MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

508(c)(1)(a) Free Church • Sole Tanakh Authority
A Study for Judaism · Christianity · Islam

DOCUMENT 164

Is There a Mediator Between Man and Yahweh?

A Covenant Deep Dive into Job, Isaiah 53, Elihu's Messenger, the Greek Text of 1 Timothy 2:5, and the Priestly Argument of Hebrews

Examining the Greatest Stated Stumbling Block Between Christianity and the Written Covenant — A Three-Religion Covenant Response

July 2026 • Revised November 2026
Elder Kepha Arcemont, Founder
miqdashbethel.ai • miqdashbethel@gmail.com

The Message is Sent to the World

REACHING JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY, AND ISLAM

✡ JUDAISM	† CHRISTIANITY	☪ ISLAM
The ***arbiter (mokiach)*** (מוֹכִיחַ) in **Job 9:33** is a courtroom arbiter, not a divine-human mediator. Job laments that no such figure exists in his own lawsuit against **Yahweh**'s power — a lament the book itself resolves not by supplying one, but by **Yahweh** speaking to Job directly, unmediated, from the whirlwind.	Christianity reads **1 Timothy 2:5** — ***"one mediator between God and men"*** — back into the Tanakh, treating Job's lament, Elihu's messenger, and **Isaiah 53** as advance witness to that one mediator. Examined word by word in Hebrew and Greek, none of the three texts makes that claim on its own terms.	The Qur'an (2:186) states that Allah is near and answers the one who calls on Him; Muslim teaching draws from it that He hears the supplicant directly, with no mediator. ***Intercession (shafa'ah)*** belongs to Allah alone and operates only by His permission — a pattern strikingly close to the covenant's own structure of direct address and sovereign forgiveness.

DOCTRINAL AUTHORITY — STANDING RULE OF MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

The sole binding authority of Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution is the *Tanakh* — the written covenant of **Yahweh**. No Talmudic tractate, Church council decree, papal encyclical, hadith collection, or extra-biblical tradition carries doctrinal weight equal to or greater than the written Torah. Where any tradition conflicts with the written covenant, the written covenant governs without exception. The

Talmud, New Testament, and Qur'an are cited as historical reference and comparative witness — never as superseding authority. Miqdash Bethel uses the Written Tanakh as its sole source for four reasons: it is the only text Judaism, Christianity, and Islam all recognize as originally given by **Yahweh**; it predates and underlies the Talmud, New Testament, and Qur'an, so testing those traditions against it follows the evidentiary direction of **Deuteronomy 19:15** — the earlier witness governs the later commentary; every later tradition that departs from the Tanakh does so by addition or reinterpretation, never by overturning the text itself, so the text remains the fixed standard; and **Yahweh**'s own words declare the covenant unchanging (Malachi 3:6; Psalms 119:89), making the written covenant — not evolving institutional interpretation — the only stable ground for doctrine. All three great covenant traditions — Judaism, Christianity, and Islam — are addressed simultaneously and equally in every Miqdash Bethel document, because **Yahweh**'s covenant belongs to every nation that will receive it. The **Deuteronomy 19:15** two-or-three-witness evidentiary standard governs all textual claims in this document.

HOW TO READ THIS DOCUMENT

This document applies the sole authority of the written Tanakh. **Yahweh** (**יהוה**) and **Elohim** (**אֱלֹהִים**) appear in bold throughout. Tanakh books and people are named in English. Wherever a Hebrew word is used, the English word comes first with the Hebrew in parentheses, both in bold italic, for example ***arbiter (mokiach)***; Greek words are handled the same way, for example ***mediator (mesites)***. Hebrew letters appear in bold. Scripture references and quotations are bold, and anything in quotation marks is bold italic. Strong's numbers (H3198 and the like) are plain text; they come from James Strong's *Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* (1890), a concordance that numbers every Hebrew and Greek word of the Bible. Each finding is graded under **Deuteronomy 19:15**: **Corroborated** (two or three witnesses in the written text agree), **Single witness** (one passage only), or **Not in the text** (the claim is not found in the Tanakh).

Verse numbers follow the English version. In a few chapters the Hebrew Bible divides the chapter at a different point, so the same verse carries a different number in the Hebrew text. Where that happens, the Hebrew number is given in brackets on first citation, for example Numbers 30:13 [Hebrew 30:14].

Lexicon cited. BDB is *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (the Brown-Driver-Briggs lexicon), edited by Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906). It is a one-volume dictionary of biblical Hebrew and Aramaic, built on the work of Wilhelm Gesenius, and it gives each word's root, meanings, and the verses where it is used. Two translators' aids are also cited, and neither is a lexicon: the translators' notes of the *NET Bible* (Biblical Studies Press), which explain the Hebrew behind each verse of that translation, and William D. Reyburn's *A*

Handbook on the Book of Job (United Bible Societies, 1992), a verse-by-verse guide written for Bible translators.

Three audiences are addressed simultaneously: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Rabbinic commentary, New Testament texts, and the Qur'an are cited as historical and comparative reference — not as binding authority. The Written Tanakh governs all conclusions.

TANAKH BOOKS CITED IN THIS DOCUMENT

DIVISION	BOOKS CITED	PURPOSE IN THIS STUDY
Torah	Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy	Sinai covenant structure; Moses' intercession; the priesthood and atonement; direct repentance narratives; the two-or-three-witness standard
Prophets	1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, Jonah, Malachi	Eli's warning; human intercession by prophets and kings; David's forgiveness; the Servant passages; direct-access prophetic calls; the promised restoration of the Levitical priesthood
Writings	Psalms, Job, Daniel, 2 Chronicles	Job's lament for an arbiter; the Psalmist's direct cry; Daniel's direct confession; Manasseh's repentance

COMPARATIVE TEXTS CITED IN THIS DOCUMENT

TEXT	TRADITION	HOW IT IS USED IN THIS STUDY
1 Timothy 2:5–6	Christian (New Testament)	The ***"one mediator"*** verse; the Greek ***man (anthropos)*** without the article (Section VI)
Galatians 3:19–20; **Hebrews 8:6; 9:15; 12:24**	Christian (New Testament)	Other uses of ***mediator (mesites)*** (Section I-A)
Hebrews 2:17–18; 4:15; 7; 9:11–14; 10:1–14	Christian (New Testament)	The priestly argument, fairly stated and weighed (Section VIII)
John 5:19, 30; **1 Corinthians 15:28**	Christian (New Testament)	The Son's role placed under the Father's will (Section XII)

TEXT	TRADITION	HOW IT IS USED IN THIS STUDY
Romans 10:13; **Acts 2:21**	Christian (New Testament)	**Joel 2:32** [Hebrew 3:5] quoted without a mediator (Section X, Witness Five)
Council of Chalcedon (451 CE)	Christian (church council)	The later ***"two natures"*** language (Section VI-B)
Septuagint, **Job 9:33**	Jewish (Greek translation)	The only use of ***mediator (mesites)*** in the Septuagint, inside a wish (Sections II-B, VI-E)
Targum Jonathan on **Isaiah 52:13**	Jewish (Aramaic paraphrase)	***"My servant the Messiah"*** (Section V-B)
Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 98b	Jewish (rabbinic)	**Isaiah 53** language applied to the Messiah (Section V-B)
Rashi; Zohar; Maimonides; Nachmanides (Barcelona Disputation, 1263)	Jewish (medieval)	The national and messianic readings of **Isaiah 53** (Section V)
Origen, *Contra Celsum* I.55 (c. 248 CE)	Christian (church father)	Witness that Jews of his day read **Isaiah 53** of the nation (Section V-A)
Qur'an 2:186	Islamic	Allah near to the one who calls; ***intercession (shafa'ah)*** only by His permission (Section XII)

I. FRAMING THE QUESTION — WHAT CHRISTIANITY CLAIMS AND WHAT THE COVENANT ACTUALLY SAYS

I-A. The Christian Claim Stated Plainly

Christianity teaches that no human being can approach **Yahweh** directly because of sin, and that a single, permanent, divinely-appointed mediator — Jesus — stands between every person and the Father, making access to **Yahweh** possible only through him. The classic proof text is **1 Timothy 2:5**: ***"For there is one Elohim, and one mediator between Elohim and men, the man Christ Jesus."*** The Greek word is ***mediator (mesites)*** **(μεσίτης)** — a go-between, a middle person who reconciles two parties at odds. The same word appears in **Galatians 3:19–20** (of Moses as mediator of the Law) and in **Hebrews 8:6, 9:15, 12:24** (of Jesus as mediator of a ***"new covenant"***).

This claim is then read back into the Tanakh through three texts, in this order of frequency: **Job 9:33** (Job's lament that no umpire exists between him and **Elohim**), **Job 33:23–24** (Elihu's ***"messenger, one of a thousand"***), and **Isaiah 53** (the Suffering Servant who bears iniquity). Behind all three stands the New Testament's own explicit mediator statement, **1 Timothy 2:5**, and behind that stands the priestly argument of **Hebrews 7, 9**, and 10 — that the Levitical priesthood was structurally insufficient and required a priest who was more than human. The argument runs: Job longed for a mediator who did not yet exist; Elihu glimpsed him; Isaiah described his coming suffering; Hebrews explains why an ordinary priest could never have sufficed; the New Testament identifies him as Jesus. Therefore, the argument concludes, the Tanakh itself anticipates and requires a singular divine-human mediator, and rejecting that mediator is rejecting what the covenant was already pointing toward.

This document examines that argument text by text, word by word, against the Hebrew and Greek originals themselves, under the **Deuteronomy 19:15** two-or-three-witness standard. The conclusion will not be that Job, Elihu, Isaiah, and the author of Hebrews are irrelevant, or that mediation is absent from the Tanakh. It will be that none of the proof-texts says what the argument requires it to say; **that the Tanakh's own prophets promise a future restoration of the very priesthood the argument declares permanently retired; and that the Tanakh elsewhere positively describes the opposite pattern — direct, unmediated access between the covenant person and Yahweh, available at every point in the textual record, with no waiting required.**

I-B. Mediation Is Not Absent From the Tanakh — It Is Functional, Plural, and Temporary

It must be stated clearly at the outset: the Tanakh does contain mediation. Moses mediates the giving of the Law at Sinai (**Exodus 19:9, 20:19** [Hebrew 20:16]). The ***priests (kohanim)*** **(כֹּהֲנִים)** mediate atonement through sacrifice. Prophets mediate the spoken word of **Yahweh** to the people. This is not in dispute, and no honest covenant study denies it.

What is in dispute is the Christian claim's specific shape: that mediation in the Tanakh is

(1) singular — performed by one person rather than distributed across offices;

(2) permanent — fixed rather than functional and temporary; and

(3) necessary for any access to **Yahweh** — such that without it, direct approach is categorically impossible.

Every mediating figure in the written covenant fails all three tests! Moses's mediation was for the giving of the Law at one moment in history, not a standing barrier to prayer — Moses himself spoke with **Yahweh:**

"face to face, as a man speaks to his friend" **(Exodus 33:11)**,

And so did others, repeatedly, throughout the text. The priesthood mediated specific sacrificial acts, not the totality of covenant relationship — Israelites prayed, lamented, vowed, and confessed directly to **Yahweh** without a priest present in nearly every narrative instance the Tanakh records. The prophetic word was delivered by a messenger, but the response — repentance, obedience, refusal — was always made by the person directly to **Yahweh**, never through the prophet as a continuing intermediary.

II. JOB 9:33 — THE COURTROOM ARBITER, NOT THE DIVINE BRIDGE

II-A. The Text and Its Setting

The full unit reads:

"For He is not a man, as I am, that I might answer Him, and that we should come together in judgment. There is no daysman (arbiter, mokiach) between us, that might lay his hand upon us both." **(Job 9:32–33**, KJV)

The NJPS renders the same lines: ***"He is not a man... if only there were one to arbitrate between us, to lay his hand on us both."***

This statement occurs in Job's second response to his friends, in the middle of a long legal complaint. Job has just finished describing **Elohim**'s overwhelming, uncontestable power **(Job 9:4–20)**: He moves mountains, shakes the earth, commands the sun not to rise, treads on the waves. Against that power, Job says, no human being could mount a legal case —

"If I summoned him and he answered me, I do not believe he would listen to my voice" **(Job 9:16).**

Verses 32–33 are the climax of that despair: even if Job could somehow bring his case, there is no third party empowered to stand over both litigant and Judge and enforce a fair hearing.

II-B. The Hebrew: *Arbiter (Mokiach)* מוֹכִיחַ — "One Who Arbitrates, One Who Decides"

The word in question is the participle ***arbiter (mokiach)*** **(מוֹכִיחַ)**. According to the standard critical lexical sources, this participle derives from the root ***decide (yakach)*** **(יָכַח** — H3198, ***"to decide, to judge, to arbitrate"***) — a root used throughout Tanakh in legal and disputational contexts, not in contexts of priestly atonement or divine incarnation. BDB (*Brown-Driver-Briggs Lexicon*) glosses ***decide (yakach)*** in the Hiphil as ***"to decide, to judge; to convince, prove; to reason together; to***

reprove, correct." The participle describes an ***"arbiter"*** or ***"umpire"*** — what older English translations rendered ***"daysman"*** — someone competent to render a legal verdict between two disputing parties, not a covenantal or theological figure.

This is confirmed by multiple independent witnesses. The NET Bible translator's notes state plainly that the participle is ***"the 'arbiter' or 'mediator,'"*** from a verb ***"concerned with legal and nonlegal disputes,"*** describing ***"the beginning of a dispute, the disputation process, and the settling of a dispute."*** The United Bible Societies translator's handbook on **Job 9:33** observes that the Septuagint and Syriac both render the line as a wish — ***"Would that there were an umpire between us"*** — meaning Job is not making a doctrinal statement about salvation or atonement at all. This is the decisive lexical fact for the entire Christian argument: the Greek New Testament word for ***"mediator," mediator (mesites)*** **(μεσίτης)**, is not the meaning of ***arbiter (mokiach)***. The Septuagint translators, working in the third to second century BCE, did use ***mediator (mesites)*** at **Job 9:33** — the only place the word occurs in the whole Septuagint — but they used it inside a wish, ***"Would that there were our mediator,"*** as a translator's rendering of a Hebrew legal word for an arbiter, not as a Hebrew word that itself means ***"mediator"***. The standard reference works go further still: the technical term ***"mediator"*** **(middleman, agent of mediation)** has no dedicated equivalent in the underlying Hebrew vocabulary of the Old Testament; **Job 9:33** is the one place a Greek translator reached for it, and he reached for it to translate ***arbiter (mokiach)***.

II-C. What the Text Is Not Saying

Nothing in **Job 9:33** — read in its own Hebrew, in its own immediate context (**Job 9**, where Job is despairing that no human court could ever summon **Yahweh** to answer for his suffering) — describes:

(1) a divine being who shares **Yahweh**'s own nature;

(2) a sacrificial atonement for sin (Job's complaint here is about justice and explanation for his suffering, not about forgiveness for transgression — **he protests his innocence throughout the book**);

(3) a permanent theological office instituted by **Yahweh** for all mankind.

It describes a legal arbiter — a role the Tanakh elsewhere assigns repeatedly to human beings: prophets, kings, and even, as the wider context of the Job narrative itself shows, Job himself in his role as a lay-priest who offers sacrifice for his own household (**Job 1:5**) and who, at the book's end, is commanded to ***"pray for his friends"*** (**Job 42:10**) as the resolution of his complaint. The very book that contains the ***"no arbiter"*** lament ends with Job functioning as an intercessor himself — a human one. **Job 33:23–24** introduces a related figure, discussed fully below, whom the Tanakh's vocabulary of mediation — ***arbiter (mokiach)***, ***interpreter (melitz)***, ***intercede (palal)***, ***intervene (paga)*** —

consistently describes functionally, as an action a person performs, never as a metaphysical category a being occupies.

II-D. A Lament, Not a Prophecy

The grammatical mood of Job 9:33 is a negative declarative followed by wishful longing, not a predictive or messianic statement. Job is not saying, ***"Someday an arbiter will come."*** He is saying, ***"There is no arbiter between us"*** — full stop — and grieving that absence. Classic reference works describe the passage's ***"note of despair,"*** observing that it ***"shows that Job has no hope that such an arbiter between him and Yahweh is forthcoming,"*** even while conceding that the words give ***"pathetic utterance to the deep inarticulate cry of humanity for a mediator."*** That is the honest reading: a cry, not a prophecy. A human longing voiced in anguish is not the same textual category as a divine promise. The Tanakh elsewhere distinguishes its prophecies with unmistakable formulae — ***"Thus says Yahweh," "It shall come to pass,"*** oracular introductions, fulfillment notices. **Job 9:33** carries none of these markers. It is wisdom-literature speech: the candid, sometimes excessive language of a suffering man arguing his case — exactly the kind of speech **Yahweh** Himself will later say did not ***"speak of me what is right"*** in its particulars, even while vindicating Job's basic integrity (**Job 42:7**). Job never says, ***"I need someone to die for my sins."*** He says, ***"I need someone who can make this trial fair, because I cannot stand toe-to-toe with omnipotence and argue my innocence."*** These are different categories of need entirely.

Finding — Corroborated. Job 9:33 is a courtroom lament for an arbiter, not a promise of a divine mediator. Three witnesses agree: the Hebrew word itself, ***arbiter (mokiach)***, is legal vocabulary (**Job 9:33**); the surrounding complaint is a lawsuit Job cannot bring (**Job 9:2–3, 9:14–20**); and the book resolves the lament by **Yahweh** speaking to Job Himself (**Job 38:1; 42:5**). The claim that **Job 9:33** foretells a divine-human mediator: **Not in the text.**

III. JOB 33:23–24 — ELIHU'S "MESSENGER, ONE OF A THOUSAND"

III-A. The Text

The young man Elihu, who speaks after Job's three friends have exhausted their arguments, says:

"If there is for him an angel, a mediator, one of the thousand, to declare to man what is right for him, then He is gracious to him and says, 'Deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom.'" **(Job 33:23–24, ESV).**

III-B. The Hebrew: *Messenger (Malak)* and *Interpreter (Melitz)* — Function, Not Nature

The word rendered ***"angel"*** or ***"messenger"*** is ***messenger (malak)*** (**מַלְאָךְ** — H4397), from a common root meaning ***"one sent."*** BDB defines it straightforwardly as ***"messenger,"*** used by both human couriers (such as Jezebel's messenger to Elijah, or royal envoys) and of beings sent from the heavenly court. The companion word, translated ***"interpreter"*** or ***"mediator"*** in some English versions, is ***interpreter (melitz)*** **(מֵלִיץ)**, from ***interpret (lits)*** **(לִיץ)**, meaning ***"to interpret, to be a spokesman."*** Together the phrase describes a messenger who interprets — an intermediary figure who explains **Elohim**'s purpose in affliction to the sufferer, urging repentance.

Critically, Elihu frames this messenger as ***one of a thousand (echad mini-alef)*** **(אֶחָד מִנִּי־אָלֶף)** — not a singular, unique, cosmic figure, but one instance drawn from a vast company. Standard commentary observes the messenger ***"could be 'one out of the thousands of messengers' at Yahweh's disposal,"*** and notes the broader debate among interpreters over whether the figure is angelic, human (a prophet), or even Elihu's description of his own role as counselor to Job. None of these readings requires, or even suggests, a singular, permanent, divine-human mediator standing between every person and **Yahweh** for all time. Even here, the figure is described functionally — a messenger who interprets and intercedes — not ontologically, as a being who is simultaneously fully **Yahweh** and fully man. The passage describes **Elohim**'s ordinary providential pattern of using messengers — prophets, dreams, even physical suffering itself, per the immediately preceding verses (**Job 33:14–22**) — to call a person back from the pit of death to repentance. It is pastoral theology about how **Yahweh** gets a sinner's attention, not a doctrine of substitutionary atonement through a unique mediator-redeemer.

III-C. The *Ransom (Kofer)* Is Not the Same Claim as a Mediator

Some readings conflate Elihu's ***ransom (kofer)*** (**כֹּפֶר**) in verse 24 with the messenger of verse 23, treating them as the same figure performing a single saving act. But the Hebrew text presents **Elohim** Himself, not the messenger, as the one who ***"is gracious... and says, 'I have found a ransom.'"*** The messenger's role is to declare what is right; the granting of the ***ransom (kofer)*** remains **Elohim**'s own sovereign act of mercy, exactly as it does throughout the sacrificial system, where the priest mediates the ritual but **Yahweh** alone accepts or rejects the offering and grants atonement (**Leviticus 17:11**). The pattern is consistent across the entire Tanakh: human and angelic figures deliver messages, perform rituals, and call to repentance — but **Yahweh** Himself remains the sole party who forgives, ransoms, and reconciles. **No created being, however described, is ever credited in the Hebrew text with performing the reconciling act itself**.

Finding — Corroborated. Elihu's messenger is one of a thousand, and **Elohim** Himself grants the ransom (**Job 33:23–24**); the wider Torah pattern is the same, the priest serves but **Yahweh** grants atonement (**Leviticus 17:11**). A singular, divine mediator in **Job 33**: **Not in the text.**

IV. YAHWEH'S OWN ANSWER FROM THE WHIRLWIND — NO MEDIATOR APPEARS

If the book of Job were building toward the revelation of a future cosmic mediator, the most natural place for that mediator to appear would be the book's own climax — **Yahweh**'s direct speech to Job from the whirlwind in chapters 38–41. He does not appear. **Yahweh** speaks to Job directly, person to person, with no intermediary of any kind:

"Then Yahweh answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said: Who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge?" **(Job 38:1–2).**

Some thirty chapters after Job's lament that no arbiter exists, the book resolves not by supplying one, but by **Yahweh** Himself closing the distance and speaking face to face with the sufferer. Job's own response confirms this is exactly what he receives:

"I had heard of You by the hearing of the ear, but now my eye sees You" **(Job 42:5).**

This is the single most important structural fact in the entire book for this study. The text that supposedly establishes the need for a permanent mediator is also the text that narrates **Yahweh** bypassing every mediating figure and speaking to the sufferer Himself. If the Tanakh's own resolution to Job's lament is direct divine speech with no mediator present, the most natural reading of the book as a whole cuts against, not toward, the claim that an unmediated approach to **Yahweh** is impossible.

Finding — Corroborated. Yahweh answers Job directly, with no go-between, at the book's climax **(Job 38:1; 40:1, 40:6; 42:5)**.

V. ISAIAH 53 — THE SERVANT, NATIONAL OR MESSIANIC, IS ALWAYS HUMAN

This study presents the Jewish interpretive record honestly — there are two genuine strands, and intellectual integrity, together with **Deuteronomy 19:15**, requires presenting both rather than the one most convenient to either side of this debate.

V-A. Strand One: The National Interpretation (Servant = Israel)

The majority position within rabbinic Judaism from the medieval period onward identifies the ***"servant"*** of **Isaiah 52**–53 as the nation of Israel itself, suffering in exile among the nations. This reading draws directly on the immediately preceding Servant Songs, where the servant is explicitly named Israel (**Isaiah 41:8–9, 44:1, 44:21, 49:3**): ***"You are My servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified."*** Rashi (1040–1105 CE) is the figure most associated with popularizing this reading, though the identification of the suffering servant with the collective nation predates him: the church father Origen recorded in 248 CE, eight centuries before Rashi was born, that this was already the consensus reading among the Jews of his own time — that **Isaiah 53** concerned the whole Jewish people, regarded as one individual and dispersed in suffering among the nations, so that many proselytes might be gained through that dispersion (Origen, ***Contra Celsum***, Book I, Ch. 55).

V-B. Strand Two: The Messianic-Human Interpretation (Servant = A Future Human King)

This study must also document, honestly, that the national reading is not the oldest rabbinic reading, nor the only one that persisted after Rashi. Targum Jonathan — an Aramaic translation-paraphrase of the Prophets dated to the early centuries CE, predating Rashi by roughly a millennium — renders **Isaiah 52:13 (*"Behold, my servant shall prosper"*)** as ***"Behold, My servant the Messiah shall prosper,"*** applying the passage directly to a future Messiah. Tractate Sanhedrin in the Talmud likewise associates language from **Isaiah 53** with the names and sufferings of the Messiah. After Rashi, the messianic-individual reading did not disappear: the Zohar and Maimonides (Rambam) — arguably Judaism's most authoritative rationalist halakhic voice — continued to associate **Isaiah 53** with a future, human Messiah. Nachmanides (Ramban) is a mixed witness: at the Barcelona Disputation of 1263 he stated that the true sense of the passage speaks of the people of Israel, while he also explained it according to the midrash, which applies it to the Messiah.

V-C. The Decisive Point: Both Strands Keep the Servant Entirely Human

This is the load-bearing conclusion, and it must be stated plainly: whichever of the two authentic Jewish readings one adopts — **the Servant as the nation of Israel, or the Servant as a future individual Messiah — neither reading, at any point in the documented rabbinic record, identifies the Servant as a member of the Godhead, an incarnation of Yahweh, or a being who shares Yahweh's own essential nature**.

The ***"messianic"*** strand of rabbinic interpretation is messianic-human, not messianic-divine. The two-millennia-long internal Jewish argument over **Isaiah 53** has never been ***"nation vs. God-man"*** — it has been ***"nation vs. a future flesh-and-blood king from the line of David."*** Even granting

the messianic reading every possible benefit of the doubt, it does not arrive anywhere near the Christian doctrine of a divine-human mediator. The gap between ***"a human Messiah whom Yahweh raises up"*** and ***"a co-equal divine person who is also fully human"*** is not a difference of degree; it is the entire distance between covenant monotheism and a different category of claim altogether.

V-D. A Note on the Text Itself

It should also be observed, in fairness to readers across the Abrahamic traditions, that **Isaiah 53:8** — ***"for the transgression of my people he was stricken"*** — sits more naturally as a statement made by Gentile nations or kings about the suffering of a separate party (***"my people,"*** **i.e., Israel**) than as a statement Israel could make about itself in the first person without internal contradiction. This is a genuine textual tension acknowledged even by some defenders of the national reading, and this study does not paper over it. What this study insists on, however, is that the tension is a tension between two human referents — the suffering individual/king versus the suffering nation — not evidence of a divine referent. The interpretive difficulty **Isaiah 53** poses is real; the conclusion that it requires a divine mediator to resolve it is not established by the text and is not required by either authentic Jewish reading of the passage.

V-E. Even on the Individual Reading, the Servant Is Not Described as a "Mediator"

It must be conceded honestly, for the sake of a bulletproof study, that the question of **Isaiah 53**'s referent has genuinely divided careful readers across centuries, and this document does not claim the matter is closed beyond all possible dispute. But even granting, for argument's sake, the individual reading some traditions hold, the Hebrew text of **Isaiah 53** never once uses ***arbiter (mokiach)***, ***interpreter (melitz)***, or any cognate of a mediating-arbitrating term to describe the Servant. The vocabulary used is sacrificial and judicial: ***bear (nasa)*** (H5375, ***"to bear, to carry, to lift"***), ***carry a burden (sabal)*** (H5445, ***"to bear a burden"***), and ***intercede (paga)*** (H6293, ***"to strike, to intercede,"*** used in verse 12's ***"made intercession for the transgressors"***). This is the vocabulary of bearing punishment and interceding through suffering — a real and important covenant category — but it is not the vocabulary the Tanakh uses anywhere for a structural, permanent, singular go-between standing between every individual person and **Yahweh** as a precondition for prayer or forgiveness. A figure who suffers vicariously and a figure who permanently mediates all access are not, lexically or conceptually, the same claim, and the text of **Isaiah 53** supports only the former, if it supports an individual reading at all.

Finding — Corroborated that the Servant is human on every reading: the earlier songs name the servant Israel (**Isaiah 41:8; 44:1, 44:21; 49:3**), and chapter 53 itself calls him ***"a man of pains"***

(**Isaiah 53:3**). The identity of the Servant in chapter 53 remains disputed, and this study does not claim to close it. A divine Servant who shares **Yahweh**'s nature: **Not in the text.**

VI. 1 TIMOTHY 2:5 — WHAT THE GREEK TEXT ACTUALLY SAYS

Since the Christian mediator doctrine is most directly anchored not in Job or Isaiah but in the New Testament's own explicit ***"one mediator"*** statement, intellectual honesty requires this study to examine that text directly rather than only its Tanakh background.

1 Timothy 2:5 reads, in the Greek: ***"heis gar Theos, heis kai mesites Theou kai anthropon, anthropos Christos Iesous"*** — commonly translated ***"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."***

VI-A. The Grammatical Point That Matters

The Greek word translated ***"man"*** in this verse is ***man (anthropos)*** — and critically, as multiple independent grammatical sources confirm, there is no definite article (***"the"***) in the Greek text before this word. The verse does not say ***"ho anthropos"*** **(*"the man,"* implying a unique category)**. It simply says ***"anthropos" — "a man," "a human being."*** Multiple commentary traditions across the theological spectrum concede this point even while disagreeing about its implications: some argue the missing article is theologically insignificant and that the verse still implies a unique God-man; others argue the absence of the article is precisely the point — the verse stresses Jesus's full, unqualified humanity in his mediating role, structurally identical to the role the Tanakh assigns to Moses in **Deuteronomy 5:5**, not a different category of being altogether.

In Greek, ***the man (ho anthropos)*** points at a specific, identified, often unique referent — the way ***"the President"*** picks out one particular office-holder. Plain ***man (anthropos)***, with no article, functions more like a predicate of category membership — ***"a man," "a human being,"*** describing what kind of thing the subject is, not singling him out as the one-of-a-kind instance of that category. **1 Timothy 2:5** could have been written with the article if the author wanted to mark Jesus as a unique, categorically distinct kind of ***"man"*** — a God-man, a hybrid case standing outside the normal class. It wasn't. The grammar as written places him inside the ordinary category ***"human being"*** — the same word, same form, that would describe Moses, Job, or any other man in the Greek Old Testament (LXX) or New Testament.

VI-B. Why "Unqualified" Is the Load-Bearing Word

"Unqualified" here means not hedged, not modified, not given a special exception clause. The verse doesn't say ***"a man, yet also divine"*** or ***"in his human nature"*** — later Christological language, like Chalcedon's ***"two natures,"*** does say things like that, but that is 451 CE doctrinal vocabulary, centuries after the text, read back into it. The verse itself, in **1 Timothy 2:5**, simply states ***man (anthropos)*** — full stop! No qualifier softening or complicating the humanity of a man. That is what ***"unqualified"*** is pointing at: **the text does not itself introduce the hybrid-nature idea. Later theology adds that; the verse does not.**

VI-C. Structurally Identical to Moses in Deuteronomy 5:5

This is the comparison of doing the real work. **Deuteronomy 5:5** has Moses describing his own mediating function in almost identical structural terms: a human being standing between the people and **Yahweh**, conveying **Yahweh**'s word, performing a mediating role — as a man, only as a man, with no claim to share **Yahweh**'s nature. No one reads **Deuteronomy 5:5** and concludes Moses must be part-divine because he stood in that position. The role itself — standing between, declaring the word — does not require or imply divinity in the Tanakh's own logic. So the argument runs: if **1 Timothy 2:5**'s grammar gives you an ordinary, unqualified human being in a mediating role, and **Deuteronomy 5:5** already shows that an ordinary, unqualified human being filling a mediating role is exactly what the Tanakh's pattern looks like, then the New Testament verse, read on its own terms, does not get you anywhere a Mosaic-style human mediator wasn't already. It takes a doctrinal leap outside the verse itself to turn ***"a man"*** into ***"a man who is also Elohim."*** The text gives you Moses's category; it is later theology that supplies the upgrade. Read on its own terms without later doctrinal overlay, **1 Timothy 2:5** describes a human mediator — language fully at home within the Tanakh's existing pattern of human prophetic mediation, not a verse requiring or asserting a divine-human hybrid nature.

VI-D. A Note on the Wider Context (1 Timothy 2:5–6)

A fair-minded reader should know the strongest scholarly form of the counter-argument, not just a weak version of it. Some scholars argue that **1 Timothy 2:5**'s ***"one God"*** deliberately echoes the ***Hear (Shema)*** (**Deuteronomy 6:4**), and that this echo extends through verse 6 — ***"who gave himself a ransom for all"*** — as a conscious literary reworking of the Mosaic mediator pattern in **Deuteronomy 5**. In this reading, the passage is presenting Jesus as replacing Moses as mediator, while deliberately widening the scope from Israel alone to ***"all"*** nations.

This argument deserves to be taken seriously — and on inspection, it concedes the very point this study is making, rather than overturning it. Notice precisely what the parallel requires to work: the argument's own logic depends on Jesus occupying the same structural role Moses occupied — a

human being who ***"stands between,"*** whom Israel needed because they were too afraid to approach **Yahweh** directly (**Deuteronomy 5:5, 5:27** [Hebrew 5:24]). The scholarly case for an ***"echo"*** of the ***Hear (Shema)*** is a case for continuity of pattern, not a case for a difference in kind. It explicitly trades on Moses's mediating office being filled by someone else, doing the same kind of mediating — not by someone whose mediating role is now grounded in being divine rather than human. It is also worth noting that this scholarship explicitly sets aside the grammatical question; the intertextual case and the grammatical case are two separate questions, and conceding the first costs the doctrine nothing it was already missing on the second: the verse's own wording still gives an unqualified human being in the mediating chair, exactly where the Tanakh already expected one to sit.

VI-E. The Word *Mediator (Mesites)* Itself

It is also worth noting, as a matter of intertextual honesty, that the Greek word ***mediator (mesites)*** appears in the Septuagint exactly once, and that one occurrence — at **Job 9:33** — translates ***arbiter (mokiach)***, a legal word for one who decides a case, not a dedicated Hebrew ***"mediator"*** term, indicating that the concept of ***"mediator"*** as a fixed technical term is far more a feature of Greek theological vocabulary than of the original Hebrew conceptual world the Tanakh inhabits. The Hebrew Bible speaks constantly of ***intercession (palal)***, interposition (**Deuteronomy 5:5**'s ***"I stood between"***), and representative ritual action (the ***priest's (kohen's)*** sacrificial service) — but it does not build a single technical doctrine called ***"mediation"*** around a divine-human hybrid figure.

That architecture is a later theological development read back onto the Hebrew text, not a structure the Hebrew text itself erects.

Finding — Not in the text. 1 Timothy 2:5 is a New Testament verse and is weighed here as a comparative witness only. The Tanakh's own standing-between texts describe a human mediator (**Deuteronomy 5:5; 18:15**), and no Tanakh verse describes a mediator who shares **Yahweh**'s nature.

VII. WHAT YAHWEH ACTUALLY ESTABLISHED — THE CONSTRUCTIVE WITNESS

Having examined what the mediator doctrine's proof-texts do not establish, this study now presents what the Tanakh does establish — because covenant living is not merely a rebuttal of error; it is a positive embrace of what **Yahweh** Himself revealed.

VII-A. Moses: The Pattern, Not the Exception

Deuteronomy 5:5 records Moses's own description of his role at Sinai:

"I stood between Yahweh and you at that time, to declare to you the word of Yahweh; for you were afraid because of the fire, and you did not go up the mountain."

This is the single clearest ***"standing between"*** statement in all of the Tanakh — **and the one who stands there is an ordinary man, a prophet, born of human parents, who himself sinned and was barred from entering the Land for it (Numbers 20:12), and who is never once described in the Tanakh as sharing Yahweh's own nature**. **Deuteronomy 18:15** confirms the pattern is meant to continue: **Yahweh** promises to raise up future prophets ***"like Moses"*** — explicitly human, explicitly from ***"among your own brothers"*** — not a unique, unrepeatable divine-human hybrid, but a recurring human office.

VII-B. The Full Pattern of Human Mediation in the Tanakh

The documented pattern across the Tanakh is consistent and extensive: Abraham interceded for Sodom and for Abimelech's household (**Genesis 18:23–32, 20:7, 20:17**); Moses interceded repeatedly for Israel, including after the Golden Calf (**Exodus 32:11–14**) and for Aaron (**Deuteronomy 9:20, 9:26**); Samuel interceded as judge and prophet (**1 Samuel 7:5, 7:8, 12:19, 12:23**); David and Solomon interceded as anointed kings (**2 Samuel 24:17**; **1 Kings 8:22–53**); Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel each interceded as prophets in their respective generations (**2 Kings 19:4**; **Jeremiah 37:3**; **Daniel 9:3–19**). In every single one of these cases, without exception, the mediating figure is a human being, operating within a specific functional role — prophet, king, elder — and never once described as possessing **Yahweh**'s own divine nature.

VII-C. The *Priest (Kohen)*: A Mediating Office, Not a Mediating Nature

Yahweh did establish a formal mediating office: the priesthood. The ***priest (kohen)*** — and supremely the ***high priest (kohen gadol)*** on the ***Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur)*** — served as Israel's designated intermediary in sacrificial and atoning ritual, entering the Holy of Holies once yearly to perform the rites of national atonement (**Leviticus 23:27–32**). **This is a genuine, Yahweh-ordained mediating institution.** But it is critical to observe precisely what kind of institution it is: the ***priest (kohen)*** is, without exception, a hereditary human office — patrilineal descendants of Aaron, bound by purity laws, required to be free of specific physical and ritual disqualifications, and required to offer atonement sacrifices for himself before he could offer them for the nation. The office mediates through prescribed ritual action performed by an ordinary man; it does not require, depend upon, or even gesture toward the idea that the mediator must himself partake of **Yahweh**'s own essential nature. The entire architecture of Levitical mediation is built on the premise that a consecrated human being, following **Yahweh**'s prescribed pattern exactly, is fully sufficient for the task **Yahweh** assigned.

Finding — Corroborated. Human intercession and human mediating offices run through the Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings alike (**Genesis 20:7; Exodus 32:11–14; 1 Samuel 12:23; Daniel 9:3–19**), and in every case the mediator is a man.

VIII. JESUS AND THE PRIESTLY OFFICE — HEBREWS 7, 9, AND 10

This study would be incomplete without addressing the strongest form of the Christian argument built on the priesthood itself — that the Aaronic ***priest (kohen)*** was a temporary, flawed shadow of a coming priest who had to be more than human, because only a sinless, divine-human High Priest could fulfill what the Aaronic office could only foreshadow. This argument deserves a direct, honest answer rather than a sidestep, since it is the load-bearing case many Christians actually stand on.

VIII-A. The Argument Fairly Stated

Hebrews 7:11 asks why a ***"different priest"*** arose ***"according to the order of Melchizedek"*** if the Levitical priesthood already brought ***"perfection"***; **Hebrews 7:23–28** contrasts the many Aaronic priests, who died and had to offer sacrifices ***"first for their own sins,"*** with a priest who ***"holds his priesthood permanently"*** and was ***"made perfect forever"***; **Hebrews 9:11–14** describes Jesus entering ***"the greater and more perfect tabernacle"*** with ***"his own blood"*** rather than ***"the blood of goats and calves"***; and **Hebrews 10:1–14** argues that the law's sacrifices, repeated endlessly, ***"can never perfect"*** those who approach, while Jesus's single offering does what the law's shadow could not. On this reading, the Aaronic ***priest (kohen)*** was flawed not merely procedurally but ontologically — bound by his own sin, his own mortality — and Jesus alone could supply what the office structurally lacked, because only the Son of **Yahweh** in the flesh, sinless by nature rather than by ritual purification, could actually qualify.

VIII-B. Where This Argument Is Owed Real Credit

This study should grant, plainly, that the book of Hebrews does present Jesus's priesthood as categorically superior to the Aaronic one in ways the author never claims for any Aaronic ***priest (kohen)***: a priesthood that does not need daily repetition (7:27), a priesthood not interrupted by death (7:23–24), and an offering Hebrews calls sufficient ***"once for all"*** (10:10). A covenant-minded reader gains nothing by minimizing what the text actually says.

VIII-C. Where the Argument Overreaches the Text It Stands On

Notice exactly what Hebrews' own argument requires to function — and what it does not require.

First, the comparison Hebrews draws is explicitly with Melchizedek, not with deity as such. **Hebrews 7:3** describes Melchizedek himself — a human king-priest from **Genesis 14**, with no recorded Aaronic genealogy — using the word ***without genealogy (agenealogētos)***, and says he is ***"made like the Son of God"*** (Greek ***made like (aphōmoiōmenos)***, **a term of resemblance, not identity**), ***"remains a priest"*** only in the sense that Genesis records no death for him. The text's own logic point is genealogical and typological: an eternal, non-Levitical priesthood need not run through Aaron's bloodline to be legitimate before **Yahweh** — not that the priest filling it must possess **Yahweh**'s own nature. Indeed, Melchizedek, the very type Hebrews leans on for ***"permanence,"*** was an ordinary human being; nothing in **Genesis 14** hints he was anything else. If ***"permanent priest in the order of Melchizedek"*** only required a divine nature, the type Hebrews chose to argue from would defeat its own argument.

Second, the actual disqualifying feature of Hebrews names in the Aaronic office is moral and circumstantial, not metaphysical: Aaronic priests ***"die"*** (7:23) and must ***"offer sacrifices first for their own sins"*** (7:27) because they are themselves sinners. The text's diagnosis is that the office needed a priest who does not sin and does not die — not a priest who is part-divine. **These are not the same requirements.** The Tanakh itself already supplies the category for ***"a human being without that particular disqualification"***: Job is repeatedly called blameless and upright (**Job 1:1, 1:8, 2:3**) while remaining fully human; the want is moral sufficiency and endurance, not a different kind of being. Hebrews' own language — ***"tempted in every way, just as we are, yet without sin"*** (echoing 4:15, consistent with the ***"made like his brothers"*** of 2:17) — describes a man who did not sin, not a being incapable of sinning by nature.

A human who never once sinned satisfies the very deficiency Hebrews names; nothing in the text requires that such a man also be ontologically Yahweh!

Third, the claim that **Yahweh** ***"had to come as a human to understand human suffering"*** is not what **Hebrews 2:17–18** actually argues. The text says Jesus ***"had to be made like his brothers in every way"*** so that he could be ***"a merciful and faithful high priest"*** — language of qualification through shared experience, not language asserting that **Yahweh** Himself, in His own unchanging nature, was previously incapable of mercy or comprehension toward human suffering apart from becoming human.

The Tanakh's own witness runs the opposite direction: **Yahweh** is repeatedly described as already merciful, compassionate, and attentive to human affliction — ***"Yahweh is compassionate and gracious"*** (**Exodus 34:6**); He ***"heard their groaning"*** in Egypt before sending any mediator at all (**Exodus 2:24–25**). The premise that comprehension of suffering required **Yahweh** to become

human is not a claim the Tanakh anywhere makes about **Yahweh**'s own nature; it is an inference imported from later theology, not a deficiency the Tanakh itself identifies in **Yahweh**.

VIII-D. The Conclusion This Section Draws

Hebrews 7, 9, and 10 make a real and serious case that the office needed permanence, moral sufficiency, and a sacrifice that did not require endless repetition. None of that case, examined on its own terms, requires the priest filling that office to be part-divine. It requires a human priest who does not die and does not sin — categories the Tanakh already has room for in its own logic of a perfectly righteous man, without ever needing to cross into a different category of being. The argument that Jesus ***"had to be Yahweh in the flesh"*** to qualify is a theological conclusion laid over the text of Hebrews; it is not a premise the text's own comparisons — Melchizedek's typological permanence, the moral failure of sinning priests — actually establish.

Finding — Not in the text. Hebrews is a New Testament comparative witness. The Tanakh's own Melchizedek is a human king and priest (**Genesis 14:18; Psalms 110:4**), and no Tanakh verse requires the priest of his order to share **Yahweh**'s nature.

IX. THE PROPHETIC RESTORATION OF THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD

If the Aaronic priesthood were flawed in the sense the Hebrews argument requires — disqualified by its own nature, a shadow now permanently retired because something categorically better has replaced it — the Tanakh's own prophets present a direct problem for that reading. The Levitical priesthood is not merely remembered in the prophets as a closed chapter; it is explicitly promised a future, ongoing role, in the very same prophetic books Christians regard as anticipating the Messiah.

IX-A. Jeremiah 33:17–22 — The Priesthood Bound to the Davidic Throne

Jeremiah 33:17–22 sets the Davidic throne and the Levitical priesthood side by side as two parallel, equally enduring covenant promises: ***"David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel, nor shall the priests, the Levites, lack a man to offer burnt offerings before Me, to kindle grain offerings, and to sacrifice continually."*** **Yahweh** then makes the strength of this promise explicit by tying it to the fixed order of creation itself: the covenant with the Levitical priesthood can be broken only if **Yahweh**'s covenant with day and night can be broken — that is, never. Whatever this passage means about Israel's future, it places the perpetuity of the sacrificing Levitical priesthood on the same unbreakable footing as the perpetuity of the Davidic line — the very line Christians say culminates in the Messiah. A reading that has the Messiah permanently retiring the

Levitical office is in active tension with a prophecy that binds both promises together as equally everlasting in the same breath.

IX-B. Ezekiel 44 — The Restored Priesthood, With the Same Feature Intact

Ezekiel 44 describes the priesthood serving in a future, restored sanctuary in striking procedural detail — the sons of Zadok ***"shall come near to Me to minister to Me,"*** entering the sanctuary, approaching **Yahweh**'s table, keeping His charge (44:15–16), down to the fabric of their garments and the conditions under which they may approach the altar. Tellingly, this future priesthood still requires a sin offering for the priest himself after ritual defilement (44:27) — the very feature **Hebrews 7:27** names as proof the Aaronic office was insufficient. If the future, **Yahweh**-ordained restoration of the priesthood still includes a ***priest (kohen)*** offering atonement for his own sin before serving, then ***"a priest who must atone for himself first"*** cannot be the disqualifying flaw the Hebrews argument requires it to be — **Yahweh** rebuilds the office with that same feature intact.

IX-C. Isaiah 66:18–21 — The Priesthood Widened, Not Retired

Isaiah 66:18–21 goes further still, describing **Yahweh** gathering the nations to His holy mountain and declaring, ***"I will also take some of them for priests and Levites"*** — extending the priestly office outward to include those gathered from among the nations themselves, in a passage about the eschatological ingathering of ***"all flesh"*** to worship at Jerusalem (66:23). The Hebrew ***"from them"*** may also be read of the children of Israel brought home in verse 20, so that the scattered priestly families are restored to service (see Doc 288, Section VIII-B). On either reading, it describes a continuation of the Levitical priestly function in the very age the prophets associate with the Messiah's reign — not a final replacement that retires animal sacrifice and hereditary priesthood altogether.

IX-D. The Conclusion This Section Draws

It is worth observing plainly that Christian commentators wrestling with these three passages do not, on the whole, read them at face value; they typically argue the language must be symbolic, or fulfilled ***"spiritually"*** through the Church, precisely because the literal sense conflicts with the doctrine that the Levitical priesthood has been permanently superseded. That interpretive strain is itself informative: if these texts straightforwardly said what the doctrine needs them to say, they would not require reinterpretation to fit it. Read on their own terms, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah present the Levitical priesthood — sacrifices, sin offerings, hereditary office and all — not as a deficient system **Yahweh** intended to discard, but as an institution He Himself promises to restore and, in Isaiah's case, even broaden. An office **Yahweh** announces He will rebuild is not, by **Yahweh**'s own testimony through His prophets, an office that was irreparably flawed by its merely human nature in the first place.

Finding — Corroborated. Three prophets promise the priesthood a future: **Jeremiah 33:17–22**, **Ezekiel 44:15–16, 44:27**, and **Isaiah 66:21**. The claim that the Levitical office was permanently retired: **Not in the text.**

X. WHAT THE TANAKH ACTUALLY DESCRIBES: UNMEDIATED, DIRECT ACCESS TO YAHWEH

Per the **Deuteronomy 19:15** standard, a doctrine this consequential cannot rest on three contested verses and a single priestly epistle. The following witnesses corroborate the Tanakh's consistent, positive pattern: covenant members address **Yahweh** directly, with no human or angelic intermediary present, and receive direct response.

Witness One — Exodus 19:6: Israel as a Whole Is Made a *"Kingdom of Priests"*

At Sinai itself — the very covenant event Christianity cites Moses's mediation from — **Yahweh** declares the corporate calling of the entire nation, not a single class of mediators set apart from everyone else: ***"You shall be to Me a kingdom of priests (mamlekhet kohanim) (מַמְלֶכֶת כֹּהֲנִים) and a holy nation"*** (**Exodus 19:6**). The priesthood that follows in Leviticus is a functional office within Israel for the regulation of sacrifice — it is never presented as the reason ordinary Israelites could not speak to **Yahweh** themselves. The verse's plain sense is the opposite of a permanent-mediator doctrine: the whole covenant people is given a priestly identity and called into direct relationship with **Yahweh**.

Witness Two — Exodus 32:11–14 and 33:11: Moses Speaks to Yahweh *"Face to Face"*

Even as the mediator of the Law's giving, Moses's own relationship with **Yahweh** is described as the most direct, unmediated access recorded anywhere in the Tanakh: ***"So Yahweh spoke to Moses face to face, as a man speaks to his friend"*** (**Exodus 33:11**). When **Yahweh** threatens to destroy the people after the golden calf, Moses does not call upon a third mediator to intercede on his behalf — he goes directly, personally, and successfully changes the outcome: ***"Then Moses pleaded with Yahweh his Elohim, and said, 'Yahweh, why does Your wrath burn hot against Your people?'... So Yahweh relented from the harm which He said He would do to His people"*** (**Exodus 32:11, 14**). If direct, successful intercession before **Yahweh** without any further mediator were categorically impossible, this narrative could not exist as written.

Witness Three — Psalms: The Entire Book Is Direct Address, With No Mediator Named

The Psalms are one hundred fifty compositions of direct address to **Yahweh** — praise, lament, confession, petition — composed across centuries by multiple authors, none of which invokes a

mediating figure as a precondition for the prayer to be heard. ***"Out of the depths I cry to You, O Yahweh"*** (**Psalms 130:1**); ***"Yahweh is near to all who call upon Him, to all who call upon Him in truth"*** (**Psalms 145:18**). This last verse states the principle as a flat universal: nearness is conditioned on sincerity (***"in truth"***), not on the presence of an intermediary. David's direct confession after his sin with Bathsheba states the same pattern explicitly: ***"Against You, You only, have I sinned, and done this evil in Your sight"*** (**Psalms 51:4** [Hebrew 51:6]). David addresses **Yahweh** personally and directly about the very category of sin — sin against **Yahweh** Himself — that the strongest counter-text of this study, examined in Section XI below, claims requires an intercessor no one in the Tanakh possesses.

Witness Four — Daniel 9:3–20: Direct Confession on Behalf of the Whole Nation

In exile, with no Temple, no functioning priesthood, and no sacrificial system available, Daniel does not seek out a mediator — he turns directly to **Yahweh**: ***"I set my face toward Yahweh my Elohim, and prayed, and made confession, and said, 'O Yahweh, the great and awesome Elohim, who keeps covenant and mercy with those who love Him...'"*** (**Daniel 9:3–4**). The prayer continues for seventeen verses of direct, first-person confession and petition, concluding ***"O Yahweh, hear! O Yahweh, forgive! O Yahweh, listen and act!"*** (**Daniel 9:19**). This is precisely the situation — exile, sin, distance, no Temple access — in which a mediator would be most needed if the doctrine were true. None appears, and none is sought.

Witness Five — Joel 2:32 [Hebrew 3:5], Cited by Christianity Itself: *"Whoever Calls"*

The prophet declares: ***"And it shall come to pass that whoever calls on the name of Yahweh shall be saved"*** (**Joel 2:32** [Hebrew 3:5]). This verse is itself quoted approvingly in the New Testament (**Romans 10:13**, **Acts 2:21**), which makes it doubly significant under the two-or-three-witness standard: even the tradition arguing for a singular mediator preserves, without qualification or amendment, a Tanakh verse whose entire structure is direct address — ***"whoever calls"*** — with no mention of a required intermediary anywhere in the clause.

Witness Six — Isaiah 55:6 and 65:24: Yahweh Initiates the Closeness Himself

"Seek Yahweh while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near" (**Isaiah 55:6**), and most strikingly: ***"It shall come to pass that before they call, I will answer; and while they are still speaking, I will hear"*** (**Isaiah 65:24**). This is the covenant's own description of the closeness **Yahweh** intends with His people — a responsiveness so immediate that He answers before the prayer is even finished being spoken. This is the opposite structure of a doctrine requiring a fixed, permanent intermediary standing between the person and **Yahweh** before any approach can succeed.

Finding — Corroborated. Six witnesses (**Exodus 19:6; Exodus 33:11; Psalms 145:18; Daniel 9:3–19; Joel 2:32** [Hebrew 3:5]**; Isaiah 65:24**) show direct address to **Yahweh**, heard and answered, with no intermediary present.

XI. ANSWERING THE STRONGEST COUNTER-TEXT — 1 SAMUEL 2:25

XI-A. The Text and Why It Matters

A bulletproof study cannot ignore its strongest counter-evidence, and this is it. Eli warns his corrupt sons: ***"If one man sins against another, Elohim will mediate for him; but if a man sins against Yahweh, who can intercede for him?"*** (**1 Samuel 2:25**). The Hebrew verb in the first clause is ***will mediate for him (u-fillelo)*** (**וּפִלְלוֹ**), Piel of ***intercede (palal)*** (**פָּלַל** — H6419), meaning ***"to judge, to mediate, to arbitrate."*** The second clause uses ***pray (yitpallel)*** (**יִתְפַּלֵּל**), the Hitpael of the same root — the ordinary biblical Hebrew verb ***"to pray."*** This is taken by some readers as proof that the written covenant itself concedes no one can intercede when the sin is against **Yahweh** directly — precisely the gap a mediator like Jesus is then said to fill.

XI-B. Three Covenant Answers

First, narrow context. Eli's statement is a father's rebuke of two specific, unrepentant sons engaged in active, ongoing sacrilege — extorting sacrificial meat and committing sexual immorality at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting (**1 Samuel 2:12–17, 22**). It is a pastoral warning about the seriousness of their specific, willful, continuing offense against **Yahweh** Himself in His own sanctuary — not a systematic doctrinal statement about the structure of all forgiveness for all people for all time. The narrator's own following comment, that **Yahweh** ***"desired to put them to death"*** (2:25), confirms this is describing a specific case of judicial hardening after persistent sin, not a universal metaphysical rule.

Second, Tanakh's own subsequent record contradicts a universal reading. If Eli's rhetorical question meant no one, ever, can approach **Yahweh** directly for sins committed against Him, the rest of the Tanakh would have to be read as systematically false to its own stated rule. But David — whose sin with Bathsheba and murder of Uriah is a sin squarely against **Yahweh**, as David himself says (**Psalms 51:4** [Hebrew 51:6]) — receives forgiveness through nothing but his own direct confession, with the prophet Nathan delivering not an atoning mediation but a one-sentence verdict: ***"Yahweh also has put away your sin; you shall not die"*** (**2 Samuel 12:13**). Likewise Daniel (Witness Four above), the citizens of Nineveh under Jonah's preaching (**Jonah 3:5–10**), and Manasseh, king of Judah, who ***"humbled himself greatly before the Elohim of his fathers, and prayed to Him;***

and He received his entreaty, heard his supplication, and brought him back to Jerusalem" **(2 Chronicles 33:12–13)** — all of these are direct, unmediated repentance for sin against **Yahweh** Himself, all of them recorded as successful. Eli's rhetorical question, read against this consistent pattern, functions as a severe warning about the gravity of sacrilege specifically — not a doctrinal foreclosure of all future direct repentance, which the Tanakh itself goes on to depict repeatedly and successfully.

Third, the lexical range of *intercede (palal)* undercuts the absolute reading. The same root that produces ***"mediate"*** in the first clause produces the ordinary word for ***"pray"*** in the second — and ***"pray"*** is, throughout the rest of the Tanakh, precisely the verb used for direct, unmediated address to **Yahweh** (Daniel's ***and I prayed (va-etpallelah)*** in **Daniel 9:4** is the same Hitpael stem, spoken in the first person). Eli's question — ***"who can pray (yitpallel) for him?"*** — is most naturally read as Eli's own despairing assessment of his sons' specific hardened state, not a categorical theological ruling that overturns the dozens of successful direct-prayer narratives the same canon records before and after it.

Finding — Single witness. The universal reading of Eli's question rests on one verse (**1 Samuel 2:25**), and the Tanakh records forgiveness for sin against **Yahweh** Himself again and again (**2 Samuel 12:13; Jonah 3:10; 2 Chronicles 33:12–13; Daniel 9:3–19**). Eli's warning stands as a warning to hardened sinners; as a rule closing all direct repentance it is **Not in the text.**

XII. THREE-RELIGION AUDIT — HOW EACH TRADITION HANDLES MEDIATION

ELEMENT	JUDAISM	CHRISTIANITY	ISLAM
Primary Position	Direct prayer to **Yahweh** is the constant covenant pattern. Functional mediation (priesthood, prophets) existed for specific ritual and revelatory purposes but never barred direct address.	A singular, permanent mediator (Jesus) is required for any access to the Father, grounded in **1 Timothy 2:5** and the priestly argument of **Hebrews 7, 9, and 10**, and read back into Job and **Isaiah 53**.	Allah is near and answers the one who calls (**Qur'an 2:186**). ***Intercession (shafa'ah)*** belongs to Allah alone, and is granted only by His permission, not as a structural necessity.
Covenant Strength	Preserves an unbroken textual record of successful direct repentance —	Preserves the seriousness of human inability to stand before infinite holiness	Preserves the absolute uniqueness of the One whom Islam calls Allah —

ELEMENT	JUDAISM	CHRISTIANITY	ISLAM
	David, Daniel, Manasseh, Nineveh — without an intermediary's atoning role.	unaided, and the costliness of true reconciliation.	no being shares in His authority to forgive, which guards against the elevation of any created mediator to divine status.
Covenant Departure	Some retributive theology over-applies **1 Samuel 2:25** as a universal rule rather than a specific rebuke, in tension with the canon's own direct-repentance narratives.	Generalizing Job's lament, Elihu's pastoral image, and the priestly argument of Hebrews into a fixed metaphysical doctrine, and reading ***arbiter (mokiach)*** as if it meant ***mediator (mesites)*** — a Greek theological term with no dedicated Hebrew equivalent.	Popular devotional practice (saint intercession, tomb veneration) that some traditions permit risks the very thing the Qur'an's own direct-access verses guard against, per traditions that treat it as a departure from strict ***oneness of God (tawhid)***.
Covenant Convergence	All three traditions affirm: created mediating figures are functional and permitted by divine will, but ultimate forgiveness and access belong to the Sovereign alone, not to the mediating figure's own independent authority.	Jesus' mediation is never described as independent of the Father's will — he acts in submission to and dependence on the Father throughout the Gospel record, never as a rival or autonomous source of forgiveness.	Even where a created being is granted permission to intercede on the Day of Judgment, the Qur'an insists the permission itself, and the final outcome, remain entirely Allah's to grant or withhold.

The convergence point above is the most important finding of this study for cross-tradition dialogue: even where Christianity asserts Jesus' mediatorship, classical Christian theology has never claimed Jesus mediates independently of the Father's will — every New Testament mediator text subordinates the mediating role to the Father's prior authority (**John 5:19, 30**; **1 Corinthians 15:28**). Likewise, Islamic intercession is explicitly conditioned on Allah's permission, never on the intercessor's own power. The structural pattern — that no created being possesses independent authority to forgive or reconcile, and that all true reconciliation traces back to the Sovereign's own will — is the one place all three traditions, read honestly, actually agree. The dispute is not over whether mediation occurs in some functional, derivative sense. It is over whether the written Tanakh establishes a singular, permanent, necessary mediator as a precondition for any approach to **Yahweh** at all — and on that

specific, narrower claim, the Hebrew and Greek texts themselves, examined word by word, do not support it.

XIII. CORRECTIONS TO EARLIER LIBRARY MATERIAL

This revised edition replaces the July 2026 edition of Document 164. The following points were found and corrected in this edition. A search of the Miqdash Bethel Google Docs found no other library document repeating these points.

Correction 1 — The Septuagint and *mediator (mesites)* (Sections II-B and VI-E). The July edition said the Septuagint translators ***"did not render"*** the Hebrew word at **Job 9:33** with ***mediator (mesites)***, and in the same sentence said that **Job 9:33** is the one place the Septuagint uses that word. Both cannot stand. The Septuagint does use ***mediator (mesites)*** at **Job 9:33** — its only use in the whole Septuagint — inside a wish, as its rendering of ***arbiter (mokiach)***. Section VI-E had also said that occurrence ***"corresponds to no extant Hebrew mediator term"***; it now says plainly that it translates ***arbiter (mokiach)***, a legal word, not a dedicated Hebrew word for ***"mediator."*** The argument of the study is unchanged: the Hebrew word is a courtroom arbiter, and the line is a wish, not a prophecy.

Correction 2 — Nachmanides (Section V-B). The July edition listed Nachmanides (Ramban) with Zohar and Maimonides as continuing the messianic reading of **Isaiah 53**. Nachmanides is a mixed witness: at the Barcelona Disputation of 1263 he said the true sense of the passage speaks of the people of Israel, while he also explained it according to the midrash, which applies it to the Messiah. The text now says so.

Correction 3 — *"Forty chapters"* (Section IV). Job's lament is in chapter 9 and **Yahweh**'s answer from the whirlwind begins in chapter 38, about thirty chapters later. The text now reads ***"Some thirty chapters."***

Correction 4 — Qur'an 2:186 (three-religion table and audit). The words ***"without any mediator or intercessor"*** were set in quotation marks as if they were the wording of **Qur'an 2:186**. They are not; the verse says that Allah is near and answers the one who calls on Him, and ***"no mediator"*** is the teaching Muslims draw from it. The wording now keeps the two apart.

Correction 5 — Tanakh Books Cited table. 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings belong to the Prophets in the Tanakh, not the Writings. Ezra was listed but is not cited (the name appears only in ***"Ibn Ezra"***), and Leviticus and Jonah are cited but were missing. The table is corrected.

Correction 6 — Hebrew verse numbers. Three citations now carry the Hebrew number: **Exodus 20:19** [Hebrew 20:16], **Deuteronomy 5:27** [Hebrew 5:24], and **Joel 2:32** [Hebrew 3:5]. The earlier

corrections made during the Doc 405 work (**Daniel 9:4** and **Psalms 51:4** [Hebrew 51:6]) are carried forward.

Correction 7 — Format. The study is rebuilt to the Doc 250 standard: English book and personal names, English first with the Hebrew in parentheses, graded findings, a Comparative Texts table, this Corrections section, and the ten declarations of the July edition gathered into the standard Seven Covenant Declarations with nothing left out. The old website, phone number, and Louisiana address are removed from the title page and ending block.

XIV. SEVEN COVENANT DECLARATIONS ON MEDIATION AND DIRECT ACCESS

#	COVENANT DECLARATION	BASIS
I	The Hebrew ***arbiter (mokiach)*** in **Job 9:33** is a legal arbitrator, not the Greek theological ***mediator (mesites)*** of **1 Timothy 2:5**. Job's statement is a lament over the absence of such a figure in his own lawsuit, not a messianic prophecy of one to come.	**Job 9:32–33**
II	Elihu's ***"messenger, one of a thousand"*** in **Job 33:23** describes **Yahweh**'s ordinary pattern of using messengers to call sinners to repentance; **Yahweh** alone grants the ransom, and the messenger only declares. The book's own resolution — **Yahweh** speaking to Job directly from the whirlwind — answers Job's lament with direct divine address and no mediator present.	**Job 33:23–24; 38:1–2; 42:5**
III	The immediate context of **Isaiah 40**–55 repeatedly and explicitly identifies the Servant of **Yahweh** as the nation Israel; the messianic reading identifies him as a future human Messiah. Both readings keep the Servant entirely human, and the vocabulary of **Isaiah 53** describes bearing and interceding through suffering, never mediator or arbitrator terminology.	**Isaiah 41:8; 44:1, 21; 49:3; 53:4–5, 12**
IV	**1 Timothy 2:5**'s Greek gives an unqualified ***man (anthropos)*** with no definite article — the same category as Moses' mediating role in **Deuteronomy 5:5**. The verse's own wording does not assert a divine-human hybrid nature.	**1 Timothy 2:5**; **Deuteronomy 5:5**
V	The Aaronic priesthood's disqualifying feature, per Hebrews itself, is moral and circumstantial (sin, death), not a matter of nature, and the Tanakh's own blameless man already answers it.	**Hebrews 7:23–28**; **Job 1:1, 1:8, 2:3**; **Jeremiah 33:17–22**;

#	COVENANT DECLARATION	BASIS
	Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah each promise a future for the Levitical priesthood — sacrifices, sin offerings, hereditary office and all — on the same unbreakable footing as the Davidic throne. An office **Yahweh** promises to rebuild cannot be the irreparably broken thing the mediator doctrine needs it to have been.	**Ezekiel 44:15–27**; **Isaiah 66:18–21**
VI	Direct, unmediated address to **Yahweh** — by Moses, David, Daniel, Manasseh, the Ninevites, and the whole book of Psalms — is the consistent, successful pattern of the written covenant from Sinai through the exile. Eli's warning in **1 Samuel 2:25** is a specific rebuke to two unrepentant priests engaged in ongoing sacrilege, not a universal ruling, and the Tanakh's later record of forgiveness for sin against **Yahweh** Himself contradicts reading it as one.	**Exodus 32:11–14, 33:11**; **Psalms 51:4** [Hebrew 51:6], 145:18; **Daniel 9:3–20**; **2 Chronicles 33:12–13**; **1 Samuel 2:25**; **2 Samuel 12:13**
VII	Functional mediation — prophetic, priestly, angelic — is present throughout the Tanakh and is not denied by this study. What the written covenant nowhere establishes is a singular, permanent mediator whose presence is a categorical precondition for any person's access to **Yahweh**. The covenant's own pattern is direct relationship, available to whoever calls.	**Exodus 19:6**; **Joel 2:32** [Hebrew 3:5]; **Isaiah 55:6, 65:24**

XV. THE COVENANT RESPONSE — WHAT THIS MEANS FOR THE STUMBLING BLOCK

Kepha's own framing of this study calls the mediator question the biggest stumbling block between Christianity and a life lived directly under the written covenant. Having examined the primary proof-texts word by word — Job's lament, Elihu's messenger, Isaiah's Servant, Paul's Greek grammar, and the priestly argument of Hebrews — the covenant response is fivefold.

First: the lexical gap is real and decisive. ***Arbiter (mokiach)*** means one who decides a case, not ***mediator (mesites)***. ***Messenger (malak)*** means one sent, not the unique Mediator-Redeemer of later doctrine. ***Man (anthropos)*** without the article means an ordinary man, not a hybrid category. These are not minor translation quibbles — they are the entire weight-bearing structure of the argument, and they do not hold the weight assigned to them.

Second: the burden of proof has been inverted. The honest starting point is not ***"the Tanakh requires a mediator and we must locate him"*** but ***"does the Tanakh, read on its own terms, establish this requirement at all?"*** Examined that way, a handful of contested verses and one epistle's typological argument stand against a far larger and undisputed body of direct-access texts spanning Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings alike. A minority reading of contested texts cannot overturn the canon's own majority pattern.

Third: the priestly argument does not close the gap either. Whatever **Hebrews 7, 9**, and 10 require of the priest who fulfills them — permanence, sinlessness, a sacrifice not needing endless repetition — none of it requires that priest to be anything other than human, and the prophets who are said to anticipate the Messiah are the very ones who promise the Levitical office will be rebuilt, sin offerings and all, not permanently retired.

Fourth: this is not a study that erases mediation — it locates it correctly. Priests mediated sacrifice. Prophets mediated the word. Moses mediated the Law's giving. None of these offices ever closed off direct address, lament, confession, or petition — the textual record shows covenant members using both the offices and direct address, often in the same narrative, without the text treating this as contradictory.

Fifth: the invitation standing underneath this entire stumbling block is the same invitation the written covenant has always made. ***"Seek Yahweh while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near"*** **(Isaiah 55:6)**. Whatever any tradition concludes about Jesus's identity and role — a question this document does not adjudicate — the written Tanakh itself never makes a permanent intermediary the price of admission to that invitation. The door it describes has always stood open.

XV-A. Closing Covenant Word

"Hear, O Israel: Yahweh our Elohim, Yahweh is one." **(Deuteronomy 6:4)**

The mediator doctrine is, by the honest admission of its own most careful defenders, built on inference and theological development layered atop the Tanakh — not on a plain, unambiguous textual assertion that **Yahweh**'s own essential nature must be shared by the one who stands between Him and mankind. **Job 9:33** voices a courtroom longing for a human arbiter, not a doctrine of incarnation. **Job 33:23–24** describes one messenger among a thousand, declaring what is right while **Elohim** alone grants the ransom. The book of Job's own climax resolves the lament with unmediated divine speech, not a mediator's arrival. **Isaiah 53**, on either authentic Jewish reading, never leaves the category of the human. Even **1 Timothy 2:5**, on its own Greek grammar, names ***"a man"*** — language the Tanakh would recognize from Moses at Sinai, not a category the Tanakh would recognize as compatible with **Yahweh**'s own unshared nature.

Nor does the priestly argument of Hebrews close this gap. Whatever **Hebrews 7, 9**, and 10 require of the priest who fulfills them — permanence, sinlessness, a sacrifice not needing endless repetition — none of it requires that priest to be anything other than human; the Tanakh's own category of the blameless man already supplies what the text actually asks for. And the prophets settle what theology alone cannot: Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah all describe **Yahweh** restoring the Levitical priesthood — sacrifices, sin offerings, and all — in the very age the Messiah is said to reign. An office **Yahweh** promises to rebuild cannot be the irreparably broken thing the doctrine needs it to have been.

What the Tanakh establishes instead is a pattern as old as Abraham and as enduring as the ***priest's (kohen's)*** office, corroborated by six independent witnesses of direct address running from Sinai to the exile: that **Yahweh** draws near to His people through chosen human beings, and that mankind, in turn, may draw near to Him — directly, without requiring any being to share in what **Yahweh** alone is. ***"Seek Yahweh while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near"*** (**Isaiah 55:6**) — the door the written covenant describes has always stood open.

XV-B. Sources Consulted (Two-or-Three-Witnesses Standard, Deuteronomy 19:15)

Primary Text: Masoretic Hebrew Tanakh; Dead Sea Scrolls (where extant, for Isaiah); Septuagint (LXX); Targum Jonathan; Greek New Testament (**1 Timothy 2:5**; **Hebrews 7, 9, 10**)

Lexical: BDB (Brown-Driver-Briggs) Hebrew Lexicon; NET Bible translator's notes (**Job 9:33**); William D. Reyburn, *A Handbook on the Book of Job* (United Bible Societies, 1992) (**Job 9:33, 33:23–24**); standard Koine Greek lexical analysis of mesites/anthropos (**1 Timothy 2:5**)

Rabbinic/Jewish Sources: Rashi on **Isaiah 53**; Ibn Ezra; Radak (David Kimchi); Targum Jonathan on **Isaiah 52:13**; Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Sanhedrin; Zohar; Nachmanides (Ramban), Barcelona Disputation (1263); Maimonides (Rambam); Joseph H. Hertz, The Authorised Daily Prayer Book

Patristic/Historical Witness: Origen, Contra Celsum, Book I, Ch. 55 (248 CE)

Encyclopedic/Reference Corroboration: Standard encyclopedic treatments of the priest (kohen), the Jewish priesthood, and the Day of Atonement service (Yom Kippur Avodah); Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church

SCRIPTURE INDEX

REFERENCE	SUBJECT	SECTION
Genesis 14:18	Melchizedek, a human king and priest	VIII-C; VIII

REFERENCE	SUBJECT	SECTION
Genesis 18:23–32; 20:7, 20:17	Abraham intercedes for Sodom and for Abimelech's household	VII-B; VII
Exodus 2:24–25	**Yahweh** hears Israel's groaning before sending any mediator	VIII-C
Exodus 19:6	Israel made a kingdom of priests — corporate, not singular	X, W1; XIV
Exodus 19:9; 20:19 [Hebrew 20:16]	Moses mediates the giving of the Law at Sinai	I-B
Exodus 32:11–14	Moses' direct, successful intercession after the golden calf	VII-B; X, W2
Exodus 33:11	**Yahweh** speaks to Moses face to face, as a man to his friend	I-B; X, W2
Exodus 34:6	**Yahweh** compassionate and gracious	VIII-C
Leviticus 17:11	**Yahweh** alone grants atonement through the offering	III-C; III
Leviticus 23:27–32	The Day of Atonement — the high priest's mediating office	VII-C
Numbers 20:12	Moses barred from the Land for his own sin	VII-A
Deuteronomy 5:5	***"I stood between Yahweh and you"*** — the human mediator	VI-C; VII-A; VI; XIV
Deuteronomy 5:27 [Hebrew 5:24]	Israel asks Moses to go near for them	VI-D
Deuteronomy 6:4	The Shema	VI-D; XV-A
Deuteronomy 9:20, 9:26	Moses intercedes for Aaron and for Israel	VII-B
Deuteronomy 18:15	Future prophets ***"like Moses"*** — a recurring human office	VII-A; VI
Deuteronomy 19:15	Two-or-three-witness standard governing this study	Throughout
1 Samuel 2:12–17, 2:22, 2:25	Eli's sons and Eli's warning	XI; XIV

REFERENCE	SUBJECT	SECTION
1 Samuel 7:5, 7:8, 12:19, 12:23	Samuel intercedes as judge and prophet	VII-B; VII
2 Samuel 12:13	David's sin put away on his own confession	XI-B; XI; XIV
2 Samuel 24:17	David intercedes as king	VII-B
1 Kings 8:22–53	Solomon's prayer at the Temple	VII-B
2 Kings 19:4	Isaiah asked to pray for the remnant	VII-B
Isaiah 41:8–9; 44:1, 44:21; 49:3	The servant named as the nation Israel	V-A; V; XIV
Isaiah 52:13	Targum Jonathan: ***"my servant the Messiah"***	V-B
Isaiah 53:3, 53:4–5, 53:8, 53:12	The Servant bears and intercedes — vocabulary of suffering	V-D; V-E; V; XIV
Isaiah 55:6	Seek **Yahweh** while He may be found	X, W6; XV; closing verse
Isaiah 65:24	**Yahweh** answers before they call	X, W6; X; XIV
Isaiah 66:18–21, 66:23	Priests and Levites taken in the ingathering	IX-C; IX; XIV
Jeremiah 33:17–22	The Levitical priesthood promised beside the Davidic throne	IX-A; IX; XIV
Jeremiah 37:3	Jeremiah asked to pray for the people	VII-B
Ezekiel 44:15–16, 44:27	The restored priesthood still offers a sin offering for itself	IX-B; IX; XIV
Joel 2:32 [Hebrew 3:5]	Whoever calls on the name of **Yahweh** shall be saved	X, W5; X; XIV
Jonah 3:5–10	Nineveh's direct repentance	XI-B; XI
Malachi 3:6	**Yahweh** does not change	Doctrinal Authority
Psalms 51:4 [Hebrew 51:6]	***"Against You, You only, have I sinned"***	X, W3; XI-B; XIV
Psalms 110:4	A priest forever after the order of Melchizedek	VIII

REFERENCE	SUBJECT	SECTION
Psalms 119:89	**Yahweh**'s word settled forever	Doctrinal Authority
Psalms 130:1; 145:18	Direct cry to **Yahweh**; **Yahweh** near to all who call	X, W3; X; XIV
Job 1:1, 1:5, 1:8, 2:3; 42:10	Job blameless; Job intercedes for household and friends	II-C; VIII-C; XIV
Job 9:2–3, 9:4–20, 9:32–33	Job's lawsuit and lament — no arbiter (mokiach)	II; XIV
Job 33:14–24	Elihu's messenger, one of a thousand	III; XIV
Job 38:1–2; 40:1, 40:6; 42:5, 42:7	**Yahweh** answers Job directly from the whirlwind	IV; XIV
Daniel 9:3–20	Daniel's direct confession in exile	X, W4; VII-B; XIV
2 Chronicles 33:12–13	Manasseh's direct repentance and restoration	XI-B; XIV
1 Timothy 2:5–6 (comparative)	***"One mediator … a man"*** — no definite article	VI; XIV
Hebrews 2:17–18; 4:15; 7; 9:11–14; 10:1–14 (comparative)	The priestly argument of Hebrews	VIII; XIV

"Seek Yahweh while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near."

Isaiah 55:6 — The Written Covenant of Yahweh