

ENDEAVOUR

magazine

THE ENDEAVOUR MAGAZINE.
IN THIS ISSUE.

No.49	Spring 1976.
Editorial.	Page 1
Titles of Jesus - The Messiah.	3
Gospel of John IV.	8
Book Review.	14
Letters to the Editor.	16
A Balanced Regular Diet?	21

PARTICIPATION.

An "in" thing today is participation - workers' participation in management; student participation in the councils of Universities, are but two examples. Gone is the autocratic Servant-Master concept that has reigned for millenia. Although many may feel that the new situation is less efficient in industry few would argue against the moral rightness of this democratic system. Every man has a right to contribute to the project in which he or she is involved not in the role as a cipher but as a human being with a viewpoint.

How should these changes affect our religious life and practice? Do we expect complete democracy in this sphere? A little thought will suggest that we should not try to separate the religious and the secular. If religion is not about life then it has no relevance. Christ's teaching was not only about life but was life in its essence. We have made the dichotomy to our cost. Nevertheless, we realise that our lives are indeed divided into various compartments. But we feel that our so-called religious life should invade our working life and likewise our experience at work should throw up problems of living.

Many find that a good way of helping each other is by organising a discussion group to consider matters that are important to life. This can be an effective form of participation. It assumes that all or most will have something to contribute and all are ready and able to listen. Such discussion groups can choose subjects varying over the full gamut of life. From the discussion of a theological topic to the way one relates to people at work or the problem of over population or under-nourishment that exists in many parts of the world.

The importance of participation is that all are involved and sharing and hopefully growing closer by the experience. But if the aim is, as it must be, for achieving greater spiritual depths, then the input to the group must be of a high positive value. This means that each member should endeavour to contribute. It may be from his or her experience in life or reading or studying the lives of others or from study leading to a better understanding of the life of Christ and his teaching. Or, indeed, from the study of the lives of other great teachers. The Greek philosophers, Buddhists and Hindus may have much to cause us to think. As Christians we see Christ's work and teaching as pre-eminent, but this does not mean that there is not much of great value in other religions. Again, some knowledge of other religions will certainly help us to a better understanding of those who belong to these groups.

Finally, it is well to remember the apostle's admonition that everything should be done decently and in order. It is therefore preferable when having a discussion to have a pre-arranged subject, so that everyone may be prepared and also an appointed person to introduce the topic. This latter ensures that at least one person will have done some thinking!

J.H.W.

TITLES OF JESUS - THE MESSIAH.

by J. H. Weaving.

The name of Jesus Christ is so familiar to us that we tend to forget that it contains a title. It is the anglicized Greek form of the Hebrew, Joshua Messiah. The term 'Messiah' is deeply rooted in the Old Testament meaning simply 'The Anointed One'. The kings of Judah were God's anointed ones. Samuel anointed Saul then David. Nathan spoke of the establishment of a dynasty of David (2 Sam. 7:12). Later Zadok the priest anointed Solomon (Kings 1:39). Even Cyrus is described as the anointed of the Lord (Is. 45:1).

While Judah and Israel had kings, some good but mostly bad, God sent his prophets to show the people the right way through their oracles. But we notice that from the eighth century B.C. onwards the burden of these prophets of Yahweh was intensified. They began to pronounce a drastic national judgment - a time of 'Woe' was coming upon King and people. This subsequently resulted in the captivity first of Israel then of Judah. In the words of Micah:-

'Therefore shall Zion for yoursakes be
ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall
become heaps, and the mountain of the
house as a high place of the forest'.
(Mic. 3:12).

But at the same time that they pronounced 'woe' they announced a Messianic Kingdom to follow. This announcement was made by most of the prophets but usually in somewhat ambiguous terms.

Ezekiel prophecies the regathering of Judah and Israel from the gentiles when the two kingdoms would be united with one King over them (Ez. 37:22).

Micah and Isaiah see the Kingdom as established in the top of the mountains for many nations probably intending all nations (Is. 2:1-6 Micah 4:1-5) and a time of peace when men will 'beat their swords into ploughshares'.

Again, most of the prophets foresee a mighty conflict - 'Armageddon' - preceding the Messianic Kingdom.

'Multitudes, Multitudes, in the valley of decision!
for the day of the Lord is near in the valley
of decision..... and the Lord shall roar from
Zion.... and the heavens and earth shall shake:
but the Lord will be a refuge for his people'
(Joel 3:14-16).

The Messianic king is referred to in Psalm 2 as God's son and in Psalm 110 as 'sitting on God's right hand'.

The next phase in the O.T. concept of a future Messiah is that of apocalyptic in which a clear cut escatological hope is manifested. Until this time the Messiah is an earthly figure though, indeed, abundantly endowed as we have seen. But in the apocalyptic utterances, the Messiah becomes a heavenly person.

'I saw in the night visions, and, behold there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man and he came even to the ancient of days and they brought him near before him, there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom.....' (Daniel 7:13-14).

The Dead Sea Scrolls of Qumran, the Essene community, are of considerable interest as they give a view of Israel just prior to the advent of Christ. However, we must be careful because the Essenes were a sect and therefore the view we get is not necessarily true for the Jews as a whole at that time.

The Essenes regarded themselves as a remnant community elected by God, separated from the world and destined for salvation. They saw themselves as about to meet an escatological struggle against the rest of mankind, who they regarded as the powers of darkness.

The Qumran text is based on Zechariah who places by the side of the messianic king a messianic high priest. (Zech 6). To quote Hahn (1):-

"The most characteristic and certainly for the Qumran fellowship the most decisive text is I Q Sa, II, 12-21. Here the eschatological feast of the redeemed Israel is described. Pride of place is given to Aaron the Messiah; around him the priests are permitted to group themselves; then follows the Messiah of Israel, together with the heads of tribes, the heads of families, and the elders". 4

A modified view again about the time of Jesus is seen in the Book of Enoch - discussed in a previous issue of Endeavour (41). Here the Messiah is identified with the pre-existent Son of Man.

Against this background we have to ask some very significant questions. Firstly, "What did Jesus conceive as his role in relationship to those concepts?" And secondly, "When did the early church decide to call Jesus by the title Christ - the Messiah - or in modern terms, King Joshua?" There is no doubt that all the four evangelists conceived of Jesus as the Messiah, indeed the Son of God, but can we be sure that Jesus claimed to be Messiah? We know that he would not be influenced by the messianic concepts of others but, nevertheless, it was his primary purpose to perform the role God had planned for him. For this role he may indeed have looked in the O.T. scriptures, but over and above this we believe that his time spent in contemplation and in silent prayer to God would have been his greatest source of inspiration. As another example, Jesus did not accept the commonly held view of his day concerning the Kingdom of God.

Does he give us any indication of the direction of his thoughts in relationship to Messiahship?

The question to his disciples at Caesarea Philippi is perhaps the most important clue. Unfortunately, the three synoptic accounts differ but Mark seems to give us the nearest to the original words in that it is less elaborate and more to the point:-

"Who do men say I am?" - "Some say John the Baptist, others Elijah, others one of the prophets."

"And you" he asked, "Who do you say I am?"
Peter replied, "You are the Messiah."
(Mk. 8:28-30).

Jesus' reply as we have it is ambiguous. He does not say "Yes". He does not say "No". But at least makes it clear that his concept involved a suffering Messiah. Though instead of accepting the title, 'Messiah' he refers to himself by the only title he accepted in his lifetime - 'Son of Man'. When Peter tries to turn him away from this concept he is rebuked. Likewise in the temptation - the immediate acceptance of the kingdoms of the world is rejected.

Finally, we must look at his trial - before the High Priest and Pilate.

The High Priest asks, "Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One?" Jesus replied, "I am and you will see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of God and coming with the clouds of heaven." (Mk. 14:61-2). We might say that this is quite straightforward. Jesus admitted it. But although the N.E.B. translation gives the common version, some manuscripts read 'You say that I am'; that is, 'The word is yours' - 'That is how you put it' - an answer that does not deny it, but suggests at least that Jesus' view of messiahship is different from that of the High Priest. The other accounts do not help. Matthew follows Mark and Luke and John differ considerably.

There are good reasons for believing that Jesus in fact did not admit clearly to being the Messiah. We must remember that all the accounts were written long after there was any doubt in the mind of any Christian that Jesus was the Christ.

The major argument is that if Jesus agreed he was the Messiah in the usual Jewish nationalistic sense, then Pilate would have been only too willing to crucify him to save a potential rebellion. Note in John 18:33, Pilate asks of Jesus "Are you the King of the Jews?" Jesus replies, "Is that your own idea or have others suggested it to you?" "What! Am I a Jew?" responds Pilate. "Your own nation and their chief priests have brought you before me. What have you done?" Jesus says, "My Kingdom does not belong to this world My kingly authority comes from elsewhere." "You are a king then?" retorts Pilate. Jesus answers " 'King' is your word. My task is to bear witness to the truth...." Pilate asks "What is truth?" (John 18:33-38).

What conclusions can we reach? Firstly, if we believe that Jesus accepted the title 'Son of Man' as defined in the Book of Enoch, then there is no doubt that he clearly accepted messiahship publicly. However, if we believe, as the author of this article does, that Jesus had his own concept of the office of the 'Son of Man', then there is considerable doubt that Jesus accepted messiahship before his crucifixion and resurrection.

Secondly, as we have observed, there is no doubt that all the evangelists accepted Jesus as the Messiah - indeed as the Son of God. But this conviction came after the Easter event. Among

many pieces of evidence the elaboration we find in Matthew's account of the discussion at Caesarea Philippi is surely strong evidence. The simple Markan account is elaborated with post-resurrection knowledge.

In Matthew, Peter's confession becomes 'You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God'. Jesus' reply is, "Simon, son of Jonah, you are favoured indeed! You did not learn that from mortal man; it was revealed to you by my heavenly Father, and I say unto you; You are Peter, the Rock, and on the rock I will build my church". (Matt. 16:16-18). At this time the word church (ekklesia)⁽¹⁾ would have been unintelligible.

In conclusion, it seems to the author that it is unlikely that Jesus claimed the title, Messiah, in his mortal lifetime, but was a humble man who spoke with the authority of God and left man guessing who he was, so that the principles of truth, faith, and love would determine those who were for him or against him.

Reference

The Titles of Jesus in Christology by Ferdinand Hahn, page 142, Lutterworth Press, London.

NEWS ITEM.

THE SUMMER SCHOOL.

SATURDAY JULY 31st. - AUGUST 6th.

FIRCROFT COLLEGE, BRISTOL ROAD, SELLY OAK,
BIRMINGHAM.

For details write to Ian McHaffie, Moray Lodge, 176 Granton Road, Edinburgh 5.

- (1) The use of the word 'church' again in Matt. 18:17, makes it clear that Matthew is using the vocabulary of some 20 years later, when the church had been set up. Jesus would surely have used the word 'Synagogue' here.

GOSPEL OF JOHN IV.

by Wilfred Lambert

John 1:19-28 gives us the 4th Gospel's account of John the Baptist, and it fits perfectly into the picture we obtained from studying the prologue, of the purpose of this Gospel. The prologue gives us Jesus not just as a man born in Bethlehem, approximately at the turn of the century, but one whose beginnings, in the purpose of God, went back before creation. In other words, he was not concerned solely with history in the ordinary, mundane sense, but with the purpose and significance behind history and in dealing with John the Baptist one finds exactly the same points brought out. You will notice that throughout this section we do not have an account of Jesus' baptism as such - we have words about John the Baptist preaching and baptising those who came to him and we have John's witness to Christ which also refers to the baptism (1:33) but an account of the baptism as such is lacking. The reader is expected to know this and John is not repeating well known facts. The second point in which this version differs substantially from Matthew, Mark and Luke is that it does not emphasise particularly the importance of John the Baptist, other than as a witness to Christ.

Let us consider for a moment what there is in Matthew, Mark and Luke that relates to this. There is John the Baptist preaching 'repent'. There is his message to the various classes of people who came to him - soldiers for example, the tax collector, and so on. There is the description of his way of life; the clothes he wore and the food he ate. All these things are passed over here because they are not relevant to the point of the witness of John the Baptist to Jesus. Instead we have emphasis on the fact that John is not the Messiah, but is merely looking forward to him. This point, of course, is also made in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, but there is a positive element in John's Gospel which you will not find in these three. The emphasis on the messianic character of Jesus is implied very plainly - "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world".(1.29).

Having now observed some general characteristics, we will note a few specific points that merit attention.

In V.19 the words "the Jews" are used in a context that indicates that John's Gospel was not written in a Jewish environment. This appears so, as a Jewish national, resident in Jerusalem, would not conceivably write, "When 'the Jews' sent priests and Levites to Jerusalem" but this usage is often found in John and it confirms the traditions we have noted that the Gospel was written towards the end of the 1st century or during the beginning of the 2nd century and that it was written outside Palestine.

John's statement that he was not the Christ caused those listening to him to wonder whom he might then be. Could he be Elizah. Was he the prophet? We see from apocryphal literature that at the time of John the Baptist the Jews were expecting someone called "the prophet" and it seems natural that they should conclude that this was he. They acknowledged that there had been among them no prophet for a long time and they looked forward to the period when this would be rectified. This in a way, is a kind of messianic expectation, being not separate altogether from the idea of the Messiah and yet it is often expressed as though it were parallel and what one would not realise from the New Testament is that the Jews were quite prepared to accept several messianic figures and not just one. They knew of different prophets, had different expectations among themselves, and did not insist on reducing these expectations to one figure. Let us consider an example as an illustration of this. It comes from the first book of Macabees and refers to the time when the Temple had recently come under Jewish control after it had been in the hands of pagans.

During pagan occupancy one of the altars, the stone altar, had been defiled and could not therefore be used. However, it had been sacred and could not be thrown out, which presented something of a problem, not easily solved and so we read that the stones were put aside until "the prophet" should come. He would know the answer to the problem of how the altar stones should be treated.

Turning to V.28 of the Gospel we find there something else worthy of consideration. The town of Bethany is mentioned and the Bethany that comes to our minds is in association with Martha, Mary and Lazarus. But the place referred to in this verse cannot be the same as it is spoken of as being beyond the Jordan, which from a Jewish viewpoint, means east of it, whereas the other Bethany, where the three lived, was quite close to Jerusalem, on the west side of the river. In this regard

there are various readings, some of which mention Besasara and it is known that there was a place, Basabara, but it is most likely that there was a small unknown place called Bathany, beyond the Jordan, because John was not preaching and baptising in the popular centres.

Verse 29 contains one of the real problems in this paragraph - "Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the World." So often we have read this, but do we realise how difficult it would be for the Jews to comprehend its meaning when it was spoken? Which lamb was the Lamb of God?. Lambs were, of course, mentioned in the O.T., the most obvious being the lamb from the Passover meal, but if you think back to the institution of the Passover and the instructions from its performance, the lamb there was not taking away sin. It was bringing salvation, in a sense, but was not taking away sin and if you ask what was the sacrifice by which the sin of the world might be taken away, one might think, for example, of the goat on the Day of Atonement. You will recall how the high priest put his hands on the animal and thereby transferred to it the sins of the community. There were in fact two goats and one of them was driven out into the wilderness, symbolising how the sins of the community were taken away. That would form a suitable O.T. background would it not for a sacrificial animal that takes away the sin of the world, but it is very difficult to find a parallel for a lamb, at least in ritual. There is, however, one O.T. passage which I think might help and this is found in the 53rd chapter of Isaiah. It reads:- "He was oppressed and he was afflicted yet he opened not his mouth, like a lamb that is led to the slaughter and like a sheep that before its shearers is dumb so he opened not his mouth.(Is.53:7). This seems to fit well but would its meaning be understood at the time of John the Baptist? Perhaps the most spiritually astute could comprehend its meaning, but surely to understand the statement properly one would need to know the doctrine which came only with the last Supper. That is how, after this in the early church, the lamb from the Passover was re-interpreted so that Christ became the Passover lamb and was sacrificed for us, thereby taking away the sin of the World. Thus we need a post Easter background to understand the meaning of the verse which raises one of the several problems in the 4th Gospel that we shall be confronted with time and time again. It would be the

more difficult to understand this statement as the Jews at this time were not expecting a Messiah who would be crucified. Indeed, a very careful search through contemporary and earlier writings has failed to find anything of this kind. Certainly, we know from the Gospel that when Jesus tried to explain to his Disciples that he would be crucified they did not accept the idea. It was quite alien to their belief.

This is one of a number of statements we find in this second chapter and onwards that emphasise the messianic character of Jesus, but in Matthew, Mark and Luke the same character, whilst being present, is not evident in such explicit terms. As an example of this let us consider the 3rd chapter of Matthew:- "I baptise you with water, for repentance; but the one who comes after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to carry. He will baptise you with the Holy Spirit and fire, whose fan is in his hand and he will cleanse his floor, and gather his wheat into his barn but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire." This is the picture of the work of Jesus, whom John was announcing, and if one goes back to the O.T. the messianic character of this imagery is not in doubt. In Malachi, for instance, or even earlier prophets, one will find this picture of a harvest; of separating the good from the bad. So there is no question that John's teaching as we find it in Matthew, Mark and Luke, does contain this messianic element, though it is expressed in wording, in the synoptics, that would be quite clear to any well informed Jew of the time. On the contrary, one cannot say that the statement, "Behold the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the World" found in John's Gospel, would be so clear, even to devout Jews.

This raises, of course, a very big question. Are we going to say that the evangelist John is merely repeating a phrase used by John the Baptist on this occasion but not used by Matthew, Mark and Luke? Or are we going to say that John has taken the thought expressed in Matthew, Mark and Luke and had put it in language that would be clearer and more explicit for the hearers of the time when he was writing? Those are the two possibilities that we have before us and I think most of us will consider that the latter is the more likely and is consistent with similar situations we find elsewhere in John's record.

The Call of the Disciples.

"Again the next day after John stood,
and two of his disciples;

And looking upon Jesus as he walked,
he saith, Behold the Lamb of God!"

(John 1:35-6)

This is straightforward; it is the call of the disciples and one has other records of this in Matthew, Mark and Luke. Of the points of interest, one finds again the statement:- "Behold the Lamb of God" and one notices how here the strictly historical element is somewhat left out in order to emphasise the use that John is making of the facts. The historical details are very scant, but one does find that the disciples are introduced to Jesus who is described as the Messiah and they become disciples for this reason. This follows on the idea of witness. Firstly, John witnesses in a general way that Jesus is the Christ; then he introduces the disciples to him, or else they themselves get to know him as the Messiah. One interesting point is that Peter in this first instance is called Cephass, which is the Aramaic equivalent of Peter, both meaning a rock, and if one thinks back to other Gospels one will remember that in Mark Jesus gives Simon the surname of Peter, and in Matthew there is the well known passage the words of which can be found today around the dome of St. Peter's in Rome, "You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church." Although the giving of the name is described here nothing is drawn from it, and one wonders why. If one considers the history of the Church as presented in the Acts one sees that Peter did play a prominent part in the development of the early Christian community, but his part was not the most important necessarily. Preaching efforts, for example, are mainly centred on Paul.

The fact that he is called Cephass is interesting because normally in the N.T. only the Greek form is used. It is also interesting to note that Paul in the Letter to the Galatians uses the form Cephass as well.

This is a very small point, but is one of quite a number which show that John had information which we do not obtain from the other Gospels.

The First Miracle. (John 2:1-11)

This miracle is not, of course, recorded in Matthew, Mark or Luke, and one may wonder why it appears in John's Gospel. There is no immediately apparent answer but my own feeling is that it was included simply to show that Jesus was the Son of God, building upon the witness and the evidence of him. I do not think that we are expected to ask "What is the significance of the water? What is the significance of the wine? Is the feast and the fact that it is a marriage feast, something to do with the marriage feast of the Lamb?" There is nothing in the Gospel to suggest this kind of interpretation and I personally would refrain from using it.

As often occurs in John, we find an interesting detail in the narrative and it concerns the composition of the water jars. These had to be of stone to satisfy the rites of Jewish purification as earthenware jars could themselves be rendered impure by contact with impure water or with a corpse for example, whereas stone did not suffer impurity.

The Cleansing of the Temple.

This episode, or a very similar one, is recorded in the synoptic gospels - Mark 11, Luke 19 and Matthew 21. The wording is quite clear; Jesus goes into the temple and sees all the business conveniences that had been arranged. For those who came a long way there was no need to bring with them animals and birds or whatever else they might need for offerings, instead they brought along their money and were able to buy them on the spot. It was very convenient. The money changers were there also because it was necessary to pay a tax to the temple authorities if you were an observant Jew, and this had to be paid in a special currency that would not be available in many parts of the Roman Empire. Jesus observing all this saw that it was a convenience being exploited for commercial ends, and so he used the authority that was his, as the Son of God, to act. He did so and at once the temple authorities and the Jews generally who saw it were incensed that a private individual should take upon himself this prerogative and they demanded to know by what right he did it. John says, "What

sign do you show us for doing this?" Jesus' answer is to refer them forward to the resurrection. He was going to be crucified and on the third day to rise and this was the proof that he was empowered to take this authority.

It is interesting that in this one case we are expressly told that the disciples, although they heard, did not really understand; the understanding came only after the resurrection itself. The real problem concerning this is not one of interpretation but of historical arrangement. Are there two separate occasions, because in John's Gospel this, you will observe, appears to occur right at the beginning of the ministry? We have had the first miracle and now we have the Passover in Jerusalem and the cleansing of the Temple. In the other Gospels it occurs right at the end when Jesus enters the Temple, a few days before the occasion of his arrest and quick crucifixion. Is it one or is it two episodes? In my judgement it is quite clearly one and I find it difficult to believe that the temple guard would have let it happen twice or indeed that it would have served any function to have occurred twice. I think it is put at the beginning by John because it shows so emphatically the significance of what Jesus was doing. It puts him quite clearly in the position of the Messiah. Here he is in Jerusalem in the Temple; the very centre for the worship of God. He at once takes authority in his hands and the reason that he has power to take this authority is that he was raised from the dead.

R E V I E W.

THE GOODNESS OF GOD.

by John W. Wenham.

(IVP Paperback. 223pp)

Mr. Wenham was Vice-Principal of Tyndale Hall, Bristol for 14 years, from which post he retired in 1969 and became Warden of Latimer House, Oxford. He wrote a book entitled "Christ and the Bible", which he describes in the following words:-

"In an earlier book, "Christ and the Bible", it was argued that the Gospels give a very full and clear account of the attitude of Jesus to the Old Testament. (If the Gospels give us no true idea of him, we have no adequate basis for calling ourselves (Christians.)

He taught that its history was true, its teaching authoritative and its form of words inspired. He regarded God as its author, so that what it said, God said."

As was to be expected, the publication of such a strongly argued case for an unfashionable position drew upon him an avalanche of criticism. The superficial case which can be made in refutation of such a claim is many faceted, detailed, and, on a first reading, convincing. Wenham was sufficiently objective to appreciate the case against him, but had a sufficiently robust faith in the Bible to face it squarely, and analyse to the full all those passages which seemed to support the refutation of his thesis. In the process he found that he had to admit that there were many areas where our present limited knowledge is insufficient to comprehend to the full the mind of God.

An excellently documented and clearly formulated account of his analysis has now been published by IVP as noted above. Wenham found, as do all who study the Bible in humility, seeking to learn rather than to bolster up preconceived ideas, that the result was much more than a mere answer to controversy, it engendered a positive advance in personal appreciation of facets which were not the object of the immediate search. He writes thus of the results:-

"This book started as a defensive exercise - as an attempt to answer some very difficult questions about the Bible; but it led on into a deeper understanding of what the goodness of God really means, and so it has become a positive exposition of the character of the living God, the One with whom we have to do."

The extensive range of biblical quotations shows him to have a very detailed knowledge of the Bible. The large number of references to works both for and against his own firmly held faith in inspiration shows that he is also a fearless reader of all which can be said about the Bible, by its foes as well as by its friends. Inside the widely spread sections of the Christian Church his reading and consideration has spread through both time and location - the early Fathers, the Roman Church, the Anglican Communion, the Reformed Churches, Seventh Day Adventists, Christian Science, Christadelphians

and many others, are all considered fairly and in an un-prejudiced manner.

He has the good sense to realise that it is from difficult aspects of a problem, for which we have no immediate answer, that honest consideration is likely to advance our positive knowledge and correct some of our faulty pre-conceptions. As a result of this outlook, he engaged in a detailed examination of every part of the Bible, with no attempt to cover-up, ignore, or explain-away those sections which presented difficulty to his beliefs. His conclusions serve to indicate the drift of his treatment, and the position which he has chosen in the face of a mass of fact which allows of no absolute certainty, and leaves one with the task of making a personal decision on the basis of apparent probability:-

".... the teaching of Christ is all of a piece - to him the Father is supremely personal, and his doctrine of God is the purest theism, as is shown by his endorsement of the Old Testament, by his teaching on judgement and by his teaching on salvation. But in this respect his teaching is also of a piece with the rest of the Bible. And the teaching of the Bible is all of a piece with the teaching of Providence, Christ, the Bible, Providence, all point in the same direction showing us both the kindness and severity of God; or, to sum it up in a single word, showing us the goodness of God."

The implications springing from this treatment bear fundamentally on the whole question of the nature of life, and it should be read by all who are concerned about it.

Ralph Lovelock.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

Dear Editor,

I have been looking into the question of whether or not Jesus instituted a 'breaking of bread' service, which has been the subject of discussion in recent issues of 'The Endeavour' Magazine, and I have come across the following quotations from Justin Martyr, who was put to death about AD 148.

Dr. R.W. Dale in his book 'The Living Christ and the four Gospels' states that in his 'First Apology' Justin states (cap 66)

"The Apostles in the Memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them - that Jesus took bread, and, when he had given thanks, said, 'This do in remembrance of me; this is my body'; and that after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, 'This is my blood' and gave it to them alone."

Again, in cap 67 Justin describes the weekly assemblies of the Christians:

"On the day called Sunday all who live in cities or in the country gather together in one place, and the 'Memoirs of the Apostles' or the writings of the prophets, are read as long as time permits. Then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president, in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability, and the people assent, saying, Amen. And there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given; and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do and willing give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us; and, in a word, takes care of all who are in need."

These quotations, I feel, settle the question as to whether the early church, about AD150, understood and believed that Jesus instituted the simple 'breaking of bread' service, and that they continued the practise.

However, the question arises as to what precisely the Christians understood by the terms 'This is my body' and 'This is my blood'.

We know that even in the 1st century Docetic ideas had developed within the brotherhood, and there were some who held the view that 'matter was evil' and that Jesus Christ did not really come 'in the flesh'. In the 1st Epistle of John 4:3 we have a reference to this error. But if Jesus Christ did not truly come 'in the flesh' the ideas surrounding the 'bread' and 'wine' as related to 'body' and 'blood' must have become very fanciful indeed.

For this reason, so it seems to me, John transferred (in his Gospel) the teaching of Jesus given to his Apostles regarding his body and blood to another occasion, found in John 6. Here there is a wider audience, and it is made clear that what Jesus offers is not some 'mystical' body, but his full humanity. (see in this connection 'Readings in St. John's Gospel' by Dr. W. Temple).

In consequence of this, and in harmony with his practical outlook, John stresses, in relation to the Last Supper, another - and practical - command of Jesus, based on his own example of washing the disciples' feet.

We come, therefore, to this conclusion. Unless we discern the Lord's body, the merely liturgical breaking bread and drinking wine can do nothing but condemn us. Similarly the practice of actually washing one another's feet is useless as a rite, without a genuine spirit of humility and love in the heart.

Therefore, because the provision of bread and wine is relatively easy and itself powerfully reminds us of the love and humility of Christ which culminated in his death, we follow this practice. On the other hand we are able to omit the rather messy and time consuming process of washing one another's feet. However, we must recall to our minds, as did the Apostle Peter (1 Peter 5:5) the way in which Jesus was clothed with humility when he took a towel and girded himself, leaving us an example.

The provision of water, referred to by Justin, as well as bread and wine, is not fully understood. It may have been either:

- (1) Simply to dilute the wine, or
- (2) Because Jesus came by water and blood (1 John 5:6)
or
- (3) To remind the participants that 'according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour' (Titus 3:5-6)
or
- (4) To symbolise the washing of one another's feet, and to remind them of their practical obligations towards one another.

With love in Christ,

Leonard Owler.

Dear Editor,

I wish to thank R. Mould of Vancouver for comment upon my letter regarding the "Rich Man and Lazarus". My main concern is with the possible bearing of the story in Luke 16:19-31 and also "the souls under the altar" of Rev. V 9-14 on the importance of Christadelphian teaching about the state of the dead in relation to man's opportunities for reconciliation to God through acceptance of Christ's offer of salvation through faith (trust), repentance, obedience, and baptism and continued trust and obedience.

The theological correctness of Christadelphian teaching about the dead was not in question, although I cannot find it enunciated unequivocally in the New Testament. I do find ample proof of the need for and certainty of Christ's return, the resurrection and judgment - and on these the Christian's hope for the world and man is fixed. The Covenant of the Lausanne 1974 International Congress on World Evangelisation included this stirring sentence:- "We believe that Jesus Christ

will return personally and visibly in power and glory to consummate his salvation and his judgment". And yet the great majority of the 5000 delegates to that Congress would accept the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus as an accurate indication of Christ's concept of the state of the dead.

To me, it seems more logical and in keeping with O.T. teaching that Christ did not believe in a literal Hades or "Abraham's bosom", but that he did know of and use this belief, common among the Jews of his day. He uses it as a vehicle in one of his discourses but the cardinal theme of all his teaching about the future of the dead was centred on the resurrection and judgment. However, since the Jews of his day (except for the Sadducees and their followers) commonly believed in the resurrection as well as in "Abraham's bosom", he did not tell his listeners they were doomed to eternal death, either before or after judgment if they continued to believe the dead were conscious while awaiting resurrection and judgment.

I do not believe we should usurp Christ's responsibility for future judgment, in our own preaching now, but rather should follow the pattern of his real teaching more closely than we do in this regard.

With love in Christ,

S. Marriott.

P.S. Erratum - No. 46, p.25.

Para.3. line 5 - should read - 'without refuting'.

THE ENDEAVOUR MAGAZINE SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Great Britain 75p per annum, (Students 50p). Single copies 20p (post free).

Canada, USA & Australia \$2.00 (Air mail \$3.50). South Africa R1.50.

Great Britain, Europe & South Africa (also articles and correspondence), The Endeavour Magazine, 150 Chessetts Wood Lane, Lapworth, Warwickshire, England.

Canada & U.S.A. The Endeavour Magazine, 108 North Orchard Road, Linthicum Heights, Maryland 21090, U.S.A.

Australia & New Zealand, The Endeavour Magazine, PO Box 213, Box Hill, Victoria 3128, Australia.

A BALANCED REGULAR DIET?

Results of Research into Methods of Systematic Reading of Scripture

by D. Pitt Francis.

This article has been prompted by the search for a regular, systematic and balanced calendar of Bible reading. Most of the readers of the Endeavour Magazine will be familiar with the Bible Companion⁽¹⁾ compiled by Robert Roberts, which is based on one reading of the Old Testament and two readings of the New. Some may be quite satisfied with this plan, but others may think a different approach can offer advantages. This article discusses the principles that underlie systematic Bible reading and offers an alternative plan.

It should be profitable for us to examine some other attempts at compilation of a systematic scheme of Bible reading because:-
(i) A change can give a refreshing new angle and awake a renewed interest: (ii) The production of the Common Bible has fostered a much greater interest in the Deutero-Canonical books than has previously existed and (iii) we shall be in a better position to discuss Bible reading schemes with members of different religious bodies if we make some effort to discover how much Bible reading is the regular practice of such bodies and examine the plans they use.

The Bible Companion (1) is a compromise. Robert Roberts commenced with a much more ambitious scheme of reading but found it impracticable. Other systems were easier. An old Jewish system spanned the Torah (i.e. Pentateuch*) once every three years and the Haftoroth (sections of the prophets and writings) were read in conjunction with these Torah readings. The three-year cycle was used by one of Austin Farrer's students to explain some of Jesus' quotations in John's Gospel. We may think that a three-year Old Testament reading cycle is easy, but we have greater reading opportunities than those of Jesus' day. He did not despise it.

* The Law - The first five books of the Bible.

The practice of reading the Old Testament once and the New Testament twice a year did not originate with the Bible Companion. It is the basis of the calendar in the Book of Common Prayer, where the New Testament is read twice (a gospel and epistolary reading per day), the Psalms are read (or sung) monthly and the Old Testament (excepting the Psalms and some genealogical sections, but including the best of the Apocryphal readings) is read once per year (2). To some extent the calendar is more ambitious than the Bible Companion and recognises that the Psalms are prayer and praise, should be on our lips daily and should not be confined to the period 1st January to 22nd March! But its exclusion of the genealogical portions of Scripture reveals its basic deficiency, for if we believe the whole Bible to be the Word of God, then we should read it all, and if the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer were convinced that although the Apocrypha may not be consulted for doctrine, it should nevertheless be read for 'example of life and instruction in manners', they ought logically to have included the whole Apocrypha in their calendrical reading scheme (3).

More akin to the Bible Companion is the McChesney system (4) published by the Banner of Truth trust, but again it is more ambitious, for the New Testament and Psalms are read twice yearly and the Old Testament, excepting the Psalms, is read once. It overcomes the problem of including legalistic and genealogical sections of the Bible, by having four sections of reading per day, a 'family' and private reading each morning and evening. In doing so, it falls into the error of the Bible Companion in overlooking the liturgical nature of the Psalms, and the need to use them daily. They ought not to be read purely for instruction and information. The existence of two New Testament readings per day paves the way for a more balanced reading of the Gospels. The Bible Companion has no Gospel reading in the final two months of each half-year. On the other hand, the Book of Common Prayer dissects Gospels and Epistles into so many morning and evening readings that the 'thread' of reading is often lost. The Banner of Truth system is evenly distributed, but maintains the practice of reading whole chapters each day which the Prayer Book's more balanced system overlooks.

There are many less ambitious schemes. Some South African Christadelphians devised a scheme consisting of only two readings:- (i) the Old Testament minus the Psalms and Proverbs and (ii) the New Testament (including the Psalms and Proverbs). As the Psalms are more evenly distributed than in the Bible Companion the scheme overcomes some of its basic deficiencies, but is less in coverage. A joint liturgical committee consisting of Anglicans and Methodists (5) recently published a calendar in which the Bible (including the Apocrypha) can be read in three years, the New Testament much more frequently and the Psalms once every three months, but all readings are very well distributed. Even the 119th Psalm is dissected in such a way that it can be read with other Psalms over a number of weeks. Further enquiries among students at Middlesex Polytechnic recently showed me that a large proportion of convinced Christians (6) do read the Bible regularly and follow a similar, but more evangelical three-year scheme (7). The advantages of other schemes are that they place the books of the Bible in near-historical order and thus help to maintain the thread of reading much more effectively. The Prayer Book's scheme partly achieved this distribution, but no attempt has ever been made to apply historical logic to the New Testament and place the New Testament epistolary reading sequence in some kind of historical sequence, pre-faced by Acts and appended by the Apocalypse.

Analysis

A study of the above reading plans, including additionally the lectionary systems of other churches has isolated ideal features of a viable reading plan:-

1. The Old Testament should be read once per year and the New Testament twice, but the Psalms should be used daily in worship on a monthly calendrical basis.
2. The use of the Apocrypha by New Testament writers, Paul's quotations from Wisdom of Solomon in Romans (8) for example, is such that apart from any considerations of inspiration or otherwise, there should, at least, be provision for reading the Apocrypha, mainly at the year-end, when non-interested readers can read substitute Old Testament reading.

3. Chapters should be unfragmented, but reading material should be distributed evenly between one day and another. The only exception to the non-fragmentation principle is Psalm 119, which is considerably more than 1/30th of the Book of Psalms.

4. Arising from 3., it is best to have one Old Testament reading per day, so that chapters can be evenly divided. There is no equality of size. Chapters of Leviticus, 1Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Luke and Acts are, on average much longer than those of Psalms, Ecclesiastes and Zechariah, and some of the Apocryphal books, notably those of Maccabees and II Esdras are even longer.

5. The books of the Old Testament (and Apocrypha) should be in order of historical relevance, not necessarily in historical order. Thus, although Tobit and the Prayer of Manasseh can claim relevance to pre-captivity times (though written long after) Judith is so evidently late Persian that its characters, like those of Revelation 2 and 3 (i.e. 'the woman Jezebel' etc) are given names of people of an earlier period. Since Daniel claims relevance to captivity history (including its Apocryphal additions) it can safely be placed in this period irrespective of when it was written. The same may be said of Isa 40-66, whether early or late. An exception has to be made in the case of II Esdras, which, despite its claim to be written by Ezra stands on the edge of the Apocryphal 'cannon' and should therefore be read last.

6. There is good reason for a slight redistribution of the monthly calendar for reading the Psalms. The author of this article has researched the word content of Psalms in our modern versions as against that on which the Common Prayer Book's calendar was based, and it can be shown that when the doxology is omitted, the Anglican system tends to be too ambitious at the beginning of each month and insufficiently ambitious at the end of each month. A revised programme is given in the centre columns of this reading plan.

7. In the case of the New Testament, the Gospel reading must be divided evenly, but chapters should not be fragmented. The relationship of this content of the Gospels to the rest of the New Testament is almost exactly of the order 5:6. Therefore, the best way to achieve such a spread is not to fragment the Gospels and read them daily (as in the Prayer Book) nor to distribute them in an unbalanced way through the year (as in the Bible Companion) but to spend consecutive periods of 5 days

and 6 days each reading the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament, alternately. The other reading in the New Testament should obviously commence with Acts and end with Revelation, but the epistles should be placed in historical (or near-historical) order.

Conclusion

A reading plan which includes all seven of these features has been devised. The result is a plan which effects much more even distribution of reading and has not the occasional long days and 'rest days' which the Bible Companion provides. For an additional five minutes per day, the user can enter into the spirit of the Psalmist and attain some familiarity with Deutero-canonical books. Although the plan which is provided in the following pages does not necessarily place the Old Testament books in an ideal historical sequence, at least it is hoped that some steps may have been taken in that direction.

References

1. R. Roberts: The Bible Companion (Christadelphian Office).
2. The Book of Common Prayer (pages 16 to 27) and Psalms (pages 195-285).
3. The Articles of Convocation (London: 1562 - Article VI).
4. R.M. McCheyne: Calendar for Daily Readings (The Banner of Truth Trust).
5. Joint Liturgical Group: The Daily Office - attempts at revision of the liturgy by Anglicans and Methodists.
6. Search the Scriptures (published by IVF).
7. The research was recently conducted among student members of the Middlesex Polytechnic Christian Community, of which 60% admitted Bible reading of some kind, and 25% followed a systematic calendar.
8. Compare Wisdom 2:23-24 with Romans 5:12; Wisdom 3:8 with 1 Cor 6:2 and even more particularly, Wisdom 15:7 with Romans 9:21-23. Also Ephesians 6:11-17 has more similarity with Wisdom 5:15-23 than with Isa 59:16-18.

THE ALTERNATIVE BIBLE COMPANION

January				Psalms	February			
1	Gen 1-3	Matt 1,2		1-7	1	Exod 36-38	Acts 17	
2	4-6	3,4		8-12	2	39,40	18	
3	7-10	5		13-18	3	Lev 1-3	Matt 19	
4	11-13	6		19-22	4	4-6	20	
5	14-17	7		23-28	5	7,8	21	
6	18-20		Acts 1	29-33	6	9-11	22	
7	21-23		2	34-37	7	12-13	23	
8	24,25		3	38-41	8	14,15	Acts 19	
9	26,27		4	42-46	9	16-18	20	
10	28-30		5	47-51	10	19-21	21	
11	31,32		6	52-57	11	22,23	22	
12	33-35	Matt 8		58-64	12	24,25	23	
13	36,37	9		65-68	13	26,27	24	
14	38-40	10		69-72	14	Num 1,2	Matt 24	
15	41,42	11		73-76	15	3,4	25	
16	43,44	12		77,78	16	5,6	26	
17	45-47		Acts 7	79-83	17	7,8	27	
18	48-50		8	84-88	18	9-11	28	
19	Exod 1-3		9	89-92	19	12-14	Acts 25	
20	4-6		10	93-99	20	15,16	26	
21	7,8		11	100-104	21	17-19	27	
22	9-11		12	105-106	22	20,21	28	
23	12,13	Matt 13		107-109	23	22-24	1 Thes 1-3	
24	14-16	14		110-115	24	25,26	4,5	
25	17-19	15,16		116-119	25	27-29	Mark 1	
26	20-22	17		120-121	26	30-32	2	
27	23-25	18		122-131	27	33,34	3	
28	26-28		Acts 13	132-138	28	35,36	4	
29	29,30		14	139-144				
30	31-33		15	145-150				
31	34,35		16					

March				Psalms	April			
1	Deut 1,2	Mark 5		1-7	1	Ruth	Luke 3	
2	3,4		Gal 1,2	8-12	2	1 Sam 1-3	4	
3	5,6		3,4	13-18	3	4-7	5	
4	7-9		5,6	19-22	4	8-10	2 Cor 8,9	
5	10-12		2 Thess	23-28	5	11-13	10,11	
6	13-15		James 1,2	29-33	6	14,15	12,13	
7	16-18		3-5	34-37	7	16,17	Rom 1,2	
8	19-21	Mark 6		38-41	8	18,19	3,4	
9	22-24	7		42-46	9	20-22	5,6	
10	25-27	8		47-51	10	23-25	Luke 6	
11	28	9		52-57	11	26-28	7	
12	29-31	10		58-64	12	29-31	8	
13	32-34		1 Cor 1,2	65-68	13	2 Sam 1-3	9	
14	Josh 1-3		3,4	69-72	14	4-7	10	
15	4-6		5,6	73-76	15	8-11	Rom 7,8	
16	7,8		7,8	77-78	16	12,13	9	
17	9,10		9,10	79-83	17	14-16	10,11	
18	11-13		11,12	84-88	18	17,18	12,13	
19	14-16	Mark 11		89-92	19	19-21	14,15	
20	17-19	12		93-99	20	22-24	16	
21	20,21	13		100-104	21	1 Chro1,2	Luke 11	
22	22-24	14		105,106	22	3-5	12	
23	Judg 1-3	15,16		107-109	23	6	13	
24	4,5		1 Co 13,14	110-115	24	7-9	14	
25	6,7		15	116-119	25	10-12	15	
26	8,9		16	120-121	26	13-16	Eph 1,2	
27	10-11		2 Cor 1,2	122-131	27	17-20	3,4	
28	12-14		3,4	132-138	28	21-23	5,6	
29	15-17		5,7	139-144	29	24-26	Phil 1,2	
30	18,19	Luke 1		145-150	30	27-29	3,4	
31	20,21	2						

May			Psalms	June		
1	Prov 1-3	Luke 16	1-7	1	Job 19-21	1 Pet 3-5
2	4-7	17	8-12	2	22-25	John 7
3	8-10	18	13-18	3	26-29	8
4	11-13	19	19-22	4	30-32	9
5	14-16	20	23-28	5	33-35	10
6	17-19	Col 1,2	29-33	6	36-39	11
7	20-22	3,4	34-37	7	40-42	2 Pet 1,2
8	23-25	Philemon	38-41	8	Joel	3
9	26-28	1 Tim 1,2	42-46	9	Jonah	Jude
10	29-31	3,4	47-51	10	2 Chron 1-4	1 John 1,2
11	Eccles 1-4	5,6	52-57	11	5,6	3-5
12	5-8	Luke 21	58-64	12	7-9	2 & 3 John
13	9-12	22	65-68	13	10-13	John 12
14	Cant. 1-4	23	69-72	14	14-17	13
15	5-8	24	73-76	15	18-20	14
16	1 King 1,2	2 Tim 1,2	77,78	16	21-23	15
17	3-5	3,4	79-83	17	24-26	16
18	6,7	Hebr. 1, 2	84-88	18	27-29	Rev. 1,2
19	8	3,4	89-92	19	30-32	3,4
20	9,10	5,6	93-99	20	33,34	5,6
21	11,12	7,8	100-104	21	35,36	7,8
22	13,14	John 1	105-106	22	Amos 1-3	9,10
23	15,16	2,3	107-109	23	4-6	11,12
24	17,18	4	110-115	24	7-9	John 17
25	19,20	5	116-119	25	Hosea 1-4	18
26	21,22	6	120-121	26	5-8	19
27	Job 1-3	Heb 9-10	122-131	27	9-11	20,21
28	4-7	11	132-138	28	12-14	Rev. 13,14
29	8-11	12,13	139-144	29	Micah 1-4	15,16
30	12-14	Titus	145-150	30	5-7	17,18
31	15-18	2 Pet 1,2				

July			Psalms	August		
1	Isa 1-3	Rev 19,20	1-7	1	Isa 48,49	Acts 15
2	4-6	21,22	8-12	2	50-52	16
3	7-9	Matt 1,2	13-18	3	53-55	17
4	10-13	3,4	19-22	4	56-58	18
5	14-16	5	23-28	5	59-61	Matt 19
6	17-19	6	29-33	6	62-64	20
7	20-22	7	34-37	7	65,66	21
8	23-25	Acts 1	38-41	8	Nahum	22
9	26-28	2	42-46	9	Habakkuk	23
10	29-31	3	47-51	10	Zephaniah	Acts 19
11	32-34	4	52-57	11	Jerem 1,2	20
12	35-37	5	58-64	12	3,4	21
13	38,39	6	65-68	13	5,6	22
14	Tobit 1-4	Matt 8	69-72	14	7-9	23
15	5-9	9	73-76	15	10-12	24
16	10-12	10	77,78	16	13-15	Matt 24
17	13,14 (Mn)	11	79-83	17	16-18	25
18	2 King 1-3	12	84-88	18	19-21	26
19	4,5	Acts 7	89-92	19	22,23	27
20	6,7	8	93-99	20	24,25	28
21	8,9	9	100-104	21	26-28	Acts 25
22	10-12	10	105,106	22	29,30	26
23	13,14	11	107-109	23	31	27
24	15,16	12	110-115	24	32	28
25	17,18	Matt 13	116-119	25	33-35	1 Thes 1-3
26	19-21	14	120-121	26	36,37	4,5
27	22,23	15,16	122-131	27	38-40	Mark 1
28	24,25	17	132-138	28	41-43	2
29	Isa 40-41	18	139-144	29	44-46	3
30	42-44	Acts 13	145-150	30	47-49	4
31	45-47	14		31	50	5

September			Psalms	October		
1	Jerem 51	Gal 1,2	1-7	1	Dan 9,10	Luke 3
2	52	3,4	8-12	2	11,12	4
3	Lamt. 1,2	5,6	13-18	3	Song Azar.	5
4	3-5	2 Thess	19-22	4	Sus/Bel.	2 Cor 8,9
5	Bar. 1-3	James 1,2	23-28	5	Haggai	10,11
6	4,5	3-5	29-33	6	Zech 1-4	12,13
7	6	Mark 6	34-37	7	5-8	Rom 1,2
8	Obadiah	7	38-41	8	9-11	3,4
9	Ezek. 1-3	8	42-46	9	12-14	5,6
10	4-7	9	47-51	10	Esth. 1-3	Luke 6
11	8-11	10	52-57	11	4-7	7
12	12-14	1 Cor 1,2	58-64	12	8-10	8
13	15,16	3,4	65-68	13	" (Apocr)	9
14	17-19	5,6	69-72	14	Ezra 1-3	10
15	20	7,8	73-76	15	4-7	Rom 7,8
16	21,22	9,10	77,78	16	8-10	9
17	23-25	11,12	79-83	17	Malachi	10,11
18	26-28	Mark 11	84-88	18	Nehm 1-3	12,13
19	29-31	12	89-92	19	4-6	14,15
20	32-34	13	93-99	20	7,8	16
21	35-37	14	100-104	21	9-11	Luke 11
22	38,39	15,16	105,106	22	12-14	12
23	40,41	1 Cor 13,14	107-109	23	1 Esd 1,2	13
24	42,43	15	110-115	24	3,4	14
25	44-46	16	116-119	25	5	15
26	47,48	2 Cor 1,2	* v81-121	26	6,7	Eph 1,2
27	Dan 1,2	3,4	122-131	27	8	3,4
28	3,4	5-7	132-138	28	9	5,6
29	5,6	Luke 1	139-144	29	Wisd 1-3	Phil 1,2
30	7,8	2	145-150	30	4-6	3,4
				31	7-9	Luke 16

November			Psalms	December		
1	Wisd 10-12	Luke 17	1-7	1	2 Macc 1,2	1 Pet 3-5
2	13,14	18	8-12	2	3	John 7
3	15-17	19	13-18	3	4	8
4	18,19	20	19-22	4	5,6	9
5	Judith 1-4	Col 1,2	23-28	5	7,8	10
6	5-7	3,4	29-33	6	9,10	11
7	8-10	Philemon	34-37	7	11,12	2 Peter
8	11-13	1 Tim 1,2	38-41	8	13,14	Jude
9	14-16	3,4	42-46	9	15	1 John 1,2
10	Ecclus 1-3	5,6	47-51	10	1 Macc 1,2	3-5
11	4-6	Luke 21	52-57	11	3	2 & 3 John
12	7-9	22	58-64	12	4	John 12
13	10,11	23	65-68	13	5	13
14	12,13	24	69-72	14	6	14
15	14-16	2 Tim 1,2	73-76	15	7,8	15
16	17-19	3,4	77,78	16	9	16
17	20,21	Hebr 1,2	79-83	17	10	Rev 1,2
18	22,23	3,4	84-88	18	11	3,4
19	24-26	5,6	89-92	19	12	5,6
20	27-29	7,8	93-99	20	13,14	7,8
21	30,31	John 1	100-104	21	15,16	9,10
22	32-34	2,3	105,106	22	2 Esd 1,2	11,12
23	35,36	4	107-109	23	3,4	John 17
24	37,38	5	110-115	24	5,6	18
25	39,40	6	116-119	25	7	19
26	41-43	Hebr 9,10	* v81-121	26	8,9	20,21
27	44,45	11	122-131	27	10,11	Rev 13,14
28	46,47	12,13	132-138	28	12,13	15,16
29	48,49	Titus	139-144	29	14	17,18
30	50,51	1 Pet 1,2	145-150	30	15	19,20
				31	16	21,22