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Caesarea Philippi is located near the foot of Mount Hermon and is the location for one of the three main sources of the Jordan River. It has importance as a biblical location for what Jesus said there and as an historically notable city.

For a coin collector like me, I like to think about Herod the Great who built a marble temple near the spot called Paneas as represented by the coin. I don’t have the coin but it is a cool one nevertheless.

There is a large cave from which the Jordan used to flow. Such a cave with a river flowing from it was why it acquired the name, the gate of hell. Given all the paganism, it might be the right name. The Greek fertility-god Pan was worshiped there. Idol images were placed in the carved-out spots seen along the road.

Phillip the tetrarch (Herod Phillip) enlarged the town and changed its name to Caesarea Philippi, in honor of himself and Tiberius Caesar. It was the capital of the area controlled by Phillip.

Agrippa II further embellished the town and changed its name to Neronias to honor Emperor Nero of Rome; but after Nero’s death the name quickly faded.

Titus, the Roman conqueror of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., staged gladiator shows there, pitting Jewish slaves against wild animals and against each other.

The Crusaders also lived there with a peak population of about 2,625. They used it as a key fortress to guard the main route from Damascus to Tyre at the point where it descended to the Hula Valley. The Crusaders fortified the city and used it for an attacking base against Damascus. Control of the city went back and forth between Crusaders and Moslems for most of the Crusader period. The Mamluks were the last to actually occupy the city.

For our purposes the passage in **Matthew 16:13-21** is most important. *“When Jesus came to the region of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, "Who do people say the Son of Man is?" 14 They replied, "Some say John the Baptist; others say Elijah; and still others, Jeremiah or one of the prophets." 15 "But what about you?" he asked. "Who do you say I am?" 16 Simon Peter answered, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God." 17 Jesus replied, "Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, for this was not revealed to you by man, but by my Father in heaven. 18 And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it. 19 I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven." 20 Then he warned his disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Christ. 21 From that time on Jesus began to explain to his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem and suffer many things at the hands of the elders, chief priests and teachers of the law, and that he must be killed and on the third day be raised to life.”*

In the time of Jesus the city was an obvious religious center. The temple to the Emperor was religious as well as the temples to the pagan gods. I went looking for the temple built by Herod the Great. (I don’t know if I found any remains from it but I did find a diamond pattern piece of a wall which is like the one I saw at Jericho at Herod’s palace there.)

The important question asked there was about who Jesus was. Peter’s answer was perfect. *16 Simon Peter answered, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God." 17 Jesus replied, "Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, for this was not revealed to you by man, but by my Father in heaven.* There is nothing more than can be said. Jesus is the Christ, the Messiah. He is the one and only Son of God.

Peter knew this, not because he was taught it but because the Heavenly Father revealed it. *17 Jesus replied, "Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, for this was not revealed to you by man, but by my Father in heaven.*

The keys to the kingdom are being revealed. There is a kingdom which is to come which will supersede the fourth and final kingdom.

God has always been about a kingdom. We see that as God met with Moses on **Mt. Sinai.** Exodus 19:3-6 “*Then Moses went up to God, and the Lord called to him from the mountain and said, "This is what you are to say to the house of Jacob and what you are to tell the people of Israel: 4 'You yourselves have seen what I did to Egypt, and how I carried you on eagles' wings and brought you to myself. 5 Now if you obey me fully and keep my covenant, then out of all nations you will be my treasured possession. Although the whole earth is mine, 6 you will be for me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.' These are the words you are to speak to the Israelites."*

God’s goal for Israel was they would be a holy nation and a kingdom of priests. That vision never changed. Indeed, Peter repeated that same desire to Christian Gentiles in 1 Peter 2:9-10 “*But you are a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people belonging to God, that you may declare the praises of him who called you out of darkness into his wonderful light. 10 Once you were not a people, but now you are the people of God; once you had not received mercy, but now you have received mercy.”*

In these kingdoms there would be laws and those laws would be applied. The law which God gave on Mt. Sinai formed the basis of relationship with Israel. It was both a simple and complex relationship. On the one hand the law was simple. Yet in daily life it often became complex. In the earliest days, Moses himself both instructed the people in the law and decided complicated matters of law for them. Moses said, “*Whenever they have a dispute, it is brought to me, and I decide between the parties and inform them of God's decrees and laws*."[[1]](#footnote-1) In time this became too much for Moses alone and he appointed assistants. His father-in-law, Jethro, gave this advice: “*But select capable men from all the people-- men who fear God, trustworthy men who hate dishonest gain-- and appoint them as officials over thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens. Have them serve as judges for the people at all times, but have them bring every difficult case to you; the simple cases they can decide themselves. That will make your load lighter, because they will share it with you.”[[2]](#footnote-2)*

In time, this group of assistants in the law became an institution in their own right. Authority soon rested among the rabbi’s to interpret the meaning of the law. They would consider the principles of the law, and decide issues. The decisions which they made had the force of the original law itself. Over the centuries, rabbinical expansion of the principles of the Law took place in all areas of community life.

The Rabbis were constantly called upon by their community to interpret scriptural commands. Was such-and-such an action permitted? Was such-and such a thing or person ritually clean? The law, for example, forbids working on Saturday but it does not define “work.” As a result, the Rabbis were called upon to declare what an individual was or was not permitted to do on the Sabbath. They “bound” (prohibited) certain activities, and “loosened” (allowed) other activities.

In the Hebrew way of thinking, binding and loosing[[3]](#footnote-3) is the interpretation of the Law. Anyone who acted in this capacity was sitting in the **Seat of Moses**. It is easy to see why they used that term. Since Moses had acted in this way when he was alive, interpreting the law, and since they were carrying on that tradition, they were sitting in his seat.

What we have in Matthew, the one Gospel originally written in Hebrew, is the transfer of this authority from Israel to the disciples. The Matthew 16 passage is important for two reasons. It shows the Jesus is the Son of God and it shows that the kingdom authority is transferred from the Sanhedrin to the disciples. Matthew 16:19*“I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven."*

**Matthew 18:18-20** covers some of the same topics.*"I tell you the truth, whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven. Again, I tell you that if two of you on earth agree about anything you ask for, it will be done for you by my Father in heaven. For where two or three come together in my name, there am I with them."*

First, let us show that authority with regard to the Law resided in humans and not merely in the text. Jesus himself acknowledged the authority that resided in the teachers of the law and among the Pharisees. “*Then Jesus said to the crowds and to his disciples: "The teachers of the law and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. So you must obey them and do everything they tell you. But do not do what they do, for they do not practice what they preach*.”[[4]](#footnote-4)

The early church recognized this authority and what it meant. Cyril of Jerusalem, writing in the mid-fourth century said, “The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses seat; for it signifies not his wooden seat, but the authority of his teaching.”[[5]](#footnote-5)

This authority found its highest expression in the Sanhedrin. Yet it existed down to the local town and synagogue level. Outside the gates of the excavated ruins of ancient Dan, I have had the opportunity to sit in a seat where once such decisions were made. There, the city elders gathered to “sit in Moses’ seat.” Proverbs 31:23 gives us a sense for this: “*Her husband is respected at the city gate, where he takes his seat among the elders of the land*.”

I believe it is in this context and with this meaning Jesus spoke the words which Matthew records. *“I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven."*

This is an important moment in the history of Judaism and the Church. Here is Jesus, the Son of God, investing the authority of Moses into the hands of his disciples. They now become the ones responsible for interpreting the law. This is decisive for it represents the transfer of spiritual authority. It places within the context of the church the authority held by those who sit in the seat of Moses.

Once the Church was established by Jesus, we find that this authority continued on. In the beginning of the Church, it was the Apostles themselves who sat in the Seat of Moses for the Church. The Church which took shape had a foundation. “*He came and preached peace to you who were far away and peace to those who were near. For through him we both have access to the Father by one Spirit. Consequently, you are no longer foreigners and aliens, but fellow citizens with God's people and members of God's household, built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets[[6]](#footnote-6), with Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone. In him the whole building is joined together and rises to become a holy temple in the Lord.[[7]](#footnote-7)*

God gave the Levites as a gift to the Tabernacle. “*I myself have selected your fellow* ***Levites*** *from among the Israelites* ***as a gift*** *to you, dedicated to the LORD to do the work at the Tent of Meeting. But only you and your sons may serve as priests in connection with everything at the altar and inside the curtain. I am giving you* ***the service of the priesthood as a gift****. Anyone else who comes near the sanctuary must be put to death.[[8]](#footnote-8)*

When Paul wrote Ephesians, he drew upon this concept for the various roles in the Church. He described these workers in the Church as gifts. To them, a primary role was assigned. “*It was he who gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers, to prepare God's people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ. Then we will no longer be infants, tossed back and forth by the waves, and blown here and there by every wind of teaching and by the cunning and craftiness of men in their deceitful scheming. Instead, speaking the truth in love, we will in all things grow up into him who is the Head, that is, Christ. From him the whole body, joined and held together by every supporting ligament, grows and builds itself up in love, as each part does its work.[[9]](#footnote-9)*

The Apostles stepped into their role and took charge of the Church. We see their authority in the instructions to Titus especially, and also to Timothy. Paul told Titus to "*straighten out what was left unfinished".* Then he proceeded to instruct Titus on what to say to the older men, the older women, the younger women and the young men. He told Titus to "*remind the people*" of certain truths, which of course sets that truth on a higher priority level than some other truth.

We also see Apostolic authority being exercised in the Acts 15 Council. On that occasion, they met to discuss the requirements for Gentiles. The question was how the law was to be applied to them. What was necessary for their salvation? After hearing various sides of the question, James said, "*It is my judgment, therefore, that we should not make it difficult for the Gentiles who are turning to God*.[[10]](#footnote-10)

What gave James the right to have a “judgment” in the first place? He was exercising the authority of the seat of Moses. Indeed, this was clearly more than just their opinions, for when they sent the letter out it was under the authority of what “seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us.…” They were laying claim to divine authority as well as their own. Tertullian summarized the events of Acts 15: “When first the Gospel thundered and shook the old system to its base, when dispute was being held on the question of retaining or not the Law; this is the first rule which the apostles, on the authority of the Holy Spirit, sent out to those who were already beginning to be gathered to their side out of the nations: “It has seemed (good),” say they, “to the Holy Spirit and to us to cast upon you no ampler weight than (that) of those (things) from which it is necessary that abstinence be observed; from sacrifices, and from fornications, and from blood: by abstaining from which ye act rightly, the Holy Spirit carrying you.”[[11]](#footnote-11)

In making the Acts 15 decision, the Apostles and elders were sitting in the seat of Moses, using the power of binding and loosing. If they did not have this power, then what different would their opinions make? However the Church has always recognized this authority. Once again, we turn to Tertullian, the Father of Latin Christianity, for his commentary on the authority of the Apostles and elders to make this decision. “Moreover, in that dispute about the observance or non-observance of the Law, Peter was the first of all to be endued with the Spirit, and, after making preface touching the calling of the nations, to say, “ And now why are ye tempting the Lord, concerning the imposition upon the brethren of a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to support? But however, through the grace of Jesus we believe that we shall be saved in the same way as the.:” This sentence both “loosed” those parts of the law which were “abandoned, and “bound” those which were reserved. Hence the power of loosing and of binding committed to Peter had nothing to do with the capital sins of believers….[[12]](#footnote-12)

For Tertullian, this is evidence of binding and loosing. Again and again, we find the Apostles and elders acting in the authority of Moses. In effect, the New Testament is the Apostolic application of the principles found in the Law. The Church has always accepted the right of the Twelve Apostles to do this and gave to their writings the same force as what we call the Old Testament Scripture. In the same sense that the Old Testament Law formed the basis of the Covenant with God, so the New Testament now forms the basis of our Covenant with God and we are thereby formed into the People of God.

Has this authority ceased in the Church. We say that the Church today has the right to apply the Scripture to issues that are not mentioned directly in Scripture, following the practices of “binding and loosing”, and sitting in the seat of Moses. That this power can be abused is evident in twenty centuries of church history. We have seen what happens when this authority is assumed by ever narrower aspects of the church. The term “**ex cathedra**” means “from the chair.” Using this expression is an attempt by Roman Catholics to claim that the Roman Church is infallible when it speaks “ex cathedra” because it is speaking from the “Seat of Moses.” But the “Seat of Moses” was not for purposes of adding to the Scripture, but to give an official interpretation on areas that were not clearly spelled out.

In modern evangelical understanding, binding and loosing has nothing to do with the authority of the Church except as it might relate to spiritual warfare. This error in thinking springs from a fundamental error in understanding about the Gospel of Matthew. What many today do not understand is that the Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew.

That Matthew was originally written in Hebrew is the unanimous view of the Church Fathers. Papias said, “Matthew put together the oracles of the Lord in the Hebrew language.”[[13]](#footnote-13) Irenaeus said Matthew was written to the Jews: “The Gospel according to Matthew was written to the Jews. For they laid particular stress upon the fact that Christ (should be) of the seed of David.”[[14]](#footnote-14) Cyril of Jerusalem also noted: “Matthew, who wrote the gospel, wrote it in the Hebrew tongue.”[[15]](#footnote-15) These are not obscure figures. Rather, they form the mainstream of the early church.

At present, no original copy of Matthew has ever been found in the Hebrew. However, if these early fathers are correct, what exists in Greek is a translation of the Hebrew. As such, it is subject to certain weaknesses. Translations of this period often did not translate the sense of a passage, rather they tended to follow the actual or literal words.

In particular, Hebrew idioms did not always make the transition intact.We know when someone says “his eyes fell to the floor,” not to take that literally. But consider the problem of a translator. What is an idiom, and what should be taken literally? We see this weakness reflected in the translation of the term “good eyes” in Matthew. This is a Hebrew idiom for a generous person. But that is not particularly clear in the Greek.

What about "binding and loosing" as spiritual warfare?

The idea of "binding" and "loosing" has risen to the forefront in some current teaching on spiritual warfare. What is interesting is the absence of these two ideas in the spiritual warfare that is mentioned in the Bible. If it were to be such an important part of warfare, one would expect to find it more prominently mentioned in the Scripture. In fact, it is most noticeable for its absence. In my opinion, far more emphasis is given to this idea than is warranted from the Scripture. At best, it is only a minor weapon among many weapons. More likely, it doesn't even exist as a weapon of spiritual warfare.

Why do some believe that "binding and loosing" are aspects of our spiritual warfare? Surprisingly, this is a new concept that has almost no history in the church.

The Belief that demons can be "bound" or that angels can be "loosed" is based upon a new interpretation of Matthew 16:10 and Matthew 18:18. These passages are interpreted to apply to spirit beings because of the phrases "bound in heaven" or "loosed in heaven." As the logic goes, since spirit beings exist in heaven, this passage must apply to them. (It is not clear how the passage could apply to demons which are not generally associated with heaven.)

What I call the "bind-loose theology" is heavily based upon a special interpretation of the "strong man" passages in Matthew 12:29, Mark 3:27, and Luke 11. In these passages, Jesus is showing that only a superior power can drive out demons. He then uses the example of a well-armed strong man who defends his house until someone stronger "attacks and overpowers" him, robbing him of his goods.

Luke's account emphasizes that the strong man is "attacked and overpowered," not mentioning anything about tying him up (binding). Matthew says the strong man must first be tied up before his house can be robbed. Mark, like Matthew, mentions that the strong man must first be tied up before the attacker can rob the house.

If Jesus meant to give this story as an illustration of "binding," Luke missed the point entirely and is leading us astray from the message. Luke's failure to mention "binding" is not misleading, however, because the point of the passage is not about "binding," but about the effect of superior power.

This is the emphasis which Tertullian gave to it. Notice that Tertullian, following Luke, retains the concept of superior power without getting into “binding:” “Well, therefore, did He connect with the parable of “the strong man armed,” whom “a stronger man still overcame,” the prince of the demons, whom He had already called Beelzebub and Satan; signifying that it was he who was overcome by the finger of God, and not that the Creator had been subdued by another god.”[[16]](#footnote-16)

Unfortunately, "binding the strongman" has become dogma in some circles. One book in my library, whose authors I respect highly for their service in missions, builds it's whole spiritual warfare concept around an improper interpretation of this passage. A better understanding is found in the historic interpretation of "binding."

I think caution regarding "binding and loosing" as spiritual warfare is in order. There are several reasons why I take this view.

First, no group or denomination in Christianity has ever interpreted these passages in this way before the last part of the 20th century. Of course, being a new doctrine or understanding does not necessarily mean the new doctrine in untrue. However, new doctrines need to be examined very carefully to see how they fit with the whole counsel of the Bible, and with the interpretation of that same Scripture over the centuries.

Second, over the centuries, the "binding" and "loosing" passages have been interpreted along the lines of the authority of the disciples to "sit in the seat of Moses." This means interpreting Scripture and conducting the affairs of the Church. The Catholic Encyclopedia expresses this idea when it says, "These powers, consisting of a "binding" and a "loosing" in the spiritual order on earth, that is, all powers necessary to the well-being of the kingdom, were recognized by the apostles from the rabbinical terms for "binding," that is, of granting or forbidding, as contained in the Jewish law." The Catholic view, which is shared by the other branches of the historic Christian church, has always been that binding and loosing were part of the authority granted to the Church, and are expressed in the idea of the "power of the keys.

Third, only Matthew records this idea, probably because he was the only one, according to Eusebius and the others we have cited, to write his original text of the Gospel in Hebrew. The passage regarding "binding" and "loosing" is a Jewish idiom translated word for word from the Hebrew into the Greek. Unfortunately, even though the words of the idiom were translated correctly, the meaning was clouded in such a literal translation.

Vine's Dictionary says "the application of the Rabbinical sense of forbidding is questionable.” However, prior to expressing that conclusion, Vine does give this passage its classical "spiritual authority" slant when he says, "The Lord's words to the Apostle Peter in Matthew 16:19, as to binding, and to all the disciples in 18:18, signify, in the former case, that the Apostle, by his ministry of the Word of Life, would keep unbelievers outside the kingdom of God, and admit those who believed. So with regard to 18:18, including the exercise of disciplinary measures in the sphere of the local church; the application of the Rabbinical sense of forbidding is questionable."

Notwithstanding the questions raised by Vine, Dr. Roy Blizzard[[17]](#footnote-17) takes the historic view held by Catholics and Orthodox, but for a different reason. He cites Jewish texts to show that "binding" and "loosing" were the terms applied to the work of the rabbi's in interpreting Scripture, allowing some things but denying other based on their interpretation of the meaning of the law. So if the rabbi said you were not allowed to walk more than a few hundred yards on the Sabbath, he was "binding" certain behavior. Although Jesus criticized the Pharisees for their hypocrisy, he did require his disciples to obey their interpretations. We have already shown Jesus saying, “The teachers of the law and the Pharisees sit in Moses's seat. So you must obey them and do everything they tell you.”

Fourth, of the many passages dealing with spiritual warfare, there is a noticeable absence of any teaching regarding "binding and loosing." In my book, Hedges, I demonstrated that there is a great deal in the Bible about spiritual warfare, examining every passage in the Bible on the topic of the relationship between humans and spiritual entities. In light of the extensive Bible passages, why does Paul omit "binding and loosing" in his classic passage in Ephesians 6? Why does James only talk about resisting the devil, stopping far short of the idea of "binding"? Why only resist, when you could "bind"? Indeed, why is there no plain statement linking "binding" and "loosing" with any part of spiritual warfare?

The answer is that "binding and loosing," the way it is being taught in some quarters of the Church, is not adequately rooted in Biblical teachings on spiritual warfare.

What the Bible does say is that Satan will be "bound" and "loosed." However, the reference is to Satan being bound in the future. No one is binding him today. *"And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years. And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season."* This future tense is the only proper application of this concept to spiritual warfare.

Fifth, if Satan is being "bound" as often as people are saying the words, their "binding" certainly does not last very long. If the "bind the devil" people are indeed "binding" the devil” somebody needs to figure out how long their "binding" of the devil lasts. Then, they could line up people all over the world on a "24-hour Bind Chain" to keep "binding" Satan, so he never gets loose again.

Some might suggest that only demons are being bound, not Satan himself. Is it possible, then, that we might eventually come to a point where all the demons are bound in chains of darkness and none are free to roam the earth? Would this leave only Satan alone to do all the evil work?

One problem with using "binding" and "loosing," as if it were a new aspect of spiritual warfare, is we are totally without support for just what it means to "bind" the devil. Who knows what it means? What can Satan do when he is "bound"? Unlike God, Satan is not omni-present. There is only one of him, and he is limited to one place at a time. According to this new interpretation of "binding," when one person has "bound" Satan, is he prohibited from doing anything to anyone else?

The further one probes this new idea of "binding," the more questions are raised. I am suggesting the reason all this becomes so imprecise when the details are exposed is because the whole notion is without Biblical foundation. Jesus had many contacts with the devil and demons, but He is never described as "binding" the demons. No New Testament writer ever describes anyone ever "binding" the devil.

In Luke 13, the sick woman was freed from her infirmity. It is plain enough that Jesus was involved in a physical healing because he laid his hands upon her, something which is never done with someone under the power of a demon. It is unfortunate that the old King James uses the phrase "spirit of infirmity" because some have suggested this was a demon of infirmity. However, would Jesus "loose" a demon? Would not "bind-loose" theology say the demon should have been "bound" rather than "loosed"? The Luke 13 passage would not support the "bind-loose" theology. Indeed, this passage would have to be explained away because of Jesus "loosing" the women from her infirmity.

In some respects, I am reluctant to speak against the current usage of "binding" because I hesitate to undermine anyone engaging in spiritual warfare. However, if there is no authority in the Scripture for this "binding," it is better to stop now than to continue building on sand. It is better to get back to biblical warfare than to continue on in a fool’s paradise. In war, firing blanks doesn't kill the enemy. We need effective warfare with live ammunition.

On the other hand, I believe God is able to understand our hearts rather than our precise words. I think God knows when we "bind" the devil that we are really praying "deliver us from evil," and He takes appropriate action, in spite of our theology or our words!
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