

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 *Scripture* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_scripture-01.php

(I Cor. ch. xii-xiv). In all these cases (those of the Gentiles with Cornelius, at Ephesus and at Corinth) it may well be supposed that the fact was connected with their work of co-operation in the spread of the Gospel, for the first Gentile converts had a great work to do, and both Ephesus and Corinth were polyglot seaports.

Why, then, are only the Apostles mentioned in ii, 14? Because they, and Peter above all, were the natural spokesmen, and we may suppose that they had come out from the house to talk to the crowd which had assembled.

(To be concluded)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Do not the texts which speak of Christ as Priest and King suggest that He was made Priest only after His Resurrection? Cf. Ps. cix, 4; Gen. xiv, 18; Zach. vi, 13; Heb. viii, 4. Is not this further implied by Heb. vii, 15?

That Christ was priest after His Resurrection and continues to be such in heaven is of course true. "He, because he remaineth forever, hath an unchangeable priesthood" (Heb. vii, 24). St. Paul stresses this as one point of difference between Christ and the Levitical priests who, after death, are replaced by their successors. Thus the glorified Christ in heaven is both reigning King and Priest. But these texts by no means oblige us to conclude that only after His Resurrection did He assume His priesthood. On the contrary, it is certain that He was Priest before He rose from the dead. The supreme priestly act of Christ was the sacrifice of Calvary, for St. Paul says that, unlike the Levitical priests who have to offer sacrifice daily, first for their own sins and then for the sins of the people, Christ once and for all atoned for the sins of the people when He offered Himself. Such, he says, was the high-priest fitted for our needs (Heb. vii, 26—28).

When St. Paul says "If he (Christ) were on earth, he would not be a priest," he is not contradicting the above view, for he means that Christ could not legally serve in the *Temple* since only the descendants of Aaron could perform that ministry. Christ, of course, was of Judah. But Christ could exercise the priesthood of the New Covenant outside the Temple, and continues to exercise it in heaven.

The text of Zach. vi, 13, may refer to Christ in the typical sense, asserting that He reigns and is Priest. It does not say that He was not a priest before He reigned in heaven; nor on the other hand does the reference to reigning necessarily refer only to the life of Christ in heaven. Did not Christ tell Pilate that He was a king? And if it be answered that Christ also said His kingdom was not of this world, we may say that by this He

referred to the spiritual character of the kingdom. "The kingdom of God is within you" He said on another occasion. His kingdom certainly began on earth, and is still on earth, though also in heaven.

Heb. vii, 15: "there ariseth another priest" has no reference whatever to Christ's Resurrection. It simply means that another priest comes. Just as in the Old Testament they constantly spoke of a prophet arising, in the sense of coming into being or coming to public notice. This is also the meaning in Heb. vii, 11. In both texts the Westminster Version translates the Greek ἀνίστασθαι by "to be set up."

Melchisedech, in Gen. xiv, 18 ff, priest of the most high God and king of Salem, offering bread and wine, typifies Christ's everlasting sacrifice under the appearances of bread and wine, the Sacrifice of the Mass, which is one with that of Calvary. This has been the constant interpretation of the Church, solemnly endorsed by the Council of Trent. St. Paul does not dwell on this because it was not necessary to his argument, namely that the Levitical priesthood has ceased through the everlasting priesthood of Christ.

Finally, let it be said, Catholic theology teaches that Jesus Christ was made priest at the moment of His Incarnation.

J. P. ARENDZEN.

How did the application of Ezech. i, 10 to the Evangelists originate? Is there any reliable explanation of the fitness of the symbols to the work of each Evangelist?

St. Irenaeus (Adv. Haereses III ii, 8) was the first to apply the symbolism of the four living creatures in the heavenly visions of Ezechiel (i, 10) and St. John (Apoc. iv, 3) to the four Evangelists. He follows the order of St. John (lion; calf; man; eagle), not that of Ezechiel (man; lion; ox; eagle), but the symbols of this feature of St. John's vision derive ultimately from the vision of the prophet. In both visions the four living creatures probably represent the cherubim, angels closely associated with God in the government of the material world, or the ceaseless activities of Creation in attendance upon its Creator. The symbolism of numbers played a great part in apocalyptic literature, and four has a cosmic or worldwide significance. St. Irenaeus (I, C.) accumulates arguments to show that there can only be four Gospels, neither more nor less; just as there are four cardinal points, four winds, etc., and in this connection he interprets the four living creatures of the four Gospels. The lion, symbol of "effectual working, leadership, and royal power," represents St. John's Gospel which relates Christ's "original, effectual, and glorious generation from the Father" (John i, 1). The calf symbolizes St. Luke's Gospel which, beginning with Zachary the priest offering sacrifice, takes up Christ's priestly character. The man represents