
A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship* (TSF) *Bulletin* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin_01.php

THE THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS' FELLOWSHIP

TERMINAL LETTER FOR STUDENTS AND MINISTERS

AUTUMN 1959

39 BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

THE THEOLOGICAL JOURNALS IN 1958

(This survey, like its predecessors, confines itself to articles in English journals that are reasonably accessible, and makes no pretence of indicating more than a fraction of what is of interest or profit in these. The volume and full title of each journal is given at the first reference.)

THE TWO GREAT post-war discoveries, the Qumran texts and the Nag Hammadi library, continue to draw the longing eyes. The torrent of literature on Qumran must be unparalleled in the history of scholarship. We can do no more than salute it by the way with some weighty words from Professor Joachim Jeremias (*Expository Times*, LXIX, pp. 68ff.). The significance of the Scrolls for the New Testament, he says, is, first, that they teach us more of the historical background of Jesus — and here he deals with familiar themes, John the Baptist (indicating the difference of his once-for-all baptism from Essene practice), the origin of the Fourth Gospel (which the scrolls forbid us to treat as the product of Hellenistic Gnostic dualism), and so on — and, second, — and this is said less often — they show how completely new the message of Jesus was. 'There in the monastery by the Dead Sea lived the small group of ascetics, concerned with the highest degree of purity, unrelentingly separating themselves from the lost, even from the lame and the blind. Here is He who proclaimed to the poor and the distressed, to those who came before God as beggars that love of God which . . . . knows no bounds; He who proclaimed the coming of the joyous time in which the blind would see, the lame walk, and the poor have the Gospel preached unto them. There are two worlds which stand in contrast to one another: there in Qumran the world of Law and Lawfulness, taken in all earnestness, but also taken to the limit is its lack of love — here the world of the Gospel, with its proclamation of the boundless love of God and the joy of the blessed children of God.'

By comparison, material on the Nag Hammadi documents, for all sorts of reasons, comes more slowly. Those interested in the Gospel of Thomas of which some of the well-known Oxyrhynchus sayings ('Raise the stone and thou shalt find me . . .') now prove to be a part, should, if they can, seek out Professor Gilles Quispel's articles in *Vigiliae Christianae*; but for those for whom this is out of reach a preliminary guide is provided by R. McL. Wilson in *Expository Times*, p. 182. Dr. Wilson is clearly hesitant about some of Quispel's suggested restorations of Synoptic sayings from 'Thomas' material, and raises the question whether the completion of the parallelism does not blunt the point. The actual text of the 'Gospel of Thomas' is eagerly awaited. An introduction to the only Nag Hammadi text so far published, the *Gospel of Truth*, presumably by Valentinus, is contributed by C. K. Barrett (*Exp. Times*, pp. 167ff.). Dr. Barrett accepts substantially Van Unnik's judgment that this work of the earlier part of the second century used all the Gospels and nearly all the Paulines (including 1 Timothy), Hebrews, and Revelation and perhaps Acts, 1 and 2 Peter and 1 John. A fuller essay is given by the great Hermetic expert A. D. Nock (*Journal of Theological Studies*, VIII, pp. 314ff.).

In the realm of more conventional archaeology, some of the most exciting recent excavations have been those at Hazor, to which reference has been made in earlier surveys. General Yadin has continued his work there, and in *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XXI, pp. 30ff., describes the 1957 finds,

which included a magnificent gate of the Solomonic period. This gate is identical with that found at Megiddo, which is what one might expect if Solomon built both cities (1 Kings ix. 15). But the same passage notes that Solomon rebuilt the shattered town of Gezer that was the dowry of his Egyptian bride, and according to G. E. Wright (*BA*, pp. 103f.) Yadin has shown that the wall and gate excavated by Macalister at the beginning of the century, when archaeological technique was less gentle, was of precisely the same type as those of Hazor and Megiddo. In the same issue (pp. 96ff.), A. Malamat discusses the general picture of the reign of David and Solomon from the biblical and external records, and draws out a number of significant items in the interaction of Israel and her Egyptian and Aramaean neighbours, which brought the decline of the other powers in the day of Israel's splendour.

The 'Queen of Sheba' in the Solomon story is generally in these days associated with South Arabia. But contact with South Arabia has left few traces, and the discovery of an inscribed clay stamp at Bethel recently can be described as the earliest and possibly even the first South Arabian object found in Palestine. The date is hard to establish; but G. W. Van Beek (*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 151, p. 16) can say 'it proves that contact had been established . . . . early in the first millennium B.C., no more than two centuries and possibly only a few years after the visit of the "Queen of Sheba".'

Nelson Glueck's excavations in the Negeb continue (*BASOR*, 149, pp. 84ff., 152, pp. 18ff.), and not least interesting is his recovery of the sort of agriculture and defence system reflected in 2 Chronicles xxvi. 9ff.

These new undertakings do not mean that old friends have lost their charm. It has long been recognized that the Ras Shamra texts have affinities with the sections of the Pentateuch usually dated latest, necessitating the hypothesis of old tradition in a late literary form. Another has been pointed out by J. J. Rabinowitz (*Vetus Testamentum*, VIII, p. 95), where an Ugaritic formula for property transfer corresponds exactly with that in Leviticus xxv. 30, and, says Rabinowitz, 'speaks volumes against those who would assign a late date to the sections of Leviticus relating to the year of the jubilee'. Mari, too, has still much to teach, as E. A. Speiser (*BASOR*, 149, pp. 17ff.) shows in his comparisons of census practice.

The items mentioned so far relate to large-scale operations, but these very interesting studies appearing this year show how light can be thrown on the Scriptures by the skilled and careful observers without mountains of apparatus. In 1956 two members of the Tyndale Fellowship, Dr. M. J. S. Rudwick and Mr. E. M. B. Green, visited the site of Laodicea. The result of their observations may be found in *Expository Times*, March, pp. 176ff. Sir William Ramsay long ago argued that each of the letters to the Seven Churches reflects local circumstances well-known at the time. But why did the Lord prefer Laodicea to be cold rather than lukewarm? Rudwick and Green point out that in the local concentration of towns, Colossae had a regular supply of fresh water, and Hierapolis its famous curative hot springs. But Laodicea, for all its prosperity, had no natural water supply: its water must have come from the hot springs near Denizli; and they found the terminal part of the old aqueduct. The hot water, cooling slowly in the stone pipes, would be lukewarm when it reached the city: as that of the village of Eçirzli is today: 'Hot water heals, cold water refreshes, but lukewarm water is useless for either purpose' — in the ancient world it was, in fact, often used as an emetic. 'So the Church is charged, not with half-heartedness but with ineffectiveness.' Similarly, Mr. R. M. Ogilvie (*JTS*, pp. 308ff.) seems to have solved an old puzzle about the harbour of Phoenix in Crete (Acts xxvii. 12). Why does Luke say (for the RV and RSV translation of this verse is unsubstantiated) that the harbour faced north west and south west, when in fact it faces east? Even Ramsay could only suggest that Luke had excusably misunderstood Paul's account of the ship's council: but Ogilvie found evidence of two inlets in the now disused bay, one, now covered by earthquake disturbance, facing north west, and the other south west, and several other items which suggest that in classical times the western bay was the harbour.

Among general articles on archaeology, mention may be made of 'Early Christianity in Asia Minor' by S. E. Johnson (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVII, pp. 1ff.), which might be called 'The World since Ramsay', and 'Archaeology and Old Testament Studies' by G. E. Wright (*ibid.*, pp. 39ff.).

This deals with advances in chronology effected by archaeological means. 'While according to older textbook reconstructions of the history of the religion [the neolithic period] ought to be a period of animism, there appears to be evidence that shrines and high gods already existed.' Turning to the bearing of archaeology on the study of historical tradition, he says: 'Literary Criticism is an indispensable tool for the introductory study of written documents, but is not in itself the key to *historical* reconstruction.' Thus orthodox Wellhausenism had to be modified in the light of conclusions reached empirically by archaeological means: while the tradition-history school, despite their criticism of Wellhausen, completely refuse to use archaeological data in reconstructing early Israelite history. Noth 'does not do so because the presupposition of his methodology will not let him. . . . By his internal tradition history analysis Noth has concluded that there could have been no united Israel to have carried on such a united conquest', as the striking correspondence of several lines of archaeological study strongly suggests.

Dr. Wright is a leading member of the 'Albright school', and the master himself appears in *JBL*, pp. 244ff. on the topic of Bultmann's history and eschatology, a theme on which it is good to listen to one so concerned with the empirical study of historical data.

In the field of Old Testament history, mention has been made in the last survey of the thorough treatment by E. Danelius of Joshua xvi-xvii and the Ephraim-Manasseh boundary: the matter is brought to a satisfactory and painstaking conclusion in *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, xc, pp. 32ff., 122ff. Of more general interest will be the article by S. Talmon (*Vetus Testamentum*, viii, pp. 18ff.) on calendar reckoning in Ephraim and Judah, which takes us beyond the work of Thiele and others in understanding the complex chronology of Kings and Chronicles. Talmon shows how 1 Kings xii. 26f. discloses the real motives of Jeroboam, set as he was on breaking up the Davidic centralization of the nation. He was in effect delaying the Feast of Tabernacles, and no doubt reverting to an old Ephraimite calendar. But in the Chronicler's account of Hezekiah's Passover, itself an attempt to re-unite the northern remnant with Judah in worship (2 Ch. xxx), we find Hezekiah has made a concession (verse 2): the Passover has been delayed a month. 2 Chronicles xxx is, in fact, not an unimaginative projection of the Josiah account, but a genuine historical source, reflecting accurate detail. Verse 26 is literally true: it was the first fully united feast since Solomon. Josiah (and again the Chronicler, 2 Ch. xxxv. 17ff., sees the significance) is able to revert to the orthodox date at his Reformation Passover. Talmon takes his investigations further, making use of the Babylonian Chronicle discovered by D. J. Wiseman in synchronizing difficult dates, taking his study to Rabbinic times. We cannot pause longer, except to note how well the Chronicler is wearing these days, and to wonder, with Talmon, why, if Jerusalem centralization is the burden of the Deuteronomic Passover, the credit for the Deuteronomic Reform is not given to Hezekiah.

Dr. Leon Morris' work on the vocabulary of atonement is celebrated, and it is good to see another contribution of his in this field in *Evangelical Quarterly*, xx, pp. 196ff., where he deals with the *'asham*, or sin-offering, suggesting that its substitutionary and expiatory elements are more fundamental than is often supposed. More of Professor G. E. Ladd's studies in apocalyptic, referred to in the last survey, appear in *EQ*. In 'The Place of Apocalyptic in Biblical Religion' (pp. 75ff.) he examines Dodd's thesis of 2 Corinthians as a turning-point in Paul's eschatological thought, and finds realized and realistic (i.e. dramatic and futurist) eschatology side by side and both essential. In 'The Origin of Apocalyptic in Biblical Religion' (pp. 140ff.) he seeks to show that there is no need to give a Persian origin to a form whose roots are so manifestly in prophetic eschatology. Late Jewish apocalyptic undoubtedly surrendered the prophetic consciousness of God's Lordship of the present: but this was redressed in New Testament eschatology, which retains the antithetical two-age structure of the apocalyptic form.

An interesting note on another eschatological theme comes from E. M. B. Green (*Expository Times*, pp. 285f.), on the familiar crux '*we* that are alive and remain' (1 Thes. iv. 15, 17). In these verses Paul is not expressing an opinion about the Parousia coming in his lifetime (v. 2 shows that he shared his Master's ignorance on this point). He is dealing with those who taught that Christians alive at the Parousia would have the advantage over

those who were not, thus causing arrogance among themselves and distress to the bereaved. On the contrary, says Paul, 'the dead in Christ shall rise *first*: and' (almost ironically identifying himself with their outrageous claims) '*we* that are alive . . .'. It is a similar technique of argument that Paul uses in 1 Corinthians.

The authorship of the Pastoral Epistles has again become a discussable subject: and Professor B. M. Metzger, (*Expository Times*, LXX, pp. 91ff.) lists a number of so far unanswered arguments against P. N. Harrison's linguistic tests, which have for some time reigned supreme and been taken as proof of a largely post-Pauline origin. He concludes by citing the work of the Cambridge statistician, G. Yule, *The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary*, which implicitly calls in question the validity of many linguistic tests for authorship often used to biblical studies. Yule allows more for human factors than do many purely literary critics, and requires a work of at least 10,000 words — far longer than all the Pastorals together — for satisfactory computation; and he declares that statistical data can in any case not prove authorship, but only balance the claims of one author against another.

Another dogma often taken for granted, the dependence of Ephesians on Colossians, is challenged by J. Coutts (*New Testament Studies*, IV, pp. 201ff.), who holds that a great part of Ephesians is demonstrably prior to Colossians. G. J. C. Marchant (*EQ*, pp. 3ff.) carries out a patient examination of the New Testament vocabulary of the Body, with special reference to the work of J. A. T. Robinson and Ernest Best. To see how apparently abstruse philology can richly serve the preacher, one may read Dr. Neville Birdsall's note in *Novum Testamentum*, II, pp. 272ff.; for a warning of how easy it is to build a house on sand, one may read Dr. J. H. Greenlee's 'Some Examples of scholarly agreement in error' (*JBL*, pp. 363f.), in which he adduces several examples of slips by Tregelles — where subsequently some of its greatest names in textual criticism reflect the same error. Greenlee raises the question how many other erroneous citations of important manuscripts have been copied and repeated, unchecked. Alas: in many things we all stumble — and not only textual critics.

Fourah Bay College, Sierra Leone. A. F. WALLS, M.A., B.LITT.