It seems to me that her use of the word exploitation here is in a positive sense, but I can’t help but see the gross negative side of it based on the current situational analysis, that is to say, we are in fact exploiting the land in our onward march towards development goals. The challenge “therefore is to promote sustainable development while limiting the negative impact of human activities on our climate.” (Lindsay-Nanton 2004, 284). In this paper, sustainable development, as used by Lindsay-Nanton (2004) “is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Sustainable development is not just an environmental concept. It requires sustainable social structures, good governance and sound economics. It requires a cross-sectoral vision and sustainable ways of running a society.” (Ibid., 308). The importance of sustainable development should not be lost on any of us because it is of vital importance for countries such as ours which due to their small size are, “highly vulnerable to external economic, environmental and social factors” (Lindsay-Nanton 2004, 308). She offers a chilling example of this: “Two-thirds of Jamaicans, and most of the island’s civil and economic

infrastructure, are found in the coastal zone. Most major roads and both airports...are on the coast. All these resources are vulnerable to sea level rise, and the impact of storms, hurricanes and floods. For example, the runway in Montego Bay has an elevation of 1.2 meters, but the city expects a storm surge of 1.6 metres at least once every 25 years.”(Ibid., 309).

This discourse would be incomplete without discussing the sustainability of the environment itself. The words of Taylor (2015) are of particular relevance here. He argues that “because climate change has the potential to influence all of the other development goals due to its pervasive nature and to continue driving up the attendant costs to pursue such goals in the future, there is great merit in exploring the synergies between responding to climate change and the pursuit of a sustainable development agenda. That is, many of the adaptation strategies suggested are identical to the kinds of action that are needed to ensure sustainable development.” (Taylor 2015).

In a similar fashion Taylor (2014) indicates the idea of sustainability is an integral factor which was taken for granted in the Wisdom Tradition. He contends, “Preserving and maintaining the harmony, order and balanced structure into creation by the Creator was a necessity for a meaningful and flourishing life in the social order.” The point is that the nature of wisdom itself demands an appreciation of and a commitment to the maintenance of this order.

Taylor (2014) draws a quote from the Presbyterian church (USA) to illustrate this further: “As a norm of human behavior, sustainability requires that we relate to the realm of nature in ways that respect its integrity, so that natural systems continue to

function properly, and the earth's beauty and fruitfulness may be maintained and kept [for] sufficient human sustenance, . . . [in order that] life may continue for non-human species. (Ibid., 157 – 158).

It is to their credit that this denomination has issued such a statement. Much more of this level of public chaplaincy is needed from local denominational bodies. The relative absence from the discussion on environmental matters of the church has not escaped the gaze of Taylor (2014).

He not only makes the case that there is an important space for the “biblical-theological perspective to be reckoned with in debates, discussions and conversations, related to environmental integrity and sustainability,” but also indicates the need for such a perspective itself to be redeemed from much misunderstanding. Taylor then makes the all important link between the nexus of economic development goals and environmental sustainability. He states,

Nowhere else is the perspective more pertinent than in those contexts in which social and economic development has been lagging. In these places, great hopes are being placed on rapid technological, industrial, agricultural and infrastructural development. The challenges that this poses for serious environmental and ecological compromise are stark. The impact of these in terms of short term and long-term consequences poses serious dilemmas for public policy decisions as well as corporate planning. (Ibid. 159 – 160).²

² Cf. E.B. Edmonds, 1997.

This is precisely the grappling with which the writer engages. In so far as the overwhelming majority of the Jamaican church has little interest in such matters the writer is alarmed and wishes to sound a clarion call to the religious powers that be to wake from their slumber. As Taylor (2014) puts it, “The peculiar tensions and conflicts that seem to be attendant upon the need to address telling economic and social needs and to make advance in related areas, and at the same time, protect and preserve environmental integrity and sustainability cannot be ignored.” (Ibid.,160). This essential concept of sustainability is echoed in a single sentence by Roper (2012), “We must not merely live but we must live in a way that can sustain life.” (Roper 2012, 23).

This idea had been fleshed out some more by him as he discussed the Jubilee instructions of God to the nation of Israel. He explains that the Jubilee “called upon them to have a Sabbath year every seventh year and every fifty years to make not just the forty ninth year the Sabbath, but also the fiftieth year as well. It called upon the people of Israel to take two years off from tilling the soil and reaping the produce that they had grown. They were to rely upon the fruits that grow wild, the untended vine and the untilled soil.”

This instruction found very little resonance with the Israelites and was hardly even attempted throughout their history. Notwithstanding that, Roper is of the view that there is great merit in abiding by its principle in today’s reality. He states, “If we begin to think about it, the ancient principle that we find so laughable and impractical from long ago has begun to make a come-back. For one thing, we have begun to be more convinced about protecting the integrity of the earth. With climate change, global-warming, aridity, the danger of the earth running out of drinking

water, the melting of the ice cap, rising sea levels and the like. Words like conservation, stewardship, crop rotation, and allowing the land to lay fallow have begun to be once again part of even secular and modern vocabulary.” (Roper 2012, 10 – 11).

Weaver and Hodson are quite accurate in their conclusion, “Sustainable Development will only be achieved as it is accepted by ordinary people going about their everyday lives. For that to happen it must be expressed in a simple practical way: a code of conduct.” We turn our attention at this point to two cases in point that illustrate the tension between economic progress and environmental integrity, the proposed Goat Islands development project and the link between the city’s gullies and the pollution of our territorial waters.

The Goat Islands Development Proposal

Arguably the most trending environmental issue in 2013 and 2014 in Jamaica was the proposed Goat Islands development. Although all indications are that the project has been aborted due to the delays that arose from the outcries against it on environmental grounds, the project provides an excellent case in point for the purposes of this paper. Bruner, Magnan, Rice and Reid (2014) provide us with a summary of the proposed Goat Islands development. “In 2013, the Ministry of Transport, Works and Housing announced that the China Harbour Engineering Company (CHEC) had selected the area on and around the Goat Islands to build a major trans-shipment port and accompanying industrial economic zone. (Bruner, Magnan, Rice and Ried 2014, 17).

According to Roper (2013), “The indication from Dr Omar Davies [is] that the Government of Jamaica is contemplating an unsolicited investment proposal of US\$1.5 billion in Jamaica's

seaport in the Portland Bight Protected Area (PBPA) from the Chinese.” (Roper, 2013). Further important details emerge from Bruner, Magnan, Rice and Ried (2014).

On one hand, success would bring much-needed jobs and economic activity. The third set of Panama Canal locks was set to have been completed in 2015, with operations beginning in 2016 (Tronche 2014). Increased capacity will permit transit by much larger Post-Panamax vessels, and in turn significantly increase cargo traffic through the Caribbean. With Kingston Harbour already second only to the Bahamas’ Freeport in volume handled by Caribbean ports (*Caribbean Journal* 2013), Jamaica is well-placed to attract a significant share of this new traffic and associated demand for services.

The new port is seen as important to Jamaica establishing itself as a key player in this context. Minister of Industry, Investment and Commerce Anthony Hylton has articulated the ambitious goal of making Jamaica the fourth key node in the global logistics chain, along with Rotterdam, Singapore and Dubai (MarineLink 2013). The International Monetary Fund (IMF) also notes the relevance of a planned trans-shipment port and associated industrial area to Jamaica’s goal of increasing its role in global logistics (IMF 2014).

The magnitude of economic benefit expected to accrue from this project was expressed by Davies to Roper (2013): “During the construction phase, the total project is anticipated to employ some 3,000 persons, and when fully operational, the project will employ upwards of 15,000. The Chinese have done their technical analysis and are ready to over the life of the investment, to expend a minimum of US\$1.5 billion.”

Despite such an enormous amount of anticipated foreign direct investment and voluminous job creation projections the proposal encountered a major stumbling block in the form of environmental concerns. This was described by Roper (2013): “The PBPA was so designated in 1999 and encompasses an area of 724 square miles of the Jamaican archipelago. It stretches from Hellshire in St Catherine in the east to Rocky Point in southeast Clarendon.”

The website of the Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation (CCAM) indicates that this was created in 1999 by Jamaica's Government under the National Resources Conservation Act (NRCA). The PBPA exists to protect a large marine and terrestrial area of the island. The PBPA is home to birds, iguanas, crocodiles, manatees, marine turtles, and fish, many of which are endemic to the area.³

Roper (2013) adds that “The PBPA is a nesting site for marine birds and endangered turtle species, such as hawksbill and green turtles. This reserve area is said to contain 81 acres of limestone forest, wetlands, sea grass and mangroves. It covers 500 kilometers on land and 1,300 kilometers on the marine side. Little Goat Island falls within the PBPA. It should not be difficult to see why the drawings of swords over this project was inevitable. The project was grand in scope as was the economic benefits, but the loss of this globally recognized and designated protected area and the ripple effects was equally worthy of consideration. This is how the principals at CCAM expressed it: “Due to the location of the proposed site in the core of the Portland Bight Protected Area, reactions have been heated. Building a port on Goat Islands

³ <http://www.ccam.org.jm/pbpa/the-portland-bight-protected-area>.

requires that Jamaica accept a trade-off sacrifice [in] an area of outstanding environmental importance in exchange for development. In Phase 1, the following will be built: an industrial park, support infrastructure, a container terminal, berths, a portside logistics zone, and a coal-fired power plant. http://www.ccam.org.jm/CSF_Jamaica_series_technical_oct2014_web.pdf/view.

The coal powered plant in and itself raises several environmental issues. A coal power plant will increase the carbon footprint of Kingston, St. Catherine and Clarendon exponentially. This does not auger well for overall air quality and will only be adding to the amount of greenhouse gases we produce. Speaking on the matter of global warming, Taylor (2015) makes it very clear that “Human beings are influencing the Earth’s climate by changing the concentration of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere and enhancing the greenhouse effect.” If we think this is just much ado about nothing we are surely misguided. Taylor (2015) asserts that, given the current levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere “The implication is that even if the world were to stop emitting CO₂ today, future generations, including those in the Caribbean, will still have to live with the impact of present-day emissions.”

Interestingly, the management of the PBPA was assigned to the Urban Development Corporation (UDC) and not to the National Environment Protection Agency (NEPA). This observation is made by Roper (2013): “Fortunately or unfortunately, the management of the PBPA has been given to the Urban Development Corporation (UDC), so it is up to the UDC, and not NEPA, to determine appropriate uses for the PBPA.” It goes without saying that it perhaps reasonable to expect that it is far more likely that

choices would be made along economic lines than environmental lines when it matters most. As is quite obvious, the crossroad of environmental protection and economic development is one that is highly polarized with far reaching implications. The best approach then cannot be one of a shouting match or polarized groups taking pot shots at each other. There has to be honest and collaborative dialogue, fuelled by research and a desire to explore options. Roper (2013) holds the view that the original designation of the PBPA was too expansive.

He states, “I have maintained from the very outset that the 1999 decision was one-sided in that a narrow band of environmentalists and a privileged few dominated the conversation, and this resulted in economic options being foreclosed pre-emptorily. The designated area ought not to have been so large. Jamaica is confining itself to perpetual poverty by foreclosing the option for development for a full one-eighth of its development space.” It is my considered opinion that there is no *ipso facto* conflict between development and environmental sustainability. There should be a methodology of careful planning, dialogue and a commitment to balance that that can be pursued. In the case of the conflict that arose over the proposed Goat Islands project Roper (2013) posits a similar view:

Jamaica needs this particular investment at this time. Time is of the essence because of all the development in the Panama Canal and the opportunities to participate in global maritime that are implied by the 2015 Panamax. Therefore, I am recommending to the minister of transport, housing and works, Dr Omar Davies, that he take a proactive, rather than tentative, approach “to this development. I think that consultation needs to begin immediately in which the message of what is planned in the wake of this investment by the Chinese to

town hall meetings to get buy-in by the Jamaican people. Their good sense will prevail (Ibid.).

In the midst of the raging debate one example of research and presentation of options stood out, the work of Bruner, Magnan, Rice and Ried (2014):

The report on the Goat Islands project focuses on one of several fundamental questions that need to be assessed in order for Jamaicans to make an informed decision: Are there suitable alternative sites that would reduce environmental and social risk to Jamaica without imposing undue financial costs on the developer? If such sites exist, Jamaica could avoid significant social and environmental costs and risks to the nation, without diminishing the business case for the new port. (Ibid., 11). . . . This report assesses whether there are suitable alternative sites that could promote both objectives without imposing undue financial costs on the developer. Our findings show that there appears to be at least one such option: an equivalent facility at Macarry Bay, to the west of Goat Islands, would cost an estimated \$200 million less to build. Considering a planned total investment of \$1.5 billion, this represents a potential cost savings of more than 10%. Building at Macarry Bay would also impose a far smaller environmental cost. (Ibid., 22)

Bruner, Magnan, Rice and Reid (2014), raise two important questions in their proposal for the alternative site which I think could form the basis of a template for resolving similarly vexing dilemmas: (1) “What is the value of the environmental services and associated livelihoods that may be put at risk through development around Goat Island ,and how does this value compare to values at alternative

sites?” (2) Beyond immediate environmental and social impact, what negative consequences can Jamaica expect from building on Goat Islands as compared to alternative sites? (Ibid., 22).

Gullies: From the Ridge to the Reef.

Roper (2013) argues that there is a strong link between poverty and environmental destruction. He argues that “Poverty is the greatest threat to the environment.” The case in point of the gullies in this paper is similarly indicative of poverty, a poverty of economic and mental proportions. I speak specifically of the squatter settlements along the banks of the gullies in Jamaica. The persons who dwell there have no land ownership, typically have illegal water and power connections and in many instances either have no sanitary bathroom facilities or where those are constructed the effluent is released directly into the gully. Solid waste from these settlers are predominantly dumped into the gullies.

There is a view among the residents in such places that the garbage trucks do not come into their communities often enough to collect the solid waste. I can personally attest to this in one such community in particular. On the other hand, though it needs to be said that even when the garbage collection occurs more frequently many residents along the gully banks simply find it more convenient to throw their garbage into the gully. We need to ask ourselves whether there are any vested interests in keeping such squatter settlements operational. Likewise we need to ask ourselves what factors determine the inequitable distribution of garbage trucks across the city. The solid waste from the gullies make their way to the Kingston harbor and outer waters.

Information gathered from the Mananuca Environmental Society indicates, “Plastic bags breakdown in 50 years, plastic bottles in 150 years, and cigarette butts in 75 years, paper in 1 year and batteries in 200 years. These all take so much time to breakdown to the detriment of creatures that live around us. If a turtle encounters a plastic bag, which looks similar to jellyfish, he may swallow the plastic bag and choke on it. Batteries leak poisons as they breakdown and can contaminate the fish we eat, as well as kill corals and other marine life.”

There are further threats associated with plastics in the oceans. According a report in The Guardian Newspaper by Milman (2015), “Pieces are ingested by fish and then travel up the food chain, all the way to humans. It is expected this problem will worsen due to the rise of throwaway plastic, such as drinks [sic] containers and food packaging, with only 5% of the world’s plastic recycled at present.” Milman (2015) also quotes Dr. Hoogenboom: “In my opinion we need a general focus on cleaning up plastic pollution, to clean up beaches and reduce the amount of plastics in the waterways and into the oceans. It’s a significant problem globally.”

The phrase ‘from the ridge to the reef’ was used by Roper (2015) to describe the interconnection between what happens inland and what happens to the corals. In this paper it is what happens in the gullies that is in view. At the local level, Martin Henry, Communications Specialist with the Scientific Research Council of Jamaica, speaks to the importance of our coral reefs.

The highly productive coral reefs provide significant benefits to the human population. The reefs are sources of food. They are a major source of sand as they erode. As buffers, they provide protection to coastlines from waves and currents.

The reefs are important to the Jamaican tourism product as a source of sand in the sun, sand and sea formula. There is increasing interest in reef species as sources of biologically active compounds for medical drugs.

Henry describes as well the role that algae play in destroying corals: “The growth of large algae, if not kept in check, smother existing coral and prevent coral larvae from settling to form new colonies. The algae are kept under control by herbivorous organisms which graze on them. The parrot fish, a Jamaican dinner delicacy, is one of the most important grazers, and over-fishing of parrot and other reef species allows the algae to flourish. The raw sewage from gully bank residents makes its way to the sea, creating a nutrient rich environment for algae to grow.

Martin sheds more light on the inherent danger of this reality. “Peter Edwards and Tatum Fisher identify sewage and agricultural fertilizers as the major sources of nutrient-supplying pollution affecting coral reefs. Additional nutrients mean additional growth. According to the S&T Conference paper, ‘a striking ... shift has taken place from a coral-dominated system to one dominated by algae.’ Algal cover has grown from four per cent to 92 per cent.” Martin (Ibid.).

This gloomy picture is supported by a report from the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA) in 2008. The report indicates that “The influence of natural and man-induced stressors on coastal ecosystems has in most cases resulted in a switch from coral to algal dominated reefs. These stressors have resulted in a decline in coral cover from a high of 50% in the 1970s to less than 5% by the early 1990s.

A Caribbean Theology of the environment

Dr. Rolf Hille, chairman in 2004, of the Theological Commission of the World Evangelical Alliance expressed the view that “Environmental questions have become real-life questions for humanity.” This opinion was expressed in his foreword for Gnanakan’s book *Responsible Stewardship of God’s Creation*. (Gnanakan, 2004, 5). Hille continues his foreword making salient observations such as, “God created this world with great love and perfection and commanded man ‘to work the garden and preserve it (take care of it)’... It does therefore, matter to God, how we handle His creation, water, air, raw materials, soil, animals and plants. When a theologian takes a careful look at the ideas behind ecology and when Christian churches become concerned about the environment, then this is not simply a favorite hobby... Rather how we deal with the creation is also essentially a matter of being a faithful disciple of Jesus and obedient faith.”

According to Weaver and Hodson, “When the concerns about the environment began to emerge, two people related it to the Church: Dr Lynn White [who] attacked the Judaeo/Christian tradition for having taken the notion of ‘dominion’ to mean liberty to take from nature whatever and whenever we please [and] Francis Schaeffer, on the other hand, [who] expounded the theory that the local church should be the ‘pilot plant’ setting before human society a picture of the way life was meant to be.”

Taylor (2014) argues with conviction that the Wisdom Literature calls us to the sustainability of the creation. He writes, “there is a growing note of urgency presently, about the subject, to the extent that it is not unusual for the language of crisis to be associated with it. There is often reference to the pending or actual environmental or ecological crisis faced by the world in general and more so in some places in particular for varying reasons.” (Taylor 2014, 140).

Further negligence towards these matters and basking in the bliss of ignorance are luxuries that the Jamaican church can no longer afford.

I am an ardent advocate for Caribbean Theology. So in this section we will make a case for the inclusion of a theology of the environment in the discourse of Caribbean Theology as a necessity. The words of Francis Schaffer offer some opening pointers in this regard, "If God treats the tree like a tree, the machine like a machine, the man like a man, shouldn't I, as a fellow-creature, do the same -- treating each thing in integrity in its own order? And for the highest reason: because I love God -- I love the One who has made it! Loving the Lover who has made it, I have respect for the thing He has made."⁴ Along a similar vein he makes a compelling case for respect for the environment to be an intrinsic part of the life of a Christian:

The tree in the field is to be treated with respect. It is not to be romanticized as the old lady romanticizes her cat (that is, she reads human reactions into it). But while we should not romanticize the tree, we must realize that God made it and it deserves respect because he made it *as a tree*. Christians who do not believe in the complete evolutionary scale have reason to respect nature as the total evolutionist never can, because we believe that God made these things specifically in their own areas. So if we are going to argue against evolutionists intellectually, we should show the results of our beliefs in our attitudes.

⁴ Francis A. Schaeffer, *Pollution and the Death of Man*, Ch. 4:
<http://www.rationalpi.com/theshelter/ecology.html>.

The Christian is a man [or woman] who has a reason for dealing with each created thing on a high level of respect. (<http://www.goodreads.com/work/quotes/443980-pollution-and-the-death-of-man>).

In stating his case for a Caribbean creation theology, J. Richard Middleton firstly identifies what I think is the fundamental cause of the absence of this kind of “think and talk” on environmental concerns in our churches. He posits, “the indelible human footprint on the natural beauty of the Caribbean (our impact on the earth), combined with horrendous natural disasters (the earth’s impact on us), gives the lie to any romantic vision of what we moderns have come to know as ‘nature’ (the realm of the non-human); but it also calls into question the sort of popular piety we find in the Caribbean church that imagines a separation between human ‘salvation’ (narrowly conceived) and our earthly environment. Paradoxically, among many Christians, in the Caribbean and elsewhere, we find a decidedly otherworldly, and often individualistic view of ‘salvation’ as the saving of souls from a fiery judgment to an eternity with God in the ethereal heaven, combined with a romantic view of nature as a special place to encounter God.... Yet little if no thought is typically given to the possible connection – or better, to the disconnect- between an otherworldly salvation and a romanticized nature.” (Ibid, 79 – 80).⁵

Middleton pushes further with this when he recognizes that there seems to be an inherent lack of interest on the part of Caribbean theologians in what he refers to as creation theology. He states that

⁵ See also his full-scale treatment of ‘heavenly matters for our earthly good’ in *A New Heaven and a New Earth: Reclaiming Biblical Eschatology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2014.

“Caribbean theologians are right to express suspicions about any points of view that is [sic] blind to the reality of social inequalities, especially if this blindness is combined with a romantic view of nature.... Given the pressing human needs that face Caribbean people every day it might seem that a theology of creation would take away our focus off what is undeniably of prime importance.”

“There is also”, argues Middleton a “historical reason for the suspicion of creation as a theological topic . . . either to prioritize a concern for human flourishing over a concern for the earth, or to view creation theology with outright suspicion.” (Ibid., 81).

Having set out the status quo here in Jamaica it is my hope that the eyes of the church would be open to see the obvious, that if we continue to only sing a “Sankey” there may be no land left for us to stand on to do our singing. It is further hoped that Caribbean theologians would recognize that, as Middleton says, “this anthropocentric focus, which separates human well-being from concern about the earth, is an artificial polarization, since people only exist, live and work somewhere; that is, any socio-cultural analysis would show that people both impact and are impacted by their environment.” (Ibid. 82). Such an artificial and polarized view is not supported by Scripture either, as I have earlier shown. Middleton supports the opposite position: “It is an artificial polarization from a biblical point of view as well, since humans are consistently understood in the Scriptures as part of the wider cosmos, which is not only created by God, but is the object of God’s saving activity.” (Ibid., 83).

References

Edmonds, E.B. 1997. The Ecological Crisis. *Binah* 2: 63-76.
http://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/binah/02_063.pdf.

Mccatty, Kerry. *Pastor concerned about degradation of environment*. Jamaica Observer. May 2015.
http://www.jamaicaobserver.com/news/80632_Pastor-concerned-about-degradation-of_environment Accessed June 15, 2015

Milman, O. *Corals face 'slow starvation' from ingesting plastics pollution, experts find* The Guardian. February 2015.
<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/feb/25/corals-face-slow-starvation-from-ingesting-plastics-pollution-experts-find> Accessed June 2, 2015.

NEPA. 2008. Coral Reefs of Jamaica Status and Trends 2007.
http://www.nepa.gov.jm/student/resource-material/pdf/Coral_Reef_of_Jamaica_2007.pdf

Roper, Garnett. 2013. "Goat Islands: ecology and economy"
<http://jamaica-gleaner.com/gleaner/20130825/focus/focus6.html>
Accessed May 1, 2015.

Roper, Garnett & Middleton, J. Richard. Ed. 2013. *A Kairos Moment For Caribbean Theology: Ecumenical voices in dialogue*. Pickwick Publications - An Imprint of Wipf and Stock Publishers. Eugene, Oregon.

Taylor, Burchell K. 2014. *Living Wisely: Reflections on the*

Wisdom Books Proverbs, Job and Ecclesiastes From the Margins.
Caribbean Christian Publications. Kingston.

Taylor, Michael A. 2015. Why Climate Demands Change.
Kingston. The Grace Kennedy Foundation.

Schaeffer , Francis A, *Pollution and the Death of Man* (Tyndale
House, 1970) pp.81-93
[http://www.goodreads.com/work/quotes/443980-
pollution-and-the-death-of-man](http://www.goodreads.com/work/quotes/443980-pollution-and-the-death-of-man) . Accessed May 1, 2015

Weaver, John & Hodson, Margot R. Eds. The Place of
Environmental Theology: a course guide for seminaries, colleges
and universities. Whitley Trust, UK and the International Baptist
Theological Seminary, Prague. Made available on the CEBTS web
site

[http://www.cebts.eu/programme/doc/environmental-
theology-course-2007.pdf](http://www.cebts.eu/programme/doc/environmental-theology-course-2007.pdf)

**1 Corinthians
11: 1-16
A Rhetorical Reading**

By
D V Palmer
Lecturer
The JTS

Much of Paul's letters continues to mystify Bible students all over the globe, vindicating Saint Simon's passing observation that certain first century writings were a 'stumbling block' to some first century Bible teachers (2 Peter 3:16). First Corinthians 11 may be taken as a concrete example.

Recently I discovered that a ubiquitous biblical phenomenon might be one of the keys to unlocking the tight treasure chest embedded in verses 1-16. And what is this key? The pun! Can you imagine? The pun.¹ We should have guessed this along, because all over the Scriptures we find the pun in some of the most important theological settings. For example, in Exodus 3 the famous I AM that I AM declaration, it is believed, is a word play in connection with *YHWH* (Thompson 2003, vii), which when translated may very well be the third person ("He is") of I AM.

Then there is the time when King David wanted to build a 'house' (Temple/Palace) for the I AM, who declined the offer but offered instead to

¹ Or paranomasia. Today we pun mostly for fun; the biblical writers invariably employ this literary device to make serious points, while still maintaining their sense of humour. During 21st edition of the World Cup, we may have seen some inadvertent puns; e.g., 'Pope sent off in Italy tussle' (USA/Italy), and 'Henry is one and one with Juan' (Brazil/France)—and 'when Jamaicans (including Usain) hear gunshot *dem Bolt!*' For other rhetorical devices, see the brief but useful article, by Bradshaw (1997).

build a 'house' (dynasty) for David (2 Sam. 7). And how about Isaiah 7 (which is conceptually close to 1 Cor. 11:1-16)?

When Ahaz son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, was king of Judah, King Rezin of Aram and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel marched up to fight against Jerusalem, but they could not overpower it. 2 Now the house² of David was told, "Aram has allied itself with Ephraim"; so the hearts of Ahaz and his people were shaken, as the trees of the forest are shaken by the wind. 3 Then the LORD said to Isaiah, "Go out, you and your son Shear-Jashub, to meet Ahaz at the end of the aqueduct of the Upper Pool, on the road to the Washerman's Field. 4 Say to him, 'Be careful, keep calm and don't be afraid. Do not lose heart because of these two smoldering stumps of firewood-- because of the fierce anger of Rezin and Aram and of the son of Remaliah. 5 Aram, Ephraim and Remaliah's son have plotted your ruin, saying, 6 "Let us invade Judah; let us tear it apart and divide it among ourselves, and make the son of Tabeel king over it." 7 Yet this is what the Sovereign LORD says: "It will not take place, it will not happen, 8 for the head [capital, as in v. 9a] of Aram is Damascus, and the head [king, as in 9b] of Damascus is only Rezin. Within sixty-five years Ephraim will be too shattered to be a people. 9 The head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is only Remaliah's son. If you do not stand firm in your faith, you will not stand at all."³

So when Collins (cited in Thiselton 2000, 822; cf. Blomberg 1994, 208) writes that "Paul's rhetorical argument is constructed on the basis of a pun. He plays on the multiple meanings of 'head,'"⁴ we sense he is on to something.

² 'The house' (cf. 2 Sam. 7) lasted until about the 6th century, when 'termites' destroyed it (2 Chron.).

³ Verse 9b has another pun: "If you do not *AMEN* in your faith, you will not be *AMEN*ed at all."

⁴ The semantic range includes 'priority', 'source', Zidane's former 'weapon' of choice, 'origin', and 'authority' (Waltke 1978, 48).

Fee (1987, 504), as well, may be on to something in rejecting the traditional view that we have within the passage some notion of hierarchy. For him the meaning of the verse is to be understood along the following lines: “In terms of creation, Christ is the source [i.e. head] of every man’s life; in terms of the new creation . . . the source of every Christian man. . . .” Looking at the verse chronologically, Fee continues, “Christ created man; through man came woman; [and] God is the source of Christ in his incarnation.”

Fee’s interpretation is plausible, especially in light of verses 8 and 9. However, if Paul is using a pun, a *double entendre* may also be present. Based on this consideration, we offer below a modified presentation of the traditional perspective under the following headings.⁵

Commendational Matters

Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you (v.2).

Only one verse of commendation in this paragraph, but it may be taken together with verse 1, which enjoins the reader to follow the Messianic and apostolic pattern of sincere commendation before corrective measures are taken (1 Cor. 1:7; Rev. 2-3). The founder intends to bring this church in line with the others (v. 16). However, they must never get the impression that they are so far gone and there is no hope of redemption; so they are praised for their positive response to good tradition.⁶

⁵ For an outline of the entire book and the complex structure of vv. 2-16, see, respectively, Palmer 1992, 91-92 and Garland 2003, 505-511; and for a well-written essay on the traditional position, Fish 1992, 214-251.

⁶ That is, maintaining the groundbreaking tradition of freedom in worship and male/female equality (so Blomberg 1994, 208; contra Mount 2005?).

Covenantal Matters

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God (v. 3).

The Corinthians who first heard this letter read were people of covenant (vv 17-34). They had entered into an everlasting relationship with the eternal God. In the next chapter, particularly verses 1-6, they will be reminded that their fellowship is with this triune God, Spirit (12:4); Son (12: 5); and Father (12: 6).

As in chapter 12, the unity and diversity characterizing the triune God are brought to bear on the issue at hand; there to shape their understanding of how spiritual gifts operate effectively, and here in chapter 11 to show how the nuclear family participate in worship in a way that does not jeopardize the vertical and horizontal covenant relationships.

In verse 3, then, the functional subordination⁷ of the Son to the Father serves as a worthwhile paradigm for the husband and wife (diversity) team (unity) in worship. So what must be borne in mind is that the head of every Christian husband is Christ, and in turn the husband is the head (*PAL*)⁸ of his wife. Just as how the unity of the God-head does not cancel out (but complements) its diversity, so it must not be thought that ‘wife’ and ‘husband’ are mutually exclusive. “Yes it is true that men and women⁹ are equal in Christ before God, but that does not mean that all differences

⁷ Of course, in terms of their being, they are one (John 10:30), but as persons they have different functions both in the realms of creation and redemption.

⁸ I.e., Primary Accountability Leader (*PAL*; cf. Rom. 5:12); the wife is *SAL*.

⁹ Where Blomberg speaks of “men and women” we may more specifically speak of wives and husbands, at least in v. 3.

between the sexes may be blurred” (Blomberg 1994, 208; Dowdin 2016). Here is where the controversial covering¹⁰ comes in.

Conventional Matters¹¹

Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head. And every woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head-- it is just as though her head were shaved. If a woman does not cover her head, she should have her hair cut off; and if it is a disgrace for a woman to have her hair cut or shaved off, she should cover her head (vv 4-6).

To unveil the truth behind these verses, we must understand them against the backdrop of the Graeco-Roman culture. Of course, this is already a given in any attempt to interpret first-century literature. What is problematic is that there is not a whole bunch of interpreters that are sufficiently conversant with that culture to properly re-construct the situation the apostle addresses in verses 4-6. Knowing fully well where I fall in this interpretative quest, I can only rely on people like Thiselton and Fee (1987) to help in charting the course.

Thiselton (2000, 803; italics his), for example, informs us that “certain *male* attire or hair-styles were deemed effeminate and overtly sexual, while appropriate head coverings for respectable Roman *women* served as protection of their dignity and status as *women not to be propositioned.*” Quite a number of these respectable women were wives

¹⁰ Is it hair (v.15)? Then brothers must pray bald, unless long hair is meant. In vv. 4-5 something other than natural hair seems to be intended. See also Chisholm’s (1985, 5) nuanced position championing the twin principle of headship and sexual differentiation; for him ‘covering’ refers to hair.

¹¹ Some “commentators who wish to defend Paul’s methods of argument find these verses embarrassing, on the ground that they are entirely relative to highly time-bound considerations. But this is no accident. Paul is concerned that the eschatological status of the Christian does not raise him above everyday questions about particular times and particular places” (Thiselton 1978, 117).

and, from the perspective of Paul, all Christian women were/are indeed respectable! But why would respectable wives, for example, want to put away their veils in church? Garland's (2003, 507) answer is worth pondering:

Possibly, the fuzzy boundary between the home and the house church caused them to neglect this covering. Since they were not accustomed to wearing the covering in their homes, they did not wear it when the church met in the home. Behaviour acceptable in the home may not be appropriate for the church gathering in the home. [But] We are still left with guesses as to the motivation behind their behaviour.

Another feature of Roman culture was the wearing of some kind of a headgear on the part of some pagan male worshippers (Oster 1988, 481-505).¹² Against this background, the shame and dishonour (in a culture where this was high on the agenda) mentioned in verse 4-6 is understandable. The Christian husband at the Lord's Table, for instance, cannot look like a pagan facing his altar (Witherington 1995, 239)--and his wife should not appear disrespectful¹³ (vv. 16).

¹² Says the first century biographer, Plutarch (Boring et al 1995, 423): "But if there is anything to be said, consider whether it be not true that there is only one matter that needs investigation: why men cover their heads when they worship the gods; . . . For they uncover their heads in the presence of men more influential than they: it is not to invest these men with additional honor, but rather to avert from them the jealousy of the gods, that these men may not seem to demand the same honor as the gods, nor to tolerate an attention like that bestowed on the gods . . . the Spirit within us entreats and supplicates the gods without, thus symbolizes by the covering of the head the covering and concealment of the soul by the body."

¹³ This is what a conventional unveiled woman in the Graeco-Roman world would likely look like. One can understand some Christian women 'dissing' this cultural norm in the name of freedom; equally, a Christian brother feeling free to wearing his hair long, not bothering with the fact that many would mistake him to be a member of the 1st century equivalent of J-FLAG. "Everything is permissible" of course; but not everything is beneficial (10: 23a).

Creational Matters

A man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of man. For man did not come from woman, but woman from man; neither was man created for woman, but woman for man. For this reason, and because of the angels,¹⁴ the woman ought to have a sign of authority on her head. In the Lord, however, woman is not independent of man, nor is man independent of woman. For as woman came from man, so also man is born of woman. But everything comes from God. Judge for yourselves: Is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered?(vv 7-13)

Having partially grounded his argument in social norms and customs, the apostle now turns to higher ideals to persuade his ‘children’ to fall in line with the other assemblies (v. 16a). However, his tactics of persuasion are seldom appreciated today. Not surprisingly we hear complaints that “whenever, as in 1 Cor. 11: 1-16 or 1Cor. 14. 33b-40, appeals and arguments break down, he resorts to commands and claims the authority of Christ and that of the churches. His rhetoric does not aim at fostering independence, freedom, and consensus, but stresses dependence on his model, order and decency, as well as subordination and silence” (Fiorenza 2004, 159).¹⁵ We have to grant, along with Peter, that Paul’s writing style has made it difficult for all of us. But sometimes his critics are

¹⁴ These are more likely to be supernatural forces (Zodhiates 1997, 55-57; Theissen 1987, 171-172). The right to pray and prophesy within the gathering must be duly exercised by both genders (vv. 4-5); if the wife/woman is singled out in v. 13, it is because the new-found freedom in Christ and the Spirit (2 Cor.3: 17) is felt more keenly by her. Cf. the lavish display in Lk. 7: 36ff.

¹⁵Cf. also Theissen’s (1987, 167): “To us Paul’s reaction is a riddle. According to everything we know, women without head covering were no scandal in Corinth! Yet Paul argues against the practice.” But if the founder of the assembly is articulating “ways in which the saints. . .[are] to constitute a community of new a new society” (Horsley 2004, 230), we should not be surprised if some of his directives seem strange to our modern ears.

even more difficult to comprehend. Is it true that Paul's rhetoric fails to engender independence and freedom, or does it seek instead to remind that such privileges have parameters? Verses 7-13, then, demonstrate that the parameters of worship are not only cultural but have their roots in creation as well.

Because Paul is perhaps at his "difficult best" in vv 7-13, one Greek scholar is led to write: "The woman was not created as the image and glory of God from the beginning, as the man was" (Zodhiates 1997, 45)—this despite the clear poetic testimony of Gen. 1: 27. Paul, in verse 7, appears to be ignorant of this fact as well, but he was simply employing a Jewish way of being emphatic by negating one side of the coin. For example, if we only take the Lord's words, 'you have not chosen me, but I have chosen you' on the surface, then we virtually have no personal testimony. And what about Paul's cheeky rhetorical question in chapter 10: "does God care for oxen?" Of course He does! And, of course, He made Eve in His own likeness and image (Robertson and Plummer 1914, 231). Essentially, that is what it means to be human (Hoekema 1986). What the apostle seems to be doing in verse 7, therefore, is to underscore the (what we have called above) *pal* character of the husband.

But what does the apostle mean that the wife/woman is the glory of the husband/man? If we understand the phrase in the sense of the wife being the one of whom the husband is proud (Adam: 'my wife is my glory'; cf. 1 Thess. 2: 20),¹⁶ then the corresponding phrase below means that the woman's hair is something that brings her pride (her glory; Louw and Nida 1989, 311). Neither the wife's glory (v.15) nor the husband's (v. 13) should be the focal point of worship; and, equally important, God's glory, whether

¹⁶ Hear the pride of the first 'Iraqi' husband in his own words: "This is now bone of my bones . . ." It was shame (the same thing Paul warns against in 1 Cor. 11) that caused this husband to sing a different tune in chap. 3.

in a symbolic sense or not, must not be veiled (v. 7),¹⁷ since we are New Covenant people (cf. 2 Cor. 3: 13).

Christological Matters

One more thing. Neither the woman nor the man is called the ‘glory of God’ in the creation account. So why does Paul introduce that concept here, and why does he connect it only to one sex? Is this an example of his Jewish chauvinism? The answer lies, I think, in the writer’s intense Messianic consciousness. Every since he saw the glory of God in the face of Jesus, en route to Syria (Acts 9: 1-5; 2Cor.4: 3-6), his life has been, as the song says, “wrapped up, tied up, tangled up in Jesus”. So here we have a veiled Pauline reference to the ideal Man as the glory of God (cf. Heb. 2: 5-9; 2 Cor. 3:18). The other apostles knew before Paul that when God became a human being to display His glory, He became a male (“we beheld his glory”; John 1: 14b). Moreover, since He had to die, He had to become the ‘executable’ gender,¹⁸ that is, the accursed gender (Gal. 3: 13). But even in this matter, the woman plays a vital role in that at the right time (Gal. 4: 4-5), and in fulfillment of Scripture (Gen. 3:15), Mary had a little Lamb (John 1:29)—for “In the Lord, . . . woman is not independent of man, nor is man independent of woman. For as woman came from man, so also man is born of woman. But everything comes from God.”

Finally, some other . . .

¹⁷ Awkwardly expressed by Paul and more so by me; but it is not about him or me. It’s all about God’s glory; “The glory of God should not be veiled in the presence of God (that would be an acted contradiction in terms); by the same token the glory of man *should* be veiled in the presence of God’ (Bruce 1980, 107).

¹⁸ We often take it for granted that under the Romans, women were not crucified.

Cultural Matters

Under this heading we draw attention to another linguistic¹⁹ expression quite popular in Paul's day, and, like the pun, virtually non-existent in ours.²⁰ It is easy to remember that Paul had 'difficulty in writing reading.' What must not be forgotten is that his letters are full of verbal artistry (Botha 2001; Spencer 1984. See also the Appendix), as is shown by Lund's discovery of verses 8-12 (1970, 148; emphasis added; cf. Fee, 2014, 569):

A For man did not come
 from woman,
but woman from man;

 neither was man created

 B for woman,
but woman for man.

 C *For this reason, and because of the angels,
the woman ought to have a sign of authority on her head.*

 B' In the Lord, however, woman
is not independent of man,
nor is man independent of woman.

 For as woman came
A' from man,
so also man is born of woman. . . .

¹⁹ The number of literary devices employed by the biblical writers and their contemporaries is quite large; see, e.g., Ryken 1998.

²⁰ This device (chiasmus/chiasm) may be defined as "a series (a, b, c . . .) and its inversion (. . . c, b, a) taken together as a combined unit" (Watson 1986, 201); it was employed recently by bro. Glenn: "The structure of this book basically follows Hebraic structure, in that the first three chapters point forward towards the fourth chapter. Consequently, the remaining three . . . very much point back to the fourth . . . Therefore, the fourth . . . is central, both physically and thematically, to the entire book" (Thompson 2003, xv).

Lund explains:

In this passage we find an interesting play upon the terms “man” and “woman”. In A/B man is found in the extremes and woman in the centre of the two chiastic structures, while in B'/A' this order has been reversed. The division between the two kinds of structures is marked by C which contains the statement of what ought to be done . . . The whole structure is the central panel of the passage 11: 2-26.

If Lund’s analysis is correct, we have here yet another instance of the apostle’s literary strategy in the service of pastoral concern. The point of the embedded structure, then, is to lay stress on the C-section.²¹ this may be confirmed by the fact that immediately following verses 8-12 we have the rhetorical question of verse 13.

Does not the very nature of things teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a disgrace to him, but that if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For long hair is given to her as a covering. If anyone wants to be contentious about this, we have no other practice-- nor do the churches of God (vv 14-16)

²¹ “If the chiasmus is longer than four elements [as above], the center of the structure is emphasized and the corresponding parallels provide commentary on each other” (Lund 1970, xv). Cf. Mk 2: 27: (A) *the Sabbath* (B) was made for man (B') and not man (A') *for the Sabbath*; and Turner (2006, 111) on Matt. 7:6. Lund (xviii) also reports that “children in Roman times had to learn the alphabet forward, backwards and then both ways at once (alpha-omega, beta-psi, etc).” For a similar structure embracing only vv. 8-9, see Fee (2014, 569); he also sees another chiastic structure involving vv 7 and 10.

The passage ends with another item of cultural concern: one that was ‘hair yesterday; gone today.’²² If in the previous verses Paul is anxious to get believers understand the significance of ‘covering’ (or the lack of it) in worship, he is equally emphatic in his insistence that gender distinctions be maintained in verses 14-15.²³ Why so? Literature from Paul’s period demonstrates that the apostle was not alone in trying to counteract what may be considered an unwholesome trend. For example, a Jewish warning against pedophilia is expressed thus:

If a child is a boy, do not let locks grow on his head. Braid not his crown nor make cross-knots at the top of his head. Long hair is not fit for men, but for . . . women. Guard against the youthful beauty of a comely boy; because many rage for intercourse with a man (cited in Theissen 1987, 169).

Men with long hair and women with the opposite were also, according to Theissen (1987, 168), associated with transvestitism, something already condemned in the Hebrew Scriptures (Deut. 22:5).

In sum, any wo/man may pray or prophesy in church (Tee 2002; Palmer 2014), once s/he does so under the lordship of Christ (1 Cor. 14:37) and the leadership of the congregation. In this context, culture and convention used to play (and to a lesser extent still do) an important role, but the principles of the New Covenant are more crucial today.

²² In other words, hair length in our culture is not associated with the vices mentioned, else every Rasta would automatically become a ‘bald-head’.

²³ Similarly, one of Paul’s contemporaries writes: “Has she [i.e., nature] not by these means [hair appearance] distinguished between the male and the female? . . . Wherefore we ought to preserve the signs which God has given: we ought not to throw them away; we ought not . . . to confuse the sexes which have been distinguished in this fashion” (cited in Boring et al 1995, 426; cf. Chisholm 1985).

Finally, whatever principles are applied from the passage are best applied consistently. For example, if it is the policy of a church to allow sisters to prophesy and pray without some kind of ‘covering’, then brothers should not be censured for wearing caps or the like during worship. First Corinthians 11: 2-16 is about brothers *and* sisters. No discrimination should mar our attempt at proper application.

Works Cited

- Blomberg, C. L. 1994. *1 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Bradshaw, Robert I. 1997. Figures of Speech in the Bible.
http://biblicalstudies.org.uk/article_idioms.html.
- Botha, P J J. 2001. The Verbal Art of the Paul Letters. In, *Rhetoric and the NT*, ed. by Stanley Porter and T H Olbricht.
- Bruce, F.F. 1971. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. London: Oliphants.
- Boring, M E et al. eds. 1995. *Hellenistic Commentary to the NT*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Chisholm, Clinton. 1985. Windows on the Word: Interpreting 1 Cor. 11: 2-16 *Jamaica Baptist Reporter* (August): 4.
- Conzelmann, H. 1975. *1 Corinthians*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Dowding, Julie-Ann, 2016. *1 Corinthians 6:9-11: An Exegetical and Hermeneutical Investigation into the Biblical Position on Homosexuality and the Redemptive Role of the Church in the Jamaican Environment*. CGST thesis.
- Ellingworth, P.1994. *Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians*. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Fee, G.D. 2014². *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1987. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Fish, John. 1992. Women Speaking in Church. *Emmaus Journal*. 1: 214-251.

Fiorenza, E. S. 2004. Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians. In *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church*, ed. by E. Adams and D G Horrell.

Garland, David. 2003. *1 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Hoekema, A A. 1986. *Created in God's Image*. Carlisle: Paternoster.

Louw, Johannes and Eugene Nida, ed. 1989. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: UBS.

Lund, L W. 1970. *Chiasmus in the NT*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Mare, W.H., 1976. 1 Corinthians, in F.E. Gaebelein (ed.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Mount, C. 2005. 1 Corinthians 11:3-16: Spirit Possession and Authority in a Non-Pauline Interpolation. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 124 (2): 313–340.

Oster, R. E. 1988. When Men Wore Veils to Worship: The Historical Context of 1Corinthians 11:4. *New Testament Studies* 34:481-505.

Palmer, D V. 1992. *Spiritual Gifts*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI.

-----, 2014. *Prima Inter Partes: Prisca as Pastor and the People of God? Groundings: Catholic Theological Reflections on Issues Facing Caribbean People in the 21st Century* (July): 7-14.

Pearson, David. 2016. The Bible's Developing Teaching on women?
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B9JoFbbniRIbZktoQXJQTHZwb0U/view?pref=2&pli=1>

Robertson, Archibald, and Plummer, Alfred. 1914. *A Critical and Exegetical commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Ryken, L. ed. 1998. *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Spencer, Aida. 1984. *Paul's Literary Style*. Jackson, MI: ETS.

Tee, Tombaree. 2002. *Free to Speak?* Kingston: Pelican.

Thrall, M.E. 1965. *The First and Second Letters of Paul to the Corinthians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Theissen, G. 1982. *Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Thompson, Glenn. 2003. *The Roots of Deception*. Kingston: SRI.

Thiselton, A. 1978. Realized Eschatology at Corinth. *NTS* 24: 510-526.

----- . 2000. *First Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Turner, David L. 2006. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Carol: Stream, IL: Tyndale.

Watson, G E W. 1986. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*. Sheffield: SUP.

Witherington, Ben.1995. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: a Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans and Carlisle: Paternoster.

Zodhiates, S. *First Corinthians 11*. Chattanooga: AMG.

APPENDIX

The Concentric Structure of 1 Corinthians 11: 2-16
(Garland 2003, 511)

- A** Commendation for maintaining tradition handed on by Paul and the assertion of the basic principle that everyone has a head (vv. 2-3)
- B** Shame about coverings for men and women (vv. 4-5)
- C** Social impropriety for a woman to be uncovered; theological impropriety for a man to be covered (vv. 6-7)
- D** Theological explanation from the creation account (vv. 8-9)
- E** Central assertion: (vv. 11-12)
- D'** Theological caveat from procreation (vv. 11-12)
- C'** Social impropriety for a woman to be uncovered (v. 13)
- B'** Shame (and glory): lessons from nature (vv. 14-15)
- A'** Admonition to conform to Paul's customs and those of the churches (v.16)

Book Review:
Geared to Live.
 Kingston: CLI,
 2014

Donovan A. Thomas
 and
 Faith Thomas (editors)

by
 Sasha-Kay Campbell
 (MA)

Dr. Donovan A. Thomas is the Founder and current President of Choose Life International (CLI), which is a member of the International Association for Suicide Prevention (IASP). Previously he served as a former National Director of Jamaica Youth for Christ

and Regional Director for Youth for Christ International in the Caribbean. Dr. Thomas holds a Doctorate in Ministry from the United Theological College (Kingston, JA)/Columbia Theological Seminary (Atlanta, Georgia). He is also the author of the book, *Confronting Suicide: Helping Teens at Risk*, and he has been working with suicidal persons for over 25 years.

Mrs. Faith Thomas, the wife of Dr. Donovan Thomas, is a co-founder and current Vice President of CLI. She has served as the Senior Counselor at the Stony Hill Human Employment and Resource Training (HEART) Academy, and continues to conduct seminars locally and internationally. She has also served as an adjunct Lecturer at the Jamaica Theological Seminary (JTS), as well as she has lectured at the International University of the Caribbean (IUC), the Mico University College and the Shortwood Teacher's College. She holds a M.A. in Counselling Psychology (Hons) from the Caribbean Graduate School of Theology.

The first article is written by Mrs. Thomas, who attempted to demonstrate how an individual can get over past hurts and pains and acquire happiness. She highlights the various challenges that a hurting individual needs to overcome in order to get past their past. Hurting individuals, she points out, need to get by the phases of entrapment as a result of emotional or physical pain, and unhealthy and negative responses before they can choose happiness. She highlighted several maladaptive ways of coping and the dangers they pose to an individual, and further challenged her readers to forgive and heal in order to overcome.

Surprisingly, in her attempt to demonstrate that unresolved anger can cause deep emotional distress and harm to oneself and others, she appears to misinterpret Paul's admonition in Ephesians 4:26;

“Be ye angry, and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath.”¹ She may have mistaken ‘anger’ here to mean the carnal emotion that one entertains when one is offended. Based on her understanding, she explains that “This means that if anger arises and is left unchecked, if a day passes and the hurt is not resolved, it begins to fester and develop and thus begins the downward slide into resentment....” Maybe Paul was not referring to natural emotion here, but to a permissible anger which arises in resentment to unrighteousness.

Is this ‘anger’ the same fleshy emotion that Mrs. Thomas was addressing, an unrighteous, destructive feeling of annoyance, displeasure or hostility towards someone or situation? Verse 26 however, may be referring to righteous anger, “the emotion of indignation directed against injustice, betrayal or other evil.”²

Evidently, Paul’s use of the term ‘anger’ in both instances was referring to two distinct emotions, the former being justifiable and the other detestable. In fact, the chapter as a whole speaks to the work of regeneration in the believer. Hence, Paul instructs the church to put away the mindset and dispositions of the ‘old self’ and to allow the Holy Spirit to complete his renewing work in them.

In addition, her claim that “the popular prevailing view of God as a judge with thunderbolts of fire . . . is made predominant, rather than the love of God,” does not necessarily hold true. If it were so then unrighteousness (probably) would not be so prevalent in the contemporary Church, not to mention the antagonistic issues that are prevailing in our society. It is rather the opposite of what she proclaims, because hardly is the wrath of God heralded from the pulpits anymore. From the look of things, with all that is going on in society today, there is no evidence of a predominant view of God as a Judge with thunderbolts as Thomas proposes.

The use of Jeremiah 1:5 and 29:11 are somewhat more understandable as it concerns her argument for the right perspective of self and God. Notably, 1:5 was a direct pronouncement from God to Jeremiah concerning him. Likewise 29:11 was meant for the remnant of Israel that were in exile, not humanity. However, on the basis that the Old Testament is our

¹ Faith Thomas, “Get Past Your Past,” in *Geared to Live: Twelve Keys to Happiness*, 9.

²James R. Beck and Bruce A. Demarest. *The Human Person in Theology and Psychology: A Biblical Anthropology for the Twenty-first Century*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 2005), 227.

schoolmaster, as Paul informs us in Galatians 3:24, her point can be substantiated as this is the heart of God toward people. Scriptures such John 3:16 and other such which are directed toward a more general audience are more suited for her argument.

Her use of Romans 12:19 also seemingly contradicted her previous claim that we should emphasize God's love and forgiveness rather than his wrath.³ Here it would have been more effective to compel readers toward the compassion of God, and the forgiveness and mercy that they themselves have received from God. She chose however, contrary to the point she previously made, to emphasize the judgment of God. Essentially, her use of other Scriptures appeared to be appropriately employed, and her message clear and concise.

Beverly Stewart, an outstanding entrepreneur and philanthropist, Founder and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Jamaica Soul Vacations (JSV) follows with her article, "Establish and Re-establish Your Purpose." She skillfully encourages her readers to identify and execute their purpose by a proposed step-by-step approach. "Begin," she declares, by prayerfully inquiring of the Lord and by examining self in order to pursue "that which you were created to do." Scriptural references are rare, the only one being Habakkuk 2:2; she instructs readers to record their purpose as a simple vision statement. Of course, in the text God was instructing the prophet, Habakkuk to record the vision he had received as it was of great documentary significance. In the same manner, Stewart instructs her readers to record this important statement of purpose as a guide to fulfilling their purpose.

Correspondingly, Ms. Frances Yeo, the Vice Chair, Board of Directors of CLI, continues in the same vein with her article, "Align Yourself with Positive People." She accurately uses 1 Corinthians 15:33 to assure her readers that negative influences are indeed corrupting. Paul's admonition to the Corinthians here was that they not fall prey to the deception of false teachers, as evil communication corrupts.

Similarly, she uses Philippians 4:8 to demonstrate Scriptural recommendations for positive mental habits. Yeo suggests that in order to align ourselves with positive influences we have to "consistently choose to exercise the positive traits."⁴ Change inevitably has to begin with the 'man in the mirror,' as the late

³Ibid., 21.

⁴Frances A. Yeo, "Align Yourself with Positive People" in *Geared to Live: Twelve Keys to Happiness*, 57.

Michael Jackson heralded. Thus Yeo puts forward the recommendation that we think as Paul instructed the believers of Philippi to think. As she notes, there are numerous benefits of thinking positively that will eventually bring us closer to achieving a state of happiness. Not only will we experience a tremendous internal change but other positive individuals may gradually be drawn to us, as we shape a positive lifestyle.

Likewise, the fourth chapter entitled “Reject Negativism,” written by Dr. Raphael J. Thomas, echoes a similar message to that of Yeo’s, as the title implies. He asserted that negative self-talk is that common factor that fuels and accompanies unhappiness.⁵ With an impeccable amalgamation of Scripture and Behaviour Modification theories, he demonstrated to his readers how they can eliminate negative habits and thought patterns and rehabilitate themselves with positivity. One must radically reject negativism and actively engage in positive self-talk and reflection, he proclaims.

Incidentally, his use of 1 Corinthians 11:28 could be more suitably replaced with 2 Corinthians 13:5, as the latter has a more general application than the former. 1 Corinthians 11:28 is more suited to the occasion of the ‘breaking of bread’ or holy communion; whereas Paul warns that one should not engage in unworthily. Generally, self examination is vital to attaining and living a happy, purpose-driven life, not only for the avid Christian but to everyone. Miller postulates that it through such self-criticism that one begins to see her/himself as the Creator sees her/him, as he/she embarks on a journey to self actualization.⁶

Dr. David West, a professional Pharmacist, in his chapter “Express Gratitude” emphasized the need for us to develop a genuine attitude of thankfulness. His use of 1 Peter 2:12-13 is questionable, as the text does not seem to give the same impression that West expresses. Another reading of the text may demonstrate that Peter was not insinuating that we should not be “surprised by the testing”⁷ as West suggests, but that he was encouraging the believers to maintain a righteous life in a hostile world. He was not

⁵ Raphael J. Thomas, “Reject Negativism” in *Geared to Live: Twelve Keys to Happiness*, 66.

⁶ Paul Miller, “Spirituality, Integrity and Competence: Essentials of Ministry in Richard Baxter’s Reformed Pastor,” *The Evangelical Quarterly*, 69:4 (1997), 333-342, http://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/eq/1997-4_333.pdf (accessed August 3, 2015).

⁷ David West, “Express Gratitude” in *Geared to Live: Twelve Keys to Happiness*, 107.

so much issuing a warning, as he is encouraging the people to endure so that God will receive glory from their lives.

Significantly, Veronica Thomas Burt-Miller, a Registered Nurse provides the readers with some practical strategies that will help identify their strengths and gifts. There were two Scriptural references, which were quite appropriate as she used them to highlight the diversity of gifts that the Holy Spirit endows believers with. Likewise, The Psychiatrist, Dr. E. Anthony Allen, emphasized the need for and benefits of counselling. He particularly provides an illuminating description of the counselling process, which should certainly help to alleviate fears concerning counselling. His reference to Job 5:7 was well suited, as trouble is an inevitable part of man's fate.

Chapter eight, "Open Your Life to Spiritual Intervention" by Dr. Donald K. Stewart brought us right back to reality, as he put forward the necessity for spiritual intervention. His use of Scripture exemplified that of an expert hermeneut. He proficiently uses James 2:26 and Proverbs 20:27 to highlight the necessity for the spiritual health of the soul (spirit of man). Despite the fact that many deny the existence of the supernatural, Stewart argues that it is futile for one to pursue physical and psychological health, while the essence of their being, the soul perishes. This is what many fail to recognize, but thanks to Stewart here it is written and made plain for all his readers to understand and take heed. Only a life fully surrendered to God will experience the freedom and power to overcome one's troubles or pain.

Mrs. Jennifer Willie, a Professional Counselor, in her chapter, "Live With Less Worry" outlined the limitations of worry and provided some practical solutions to reducing worry. She specifically highlighted Matthew 6:25-34, one of the primary 'worry' Scriptures in the New Testament. Worry changes nothing, hence it is more suited to trust in the One who knows all and is Lord over all things. Additionally, Ms. Peta -Gaye Bookall, UNV Child Protection Officer with her article, "Involve Yourself In Service to Others" brings out another essential key to achieving happiness.

Essentially, humans are not solitary beings, as Yeo pointed out.⁸ Thus interacting and relating with others is a huge part of our happiness. Happiness is not attainable by living selfish and self-centred lives. Each of us should have some sense of community, as we cannot merely live for ourselves but live to serve others in love.

⁸Yeo, in *Geared to Live*, 47.

This will not only give us sense of fulfilment, but of receiving in similar manner the service of others. With the use of Romans 6:13, Acts 20:24 and Mark 8: 35, Bookall points her readers toward the underlying purpose of life. We were created by him and for him (Colossians 1:16), and likewise we exist for each other.

Finally, Mrs. Gay Ward-Foster on the topic “Value Yourself Highly” challenged her readers to do just that, value themselves highly. She illustrates the hindrances to having the right perspective of value and self. One cannot question her use of Scripture, because each was skillfully employed to emphasize her points. She also echoes some of the previous authors, as she highlights the relevance of positive thinking and influences to one’s happiness. More importantly, she emphasized that value is not found in appearance, external circumstances or life circumstances, but in the heart.⁹ Seeing ourselves as the Father sees us, is certainly a significant key to our own happiness.

In essence, *Geared to Live* does as the title suggests. It is truly designed to gear the reader to live a fulfilled life. The manner in which each chapter was structured, highlighting the major hindrances to happiness and providing clear and concise solutions, certainly makes this book worth having. It is not your regular self help book; it is an anthology that practically and spiritually prepares its readers to confront and deal with the struggles, hurt and pains of this life. One major positive about this book is the simplicity and succinct presentations in each chapter. It can easily be read by the expert academic, or professional, as well as a typical high school student.

⁹ Gay Ward-Foster, “Value Yourself Highly” in *Geared to Live: Twelve Keys to Happiness*, 231.

Book Review:

*Encounter with the New
Testament: An Interdisciplinary
Approach*

Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009

by

Russell Pregeant

Reviewer:

Abson Joseph (PhD), formerly,
Caribbean Wesleyan College
Westmoreland, Jamaica

This present volume¹ is an abridgement and updating of a previous work published by Pregeant in 1995. Pregeant establishes that one of the aims of the book is that it will be used in an academic setting, where one's study of the New Testament does not presuppose a particular

religious commitment (1). He offers a brief discussion of the origin and contents of the New Testament and of matters of translations, manuscripts, and textual criticism (2–6). This is followed by an overview of some ways of reading the Bible. In chapter 1, Pregeant explains the nature, strengths, and limitations of historical, theological and ideological, psychological, and literary approaches to the study of the New Testament and informs the reader that his own approach rests on the use of two methods: historical criticism and a moderate version of reader-response analysis (18). From this point on, the book is divided into four main parts: (1) "Before the New Testament"; (2) "The Gospels and Acts"; (3) "The Pauline Corpus"; and (4) "The General Letters and Revelation." In part 1, chapters 2–4, Pregeant offers a treatment of "the historical contexts within which Jesus lived, the early tradition was transmitted, and the writings finally emerged" (24).

"Christian Beginnings in Context" is the subject matter of chapter 2. Pregeant discusses some features of Hebrew monotheism and of Greek philosophy. He offers an overview of the story of ancient Israel; the rise of Hellenistic religion, philosophy, and culture; Israel's encounter with Hellenism; and the impact the latter made on postexilic Judaism (25–44). He also discusses the Roman imperial period during which Christianity emerged and shows how the Roman occupation of Palestine, the continuation of Jewish tradition, and Rome's adoption of many aspects of Hellenistic culture affected the emergence of Christianity (45–53). In chapter 3, "The Gospel, Jesus, and the Earliest Tradition," Pregeant

¹ This review was published by Review of Biblical Literature (*SBL* 5/ 2010).
Used by permission.

addresses the relationship between the Gospels vis-à-vis the historical person of Jesus. He proposes that, to learn something about the actual person Jesus from the Gospels, one has to “distinguish between expressions of faith and the historical realities that lie behind those expressions” (58). For Pregeant, finding the “historical Jesus” is tantamount to recovering the earliest level of the Jesus tradition (60–61). To this effect, he discusses some criteria for identifying teaching in the Gospels that comes from the “historical Jesus” (61–82).

Chapter 4 focuses on “The Resurrection Faith and the Expanded Tradition.” Pregeant examines three types of resurrection accounts; discusses the origin, meaning, and expression of the resurrection faith; and offers a treatment on the process through which Jesus’ death came to be viewed as an atoning/redemptive event. He discusses the expansion process of the Jesus tradition and how this brought about the formation of orthodox Christology (85–96).

Pregeant concludes part 1 with a discussion of the “Sociology of the Jesus Movement” and a discussion of the relationship between “Christianity and the Social Order” (98–100). In parts 2–4, Pregeant approaches the canonical books as whole, integrated, literary works. Part 2 comprises chapters 5–8 and focuses on the Gospels and Acts. Pregeant devotes one chapter to each Gospel and treats Luke - Acts as a single two - volume work. He explains the difference between “narrative criticism” and “reader -response” criticism and locates his approach to reading the four Gospel narratives and Acts within the latter.

For each Gospel, Pregeant offers a brief treatment of authorship, date, and place of composition; points to look for in the narrative; and an example of reader - response at work in the way he approaches the text. In addition, he demonstrates how other approaches have been and can be applied to treat issues that arise from study of the Gospels and Acts. For example, in chapter 5 he discusses Mark and liberation, as well as free will, determinism, and the power of God (124–26).

Chapter 6 contains discussions of some aspects of a feminist reading of Matthew and of issues that arise from a postcolonial reading of the Gospel of Matthew (142–44). Chapter 7 addresses theological issues such as the significance of Jesus’ death and resurrection and the rule of God and the hope of Israel, as well as how a deconstructionist reading of theme of poverty and riches functions in Luke -Acts (166–71). In chapter 8, Pregeant demonstrates an application of Bultmann’s existential

interpretation and of Jungian psychology to the Gospel of the John and offers a brief treatment on the Johannine Logos and ecological theology (186–90).

He concludes part 2 by discussing some issues that relate to the canon of the New Testament Part 3, chapters 9–13, is concerned with the Pauline corpus. First, Pregeant discusses some of the methodological issues, such as the relationship between the Paul's letters, the book of Acts, and the "historical" Paul; the authenticity of the letters; and chronologies of Paul's life. Then he uses a modified reader-response method in approaching the "authentic" letters and applies additional modifications in his treatment of the "disputed" letters. For each undisputed letter, chapters 9–11, Pregeant seeks to reconstruct the story behind it, offers points to look for, and provides notes on a reading of the letter from a reader-response perspective.

Chapter 12 deals with "Perspectives on Paul," where Paul's theology takes center stage. Chapter 13 deals with the "disputed" letters. There Pregeant follows a similar methodology, but he refrains from reconstructing the story behind the "disputed" letters because of the doubts around Pauline authorship (269). He concludes this section by showing how conflicting interpretations of Paul's writings have existed from early on. In part 4, chapters 14–15, Pregeant offers a very brief treatment on five writings that he considers to be on the margins of the canon because they appeared on one or more canonical lists: 1 Clement, Didache, Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas. In chapter 14 he treats Hebrews, James, 1–2 Peter, Jude, and 1–3 John using a similar methodology he applies for the "authentic" letters. Chapter 15 presents a similar but more extended treatment of the Revelation to John. He concludes the section by discussing the necessity of hermeneutics.

This is indeed an excellent introductory manual for the study of the New Testament. Pregeant presents a wide range of concepts in a clear and methodical fashion. He finds great balance in discussing different approaches to New Testament study, deals fairly with diverging opinions, and always clarifies his own position on an issue. The study questions at the end of each chapter offer an opportunity for review and further research of the concepts discussed and constitute a valuable tool for students and teachers. Pregeant's demonstration of the application and interaction of historical criticism and reader-response criticism to the New Testament is very helpful. A matter for discussion concerns the

aim of the book vis-à-vis Pregeant's moderate reader-response approach.

Pregeant intends this book to be used primarily in settings in which a student is able to encounter the New Testament with the freedom to decide what to make of the text and keep religious commitment secondary (1–2). If moderate reader-response criticism places some limits on what a New Testament text can mean as the “text gives directions to the reader” (16), how should one reconcile the guidance the text provides with the “connections” that individuals will and/or should make between the New Testament writings and their lives?

To what extent is it possible to encounter the New Testament and not be transformed by it? Elsewhere, Pregeant proposes that a genuine encounter with the New Testament cannot occur “without all owing it to engage us in a struggle for meaning and truth” (19). His stance is therefore potentially confusing. Further, by restricting the use primarily to an “academic” setting, the author potentially and unnecessarily limits the readership of a helpful introductory manual to the study of the New Testament. Perhaps the author could have done more to explain what he means by “academic.” These comments notwithstanding, Pregeant's *Encounter with the New Testament* is a valuable contribution to New Testament scholarship and will be a useful tool to students of the New Testament.

VALEDICTORIAN 2015

Anne Boodho
(BA)
Southeastern
Caribbean College
St Lucia

Indeed a great honour and privilege have been bestowed upon me this day to be addressing you as the valedictorian for the Southeastern Caribbean College (SCC) class of 2015.

Phillipians 3:10 says, “That I may know Him and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his suffering being made conformable even unto death.” This has been my life’s verse. The motto of the Jamaica Theological Seminary (JTS), is “That I might know Him.... That I might make Him known.” When I read this, it confirmed that this was where God wanted me to be. In addition, I had always maintained that for me to pursue a higher level of education, I did not want to leave my family; nor my job and I wanted the classroom experience. JTS afforded me that opportunity. Our journey officially began right here in this very building, four years ago.

For many of us it was a shaky start – not being confident of our ability to operate at this level and be successful. Some had not set foot in a classroom for as many as 20, even 30 years. Imagine that! There were major adjustments to be made in very little to no time. Our brains had to be retrained to focus, complete assignments in a set time with the specific formats – print, margins, font, spacing, running head. Initially, this took as much time as completing the paper itself. The experience was similar to being in a Greek class. And as the famous saying in theology class goes, “Greek is grief.” However, by the end of our stint, we had mastered the art.

At the commencement of the programme, there was much uncertainty and self-doubt. Can I really do this? Do I have what it takes? These questions flooded my mind. I recall my first assignment for Introduction to Psychology: I was lost, and totally clueless. I solicited advice from a friend. She said to me that she had every confidence that I was able to turn in an excellent paper. My thinking was: really? I thought about it and decided on THE ONLY course of action. Pray. My prayer went something like this: “Lord, you know all the words that the universe contains, You created all languages. I pray that you would bring to mind all the words necessary to write this paper. Then I began and like they say... the rest is history. By the end of the programme, I was confident enough to complete all assigned tasks.

My aim for doing the Guidance and Counselling programme was to have a greater understanding of self and others. This would empower me to be more effective as an educator, especially in interaction with students and parents. Half-way through the programme, I felt and conveyed to my lecturers that I had met my objective. This was evident to me in the transformation I had witnessed in my personal life. For example, I was more self-aware. I was able to use self-management skills to control my emotions, be more empathetic and demonstrate a deeper appreciation for others.

Have you ever witnessed an acrobat balancing on the tight rope? Just one false step and the act would be over. Many of us had to perform such a feat- balancing work, family, home, church and school. Much had to be sacrificed, especially our beloved sleep, and ‘siestas.’ There were many nights of burning the midnight oil and the famous *jour overt* in an effort to complete and submit work on time.

We also had some fun moments. In our Abnormal Psychology class, Mrs. James used role play to portray a bipolar patient. She slipped into those roles with such ease that we wondered, “Is she okay?” She is an excellent actress. Another moment was Mrs. James again trying to learn our creole. She used the creole word *majee*. There we were wondering, “What is she trying to say? *Maajee*? (She however, has been determined to learn and has improved immensely.)

Then there were the theologians, standing around after the Greek exam. They were in animated discussion like students do after exams. I asked, “How was it?” The responses were: “Fifty- fifty”, “that was hard”, “don’t think I passed”; then Pastor D looks up and says, “It was Greek!”

Our celebration of Creole day *cette un joli bon tan. Sate bon. The pain mie* and Pastor D’s cocoa tea and the other local delicacies were appetizing. There was a challenge to only speak creole for the night. It was most hilarious. We had fun.

On Wednesday evenings we looked forward to chapel. Oh what a time of worship. Lecturers and students would all gather in one location and spend time at the feet of Jesus prior to the commencement of class. It was a sweet smelling savour. There was also prayer to begin our individual classes, before exams, especially before presentations, and in other special situations.

Students were able to share challenges and find comfort, support and encouragement being lifted up in prayer. And prayers were answered! This brought much comfort and reassurance. We were constantly reminded that God was our source of strength.

SCC provided a high degree of academic excellence. Our lecturers were qualified and fully trained- masters in their respective fields.

Under their guidance, we have acquired a wealth of knowledge and much insight into our various disciplines. In Introduction to Psychology, we studied theorists such as Freud, and Skinner; branches of psychology such as Gestalt – the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. In Conflict Transformation, Max Lucado’s quote, “Conflict is inevitable, Combat is optional” was a real eye opener. Conflict cannot be avoided; however, we can choose the manner in which we respond to it. We will continue to discuss, to agree to disagree, the widely controversial topic of Euthanasia.

We focus now on the rewards. Today we are here to celebrate our accomplishments, to rejoice, to be jubilant and savour our successes. Graduation or Commencement exercise as it is also known as, is usually a bitter-sweet moment. For while we may have ended a chapter in our lives, a new one will emerge. This change usually comes with a certain level of uncertainty, and anxiety. In addition, we leave behind (in a sense), the close relationships that have bloomed.

Throughout this season in our lives we have been blessed with support from many, including friends, family, and brethren. I would like to take a few minutes to thank the people who have supported us throughout this journey.

Thanks to our spouses, children, parents and other family members who supported in ways we cannot articulate; lecturers who were not only concerned about academia but also in us as individuals; friends, who encouraged and gave guidance; church family who prayed, encouraged and, gave financial support; colleagues, who encouraged; employers, supervisors, who granted time off from work and left their homes at odd hours to assist us. And there were the practical things - the tea in the midnight hour, the rides to and from campus, editing, typing, participating in our assignments, being there to share ideas; and the other innumerable ways in which

you demonstrated your love, concern, understanding--we say a heartfelt, most profound thank you.

I would like to commend you my fellow graduates. Your discipline, commitment, dedication, perseverance and drive for excellence are exemplary. Many of us faced moments of grief and loss. Like Jesus at Lazarus' grave, we wept and allowed ourselves to go through the process yet we were resilient. Here, ladies and gentlemen, are a group of men and women who came to learn! Simply put.

Above all, high above all and most importantly, we give thanks to the Almighty, Jehovah God, the Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, Our soon coming King, The great I Am, the One Who was and is and is to come, to You Most High God, we give the thanks. Without God who provided all these individuals, the school, and other resources, including but not limited to, our own ability to think, recall, comprehend, apply, analyze, synthesize and make judgements; we would not be where we are today.

Let us now consider the situation in our country. Our nation is plagued with all types of social ills – abuse in all forms is on the rise, crime, violence, indifference, immorality--just to name a few. In the global village, the cries are similar. The lessons learnt at SCC have equipped us with the skills to learn, aptitude to succeed, abilities and creativity to make a difference, to work to meet the needs and assist in solving the problems that our society is currently facing. We are the agents of change. God has given us the ministry of reconciliation. However, we must remember to remain connected to our Source.

Therefore, I encourage you, my fellow graduates: Go forth and bear much fruit. Be the catalysts of change. Utilize the knowledge and skills gained to extend the kingdom of God wherever you have been or will be planted. Remain connected.