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

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

have neglected God Himself! A consideration such as this is humbling to all of us, and a call to be sure at the start of this academic year that our study is altogether submitted to God, to His Word and to His ways.

Cranmer Hall, Durham. FRANK R. ENTWISTLE.

1 The following provide helpful conservative statements:

General: *Revelation and the Bible.* Edited C. F. H. Henry (Tyndale Press).
'Fundamentalism' and the Word of God. J. I. Packer (I.V.F.).
The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible. B. B. Warfield (Marshall, Morgan and Scott).

On our Lord's view of Scripture, in addition to sections in the above:
The Old Testament in the New Testament. R. V. G. Tasker (S.C.M.).
Our Lord's View of the Old Testament. J. W. Wenham (Tyndale Press).
Ch. 7 of *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ.* N. B. Stonehouse (Tyndale Press).

THE THEOLOGICAL JOURNALS IN 1959*

IT HAS BECOME CUSTOMARY to begin these annual surveys with a series of disclaimers. First, reference is made only to articles in English, and to those only in journals that are fairly readily accessible, and, with but very few exceptions, to articles on biblical subjects only. Second, the survey makes no claim to represent more than a fragment of what is of interest and profit, even when all these self-denying ordinances have been observed. Third, it need hardly be said that it is intended only as a rough sort of signpost to the articles, not as an abstract of or substitute for them. It is not meant to be a meal, but a menu.

An enriching sea-change has recently been suffered by two journals which will be well known to many readers of the Newsletter. The old *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* has doffed its customary suits of solemn blue, and now stands forth as *Faith and Thought*, with the explanatory sub-title 'a journal devoted to the study of the inter-relation of the Christian revelation and modern research'. The Summer 1959 issue contains, *inter alia*, a survey of the importance of the Qumran texts for the Old Testament, by Professor F. F. Bruce — an excellent pilot for treacherous waters — and a paper marked by characteristic wide reading and independent judgment from Mr. T. C. Mitchell of the British Museum on Archaeology and Genesis i-xi. The *Tyndale House Bulletin* (available from Tyndale House, Cambridge at 2s.) has expanded from a modest eight to a portly forty pages, and gives pride of place to 'Some Egyptian background to the Old Testament', by K. A. Kitchen, a younger scholar in the famous Egyptological tradition of Liverpool University. Other contributions are on 'Apostasy in the Epistle to the Hebrews' (D. H. Tongue), 'Tertullian on Prayer' (O. W. Holmes), and 'The Altar in Joshua and Judges' (J. P. U. Lilley).

Studies of Qumran are now like the sand that is by the seashore, innumerable (though a recent writer has suggested that Theologies of the Old Testament will soon rival them for multitude), and for this, if for no other reason, the reviewer begs excusal from mentioning them further: for they deserve a separate article. The same may almost be said of studies on the Nag Hammadi texts, of which texts and translations of the Gospel of Truth and the Gospel of Thomas are now available, and on which a luxuriant literary vegetation can soon be expected. Among accounts in 1959 to which attention may be drawn are those by R. McL. Wilson, 'The Gnostic Library of Nag Hammaddi' (*SJT* 12, p. 161), and, specifically on the Gospel of Thomas, by Dr. Wilson and Professor G. Quispel, (*NTS* 5, p. 273, 276), and by W. C. Till (*BJRL* 41, p. 446). An important related point occurs in a 'Survey of Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts' by Dr. A. F. J. Klijn (*NT* 3, p. 161). Much stress has been laid on the 'Aramaic' character of some of the sayings in Thomas, which, it has been

* The volume and the number of the first page of each item is given. For abbreviations see the end of this article.

suggested, might favour origin at an early stage in the tradition of the Lord's sayings: but Dr. Klijn points out that the work is very likely of Syrian origin, and if this be the case, the 'Aramaisms' could easily be 'Syriasms', carried over from local speech (and thus not necessarily relevant to the preservation of the Lord's words at all). Syria, too, was the area where the freest handling of texts seems to have been allowed: in fact, Dr. Klijn concludes, only in patristic citations and in works of Syrian origin need one suspect serious contamination of the New Testament text by non-canonical matter.

So far, those of us who are not textual critics have heard but little of the Bodmer Papyri, whose publication is now under way: so, for the shape of things to come, a glance at F. V. Filson's note in *BA* 22, p. 48 may be to the point.

It would be sad if the plentitude of great discoveries that have — in God's providence, surely — been showered in our day, rendered stale and flat all the uses of archaeology in the more conventional form of the 'dig': for these are not less interesting than before. Previous surveys have mentioned the Hazor expeditions, for instance: and an outline account of the Fourth Season is provided by General Yadin in *BA* 22, p. 2. Among the discoveries he mentions is the first idolatrous Israelite cult-place to be found in Palestine (on the Judges xviii model), and a Canaanite stele of which the head has been lopped, evidently deliberately, at the time of the Israelite invasion — an instance of the conquest ordinances being taken seriously? Yadin is certain that after Canaanite Hazor was destroyed, the city was not rebuilt in permanent fashion until Solomon's time (1 Kings ix. 15): there are traces of nomad Israelites, but they are post-conquest, and lend no support to the theory sometimes put forward of a peaceful penetration before the Conquest by some Israelite groups. A historical synthesis of the excavations at Hazor, Samaria and Lachish is attempted by O. A. Tufnell (*PEQ* 91, p. 90), and G. E. Wright gives a bird's-eye view of the Samaria excavations (*BA* 22, p. 67).

Another article from Professor Wright (*BA* 22, p. 54) gives a collection of information on the Philistines, as they appear from their anthropoid coffins. Rabbi Nelson Glueck's splendid studies in the Negev continue (*ibid.* p. 82), with the justification of his conviction that 'numerous Middle Bronze I sites would be found in the Negev beyond those we had already discovered, and the existence of which confirmed the general validity of the historical memories of the Age of Abraham surviving in chapters 12, 13 and 14 of the Book of Genesis.' Copper-mining and copper-smelting sites were also found, in and alongside the Wadi Arabah (an illumination of the hitherto enigmatic Dt. viii. 9). In the same issue of *BA*, G. E. Wright has an essay emphasizing the magnitude of the achievements of Glueck with his Negev investigations, and another, well worth reading, defending Glueck, himself, and, by implication, the whole 'Albright school' from charges made by an eminent Judaic scholar (who is not an archaeologist) of framing their evidence.

Meanwhile, the illumination of Old Testament passages by analogies from Western Asia or Egypt continues. 2 Samuel xii. 14 is usually held to contain a euphemistic emendation, but R. Yaron (*VT* 9, p. 89) reveals a practically identical formula in the Egyptian 18th Dynasty Coptos decree. Both F. C. Fensham (*JBL* 78, p. 160) and Z. W. Falk (*VT* 9, p. 86) illustrate the variously interpreted Exodus xxi. 6, each showing by analogy that the slave is to be brought to the 'house of God', not 'the judges' (cf. RV mg.).

Professor Mendenhall's studies on covenant-formulations in the ancient world have been influential, and new evidence of this can be seen from an article by H. B. Huffmon (*JBL* 78, p. 285). He undertakes a formal comparison of ancient law processes with the passages in the prophets where Israel is arraigned as in a lawsuit. He distinguishes among the latter those which envisage the divine council, where (significantly, perhaps) no reference is made to the natural elements: and, on the other hand, those which open with a historical prologue and an appeal to the elements, and which proceed to indict Israel for breach of the Covenant — ultimately of the historical covenant of Sinai. The texts of treaties in the ancient world show a similar pattern, but with tell-tale differences: notably, that Israelite prophecy has no deification of the elements as though they were the divinities witnessing the treaty, for instance. Professor J. Muilenberg also deals with the form and structure of covenantal formulations (*VT* 9, p. 347) comparing the language of royal treaties, but stressing the role of the covenant mediator and throwing out some hints for New Testament theology.

Architectural, rather than literary, comparisons form the basis of a close study by S. Yeivin (*PEQ* 91, p. 6) of Jachin and Boaz, the twin pillars of Solomon's Temple. After defining by means of the comparative material the nature of the capitals, he holds that they could never have been, as is so often urged, the symbols, or the pegs for symbols, of the deity. Nor could they have been intended as the sign of the occupying Presence within — like the lance in the ground before a tent to denote occupation.

The nature of Old Testament theology is debated by H. L. Ellison and E. J. Young (*EQ* 31, pp. 50 and 136). One of the points at issue is whether there can be a theology of the Old Testament in and of itself, perhaps the crucial issue in all the present discussions on Old Testament theology. Dr. Young also holds that much of what passes for 'Biblical theology' today is not nearly biblical enough, and its proponents must prove the sincerity of their claim to be ruled by the Word of God.

A striking article by Professor James Barr entitled 'The Meaning of "Mythology" in relation to the Old Testament' opened the 1959 volume of *Vetus Testamentum* (9, p. 1). Myth, Professor Barr points out, is a totality, a complete way of looking at things. (The much harped-on 'three-decker universe' is not myth, because it is a detached fragment, and, by that very fact, sterilized as it were.) And myth is more than symbol — in myth, there is a genuine ontological relation between Tammuz dying and the cycle of nature. And 'not only does the myth teach the existence of the harmony, but ritual ensures that the harmony will in fact exist.' Now Israel, living among peoples who held a mythical world-view, broke the whole pattern of myth by the concentration on a fixed historical event, the salvation by God in the Exodus, and not on the permanent and cyclic aspects of nature. And the great battleground for the true faith of Israel was to be, for the greater part of the Old Testament period, whether God and nature were to be confounded. The consciousness of this, and the consequent breaking of the totality of myth means that the occasional use by Old Testament writers of items from the vocabulary of myth (like the 'great deep') carries with it no mythical connotation.

Professor Barr goes on to criticize assumptions familiar through the works of Mowinckel and S. B. Frost. While agreeing that myth is radically opposed to eschatology, he denies that cult must necessarily be so. In Israel, where the Exodus redemption was vital to national worship, the cult in fact transmitted to later generations the impulses to eschatology. The final form of this is apocalyptic: but there is no need to seek its origin in a mixed marriage of myth and eschatology developed during the Exile (why should Israel become more deeply impressed with myth then, as if it were a new thing?): it is, in fact, a natural outgrowth of classical prophecy; it is arbitrary to seek a distinction in the mode of using (sterilized) mythical terminology by the prophets on the one hand and the apocalyptists on the other.

Another aspect of Old Testament theology, sacrifice, is debated in the *Expository Times* by R. Dobbie and H. H. Rowley. Special attention may be drawn to Dr. Rowley's reply (70, p. 341), and particularly to his words about the claim that the prophets opposed sacrifice in principle. For instance, 'if Isaiah's denunciation of sacrifice in chapter 1 is absolute, then his denunciation of prayer is equally absolute, since it is included in the same condemnation', and he asserts the essential oneness of biblical faith (though in varying facets), as against the 'congeries of irreconcilable ideas' found, for instance, by Professor Dobbie.

An interesting little article by Z. W. Falk (*JSS* 4, p. 268) draws out the significance of some gestures referred to in the Old Testament. He sees in the turning to the left in Zechariah iii. 1, Psalm cix. 6, an allusion to the prosecutor's position on the right of the accused (from the judicial bench) and points to other allusions to the unfavourable position of the left (e.g. Gn. xlviii. 13, Mt. xxv. 32), to 'yielding the hand' (i.e. coming to an agreement), lifting the hand, keeping the right hand, and so on.

Among the contributions to literary criticism is yet another from the veteran conservative scholar, the Rev. G. T. Manley, on the Deuteronomic redactor in Judges (*EQ* 31, p. 32). He examines the main criteria for distinguishing the D-Judges. There is the 'Deuteronomic' view of history — but it is often palpably the same narrator who gives both tale and moral. There is the presence of 'Deuteronomic' style and vocabulary — but examination shows that some of the phrases said to be characteristically Deuteronomic do not

appear in Deuteronomy, and certainly there is not evidence enough to prove a direct literary dependence upon it. There is the recurrence of a Deuteronomic view of the Conquest — but in the admittedly ancient Song of Deborah the Conquest is already viewed as both complete and partial.

The antiquity of some of the other poems in the earlier biblical books is now a fairly frequent matter for discussion. The Song of Moses in Deuteronomy has not fared as well as some: but Eissfeldt has declared in favour of an eleventh-century date. This is accepted now by W. F. Albright (*VT* 9, p. 339), who in successive editions of *From the Stone Age to Christianity* had taken first a seventh- and then a tenth-century date.

The Law of Asylum is examined by M. Greenberg (*JBL* 78, p. 125), who concludes, without arguing anything for the date of its formulation, that the 'P-law' on the cities of refuge, with its view of the cities of refuge as expiatory (in Deuteronomy it is the political and humanitarian considerations that are to the fore) must be very ancient (1 Kings i. 36 is in fact an extension of the same principle). Israelite law is unique among ancient legal systems in that it allows no compounding with money for homicide; and alone with the Hittite in providing no death penalty for property offences.

The origin of the Book of Isaiah is the subject of a long paper by J. H. Eaton (*VT* 9, p. 138). While accepting a diversity of authorship for Isaiah, he insists on the unity and continuity of the book, and finds the key in the continuing activity of Isaiah's disciples. 'It may be suspected that an interpretation of chapters xl-lxvi, or of some part of them, in isolation from the rest of the book is liable to be seriously defective.'

Mr. H. L. Ellison is providing an interesting series of studies in Jeremiah in the *Evangelical Quarterly*. The first two (31, pp. 143, 205) deal with introductory matters and with Jeremiah's call. The extent and depth of Josiah's Reformation is considered, as is the question of the composition of the book. Mr. Ellison holds that the enlarged roll (xxxvi. 32) is reflected in chapters i-xx, and that Baruch may have supplied prose versions of some oracles which he had heard. Our book was early in written form. He scouts the idea that Jeremiah had a family tradition of hostility to the Jerusalem cult. Mr. Ellison is well versed in the literature of the subject, but has a strong mind of his own, and the series should prove very profitable.

Why was Jonathan not jealous of David? asks J. Morgenstern (*JBL* 78, p. 322). He answers by recalling that the institution of kingship was new in Israel, and that there was no necessity for the succession to go to the eldest son. Eight Edomite princes, for instance, are listed in Genesis xxxvi. 31f., 1 Chronicles i. 43f., and not one seems to have been the son of his predecessor. At least one came from outside Edom. Probably Beena marriage prevailed, with the king giving his daughter to an outstanding warrior, who thus became heir apparent. If Saul was expected to do the same, it explains not only the unembittered relations between Jonathan and David, but also Saul's exorbitant bride-price task for David, David's insistence on the return of Michal as part of the reconciliation with Abner, and his assumption of the role of blood-avenger of Saul and his family.

Before leaving the Old Testament field, it is interesting to cast a glance — without presuming to draw a moral — at the survey 'Old Testament Commentaries' (*ET* 71, p. 4). A panel of eminent Old Testament scholars were invited to recommend the best commentary in English on, first the Hebrew, and then the English, text of each book of the Old Testament. The age of many of the volumes is striking, as is the fact that in many cases a commentary has been included *faute de mieux*.

Whatever may be the truth about Old Testament commentaries, there can be no doubt that we are seeing fertile times for new translations, and good ones, too. This being so, one might at first think that a series of expanded paraphrases on the Pauline Epistles was somewhat otiose. However, a glance at the series (within the period of this survey Romans and Corinthians are the subjects) in the *Evangelical Quarterly* will give the assurance that there will always be room for this one. The paraphrast's name is not disclosed, but it requires no great critical powers to guess his identity.

A valuable article comes from Professor O. A. Piper of Princeton (*JBL* 78, p. 115), on 'The Origin of the Gospel Tradition'. It may be read in conjunction with Professor Riesenfeld's important pamphlet *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings*. Like Riesenfeld, he pleads for a 'demythologization' of the myth of the creative community of the early Church.

Sociology as well as sober criticism affirms that communities are receptive, not creative, entities. 'It is unthinkable that all the early Christian congregations together should have created the Christ myth.' He proceeds with some thought-provoking comments on the phenomenon of the common pattern of the three Synoptic Gospels which yet allows a wide range of freedom in the selection of materials.

By some extension of Parkinson's Law, the mathematicians have now entered New Testament criticism. In the last survey we mentioned Professor Metzger's comments, in the light of modern statistical practice, alleging the fallacy of using numerical tests to decide the authorship of the Pastorals. A New Testament scholar (K. Grayston) and a statistician (G. Herdan), working together, challenge the validity of Metzger's analogies, and apply a statistical analysis of the language of the Pastorals (*NTS* 5, p. 1). There are points for and against Harrison, but the general conclusion that emerges is that comparison of the undisputed Paulines with the Pastorals provides evidence to show a very different style. 'Whether this implies a difference in authorship depends on one's interpretation of what difference of style means.' This sounds rather as if we are at approximately the place we were before the calculating machines began to hum with Timothy's hapaxes. The patriarchal H. J. Cadbury's Presidential Address to the New Testament Society on 'The Dilemma of Ephesians' (*NTS* 5, p. 91) is quite agnostic on the application of statistical tests to the authorship of that book (and on most other things). A more sophisticated method of investigation, that of mathematical probability, is introduced into Biblical studies by J. Albertson (*JBL* 78, p. 133), who asks 'To what extent does the lack of Manuscript evidence for a given work during a certain period justify the inference that the work did not exist at that time?' and he attempts an answer with the specific question of the Book of Enoch, of which the Qumran versions, it may be recalled, do not have the Parables of the Son of Man. But a delicate reply follows from H. E. Robbins of the Department of Mathematical Statistics, Columbia University (*JBL* 78, p. 347). We transcribe not his evidence (which we do not understand), but his conclusion (to be known and read of all men). 'The wrong sort of hypothesis is being tested by an incorrect statistical criterion based on a false assumption of the nature of the probability in question. Few examples in the literature excel (it) in these respects, and it would be excellent as a cautionary example for classes in introductory statistical inference.'

The date of the Last Supper has long been a thorny question, and the profound study of Mlle Jaubert, *La Date de la Cène*, has aroused much interest by its reconciliation of Synoptic and Johannine data. Fundamental to Mlle Jaubert's thesis is the existence in our Lord's day of two separate Palestinian calendars: the Sadducean lunar calendar (according to which the Passover might fall on any day of the week) and the solar calendar used at Qumran at least (according to which the Passover would always fall on a Wednesday). In this particular year, she holds, the two fell in one week, on the Saturday and the Wednesday respectively, with the meals celebrated on the Tuesday and the Friday. These arguments do not convince Dr. George Ogg, who reviewed the book for *Novum Testamentum* (3, p. 149): but Mr. Norman Walker (*NT* 3, p. 317) returns to the defence. He does not accept later Christian liturgical practice as a serious source of information on such a subject, and he would give full weight to abbreviation of statement in the Gospels. Among the advantages of the Jaubertian chronology he sees the avoidance of four great difficulties of the Thursday dating: the divergence of the Gospel tradition on a matter of such significance: the blankness of the Wednesday; the amount which has to be crowded into nine hours; and the supposition that soldiers, judges, priests and mob were readily available at very irregular hours.

It is sometimes argued that the great hymn Philippians ii. 6-11 is of non-Pauline origin, or even an alien interpolation. J. M. Furness (*ET* 70, p. 240) contends that on every argument from language, poetic structure and context the passage is assuredly Pauline. The theological aspect he leaves in abeyance, but this is taken up afresh by R. P. Martin (*ET* 70, p. 183) in a note on *morphē* in the passage, a term which he suggestively links with the Second Adam doctrine. (Since then we have had Mr. Martin's splendid monograph on Philippians ii, *An Early Christian Confession*, which provides the most exhaustive discussion of the passage in English, as well as his

Tyndale Commentary on Philippians.)

An inscriptional parallel to the 'Corban' of Mark vii. 11 is noted by J. A. Fitzmyer (*JBL* 78, p. 60). E. M. B. Green (*ET* 71, p. 52) draws attention to a neglected fact about Syria and Cilicia. It was Vespasian in 72 AD who made Cilicia a separate province: previously Syria, Cilicia and Phoenice were a single administrative area. Now 33 and some other MSS omit the second article before 'Cilicia' in Galatians i. 21, Acts xv. 23, 41: i.e., they read 'Syria-Cilicia'. If this preserves the right reading, it might be a pointer to a pre-AD 70 origin for Acts. Light from modern Palestinian speech on words of the Lord was found by E. F. F. Bishop when an Arab chauffeur said to him of an escape in the war 'But my hour was not yet' (*ET* 70, p. 184) and when he found the lifted heel (cf. John xiii. 18) expressive of contempt and treachery (*ET* 70, p. 231).

Increasingly it is being shown how the thought of Old Testament passages is closely woven into New Testament contexts, often in a way which is not at first obvious, but which, when observed, makes a clear continuity of thought in the New Testament passage. A further suggestion of this sort is made by W. C. van Unnik (*NT* 3, p. 174), who sees in John xii. 34 an organic connection of thought through Psalm lxxxviii. 37 (and cuts across one of Bultmann's transpositions in the process). Another is in a little essay by A. T. Gelston in 'The Royal Priesthood' (*EQ* 31, p. 152), who traces the thought of the royalty given to Israel, and the concept of Israel's sovereignty among the nations, and the transference of this to the Church.

A text often used in ecumenical discussion nowadays is John xvii. 11, 'that they may be one'. T. E. Pollard (*ET* 70, p. 149) points out that the context is Christological: the Lord desires the sort of relationship between His followers as existed between the Father and the Incarnate Lord. Now, on any orthodox Trinitarian theology, that relationship cannot be parallel to the type of union which the text is so often used to support. Such a union would follow only from a Sabellian theology which ignored the personal distinctions within the Godhead.

In closing we may note a number of articles related to Scripture and Tradition. The *Expository Times* has had a series on Apostolic Succession, and the contributions of Professor C. K. Barrett (70, pp. 200 and 330) are worth particular attention. He notes as significant the way in which those who make most of the claims to apostolic succession through essential episcopacy make comparatively little appeal to Scripture, and asserts, 'Scripture *is* apostolicity'. Among noteworthy contributions on patristic views of tradition are those by E. F. Osborn (*JTS* 10, p. 335) on Clement of Alexandria, and his view of tradition as organically related to Scripture, and T. E. Pollard (*BJRL* 41, p. 414). Dr. Pollard shows how Athanasius, faced with the 'selective literalism' of the Arians, asserts the sufficiency of Scripture, the scope of Scripture (i.e. the necessity of taking its teaching as a whole), the 'custom' of Scripture (i.e. its 'sense') and the context of Scripture. Fourth-century father though he is, he seldom appeals to tradition, and when he does it is in close relation to Scripture. Of a tradition which provides a source of doctrine independent of or supplementary to Scripture, Athanasius knows nothing. Its rediscovery is an act of faith rather than of archaeology.

Fourah Bay College, A. F. WALLS.
The University College of Sierra Leone.

ABBREVIATIONS

BA — Biblical Archaeologist.
BJRL — Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.
EQ — Evangelical Quarterly.
ET — Expository Times.
JBL — Journal of Biblical Literature.
JSS — Journal of Semitic Studies.
JTS — Journal of Theological Studies.
NT — Novum Testamentum.
NTS — New Testament Studies.
PEQ — Palestine Exploration Quarterly.
SJT — Scottish Journal of Theology.
VT — Vetus Testamentum.