

Bibliography

SOME BIBLICAL STUDIES OF 1961

by A. F. Walls

The bibliographical article in this issue is concerned with articles appearing in English on Biblical subjects in some learned journals during 1961. It is reproduced, with some alterations, by kind permission of the *Theological Students Fellowship Bulletin*, in which it appeared as an instalment of an annual survey. The author is Head of the Crowther College of Religion in the University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

The Chief Editor of the Oxford English Dictionary, it is said, pierced hearts with the cry, "We must limit research!" and he lived in days of moderate harvest. Are we to shout for joy because the pastures are clothed with flocks of journals and the valleys covered over with monographs? This survey swings a highly selective sickle over small corners of an enormous field. It is restricted to journals accessible in modest libraries, to articles in English, and, generally speaking, to Biblical subjects. It repudiates with horror any suggestion of omniscience or omnicompetence, and is offered – like the Copper Scroll of Qumran – as an invitation to treasure hunting, not as a catalogue of the trove.

Now that features of literary style are fed through electronic computers, it is meet that the excavation of Biblical sites be assisted by technological advance; and gratifying, therefore, that an American marine expedition, frogmen and all, has been making under-water examinations of Caesarea harbour (C. T. Fritsch and I. Ben-Dor, *BA** 24 p. 50). No doubt some future extension of Telstar will enable us to see the Israelites actually encircling the walls of Jericho. In the meantime, however, we must submit to an element of uncertainty in our interpretation of archaeological results. Y. Aharoni, for instance (*BA* 24 p. 98) reports on the excavations at Ramat Rahel, now tentatively identified with Bethhakerem. The site promises

* For abbreviations, see end of the article.

the best view yet of a royal palace – but which palace can it be? Having been forced to abandon the suggestion that it is Uzziah's leprosarium (2 Kings 15.5), Aharoni now points to the new palace which Jehoiakim apparently built and Jeremiah denounced (Jer. 22.13-19). Is this why Jeremiah declares that Jehoiakim will be 'cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem'?

On the other hand, the progress of archaeology often leads to the confirmation of tentative proposals and the filling in of gaps. The new excavations at Gibeon, says J. B. Pritchard (*BA* 24 p. 19) have produced 'the missing link for the occupation of Gibeon in the Canaanite period immediately before the time of Joshua, when 'Gibeon was a great city, as one of the royal cities, . . . greater than Ai (Josh. 10.2)'.⁷

A principal effect of archaeological study has been to set the Old Testament against the background of the life of Israel's neighbours. One interesting piece of minor comparative study is carried out by S. Bertman (*BA* 24 p. 119), who concludes that garments with tassels (he would say, quarter-way point and corner appendages) such as are ordained for the Israelites, are worn elsewhere in the Eastern Mediterranean area as a badge of a special status, by gods, kings, rulers, warriors. In Num. 15.37ff., the context of the ordinance is the divine redemption of Israel as a people for God – are the tassels the mark of this special status shared by *all* Israelites? One of the oldest spheres of comparison of Israel and the rest of the ancient East, that of law, is

clearly not yet exhausted. It seems that it is no longer correct to say that the 'apodictic' law-form (such as the characteristic 'thou shalt not') is peculiar to Israel: S. Gevirtz (*VT* 11 p. 137) adduces parallels from West Semitic curse formulae (which include, incidentally, the mixture of second and third person which is sometimes attributed to editorial malformation in Ex. 21.2-6). But what of the 'casuistic' laws, to which as all acknowledge, there are abundant parallels outside Israel? Are we to assume that this form was borrowed from the Canaanites in the Judges period, as the Alt school have it? No, replies F. C. Fensham (*PEQ* 93 p. 143): Israel was a *people*, not a mob: from the beginning it must have had its prescriptions for dealing with situations which could occur in any community. Furthermore, deep in the Biblical tradition is the association of the law with *covenant*. Mendenhall has produced a 14-13th century (i.e. Exodus-period) Hittite parallel to this, and part is in casuistic form. The common background of early Israel with the *Mesopotamian* world is too clear for coincidence. The best explanation, Fensham argues, is that the tradition of patriarchal practice was preserved. (It might be interesting to consider whether there are theological side-effects if one begins the story of Israel with the Judges amphictyony, as is fashionable in some quarters, rather than with Abraham, like an older Semitist called Paul). One minor contrast between Israel and her neighbours which also has its theological side, is brought out incidentally in Professor D. Winton Thomas' study of

the sixth century, and the Exile in particular, as a creative epoch (*JSS* 6 p. 61). Comparison of the Assyrian records and their bombast with the Deuteronomic history he says, demonstrates the concentration of the Old Testament writers upon national *failure*. On the New Year Festival, of course, scholars remain divided as to whether the Old Testament and the rest of the Near East show similarity or contrast. There has been less discussion about the other festivals. Much interesting, if controversial, material is provided in a reassessment by J. B. Segal (*JSS* 6 p. 74). We can pause only for one feature: his insistence, in the light of the doom which overtakes all drastic attempts at calendar reform, that the Hebrew festivals were governed by the calendar. Thus to admit that harvest would vary from year to year and from place to place is not to say that the non-Passover feasts were not fixed: whatever the date of Lev. 23, the occasions to which it refers are early. This brings us to the subject of Pentateuchal criticism, on which S. Sandmel has some provocative things to say (*JBL* 80 p. 106). After reading his essay on Haggadah in Scripture no-one will accuse Rabbi Sandmel of proto-, neo-, or crypto-fundamentalism: but he shares with many who receive such accusations a grave distrust of the psychological implications of much received literary criticism of the Pentateuch ('the premise behind such studies seems to be that nobody ever wrote anything - he only copied sources'), and admiration at the feats attributed to that mighty man of valour, RJE. Departing in a

shower of epigrams, he declares that while the Graf-Wellhausen reconstruction must still be the point of departure, this very fact implies the need to depart from it. In talking of which, a reference to W. L. Holladay, *VT* 11 p. 170 may be allowed, even though neglecting his main thesis that the 'Deuteronomic' phrase of 2 Kings 17.10 and elsewhere goes back to Hos. 4.13. What is striking is his remark that the Deuteronomic law-code (Dt. 12-24, minus the introduction in 12.1-7) 'would seem to be old and undatable'. M. Haran (*VT* 11 p. 159) has an interesting article on the Gibeonites, the Nethinim and the sons of Solomon's servants, in which he maintains the connexion (not the identity) of these bodies. On the way he obviates the discrepancy often found between 1 Kings 5.13f. and 1 Kings 9.22, by distinguishing the general term *mas*, forced labour, which Solomon exacted from Israel for certain periods, from the more specific *mas obed*, which entailed life-long servitude, and was carried out on Canaanites only. The much-dissected Psalm 89 receives sensitive treatment from J. M. Ward (*VT* 11 p. 321) who concludes that it is from first to last a unity in form and concept ('a dramatic movement of ideas, poetically integrated, that proceeds to the logical climax in the poignant plea of the last six lines') and makes suggestions about its liturgical setting. H. L. Ellison's studies in Jeremiah have continued, and surely to the profit of many (*EQ* 33, pp. 16, 148, 220). Mr. Ellison is never in bondage to any man, and his interpretation, with its

proposed chronology, is invariably suggestive, even where it will not command agreement. Not the least valuable feature are his obiter dicta, e.g. 'However spiritual and wise a man may be, once he comes to think of himself as God's necessary instrument, there is no foreseeing to what depths self-interest may drag him down.'

Among lexical studies on the Old Testament may be noted those of H. H. Hirschberg (*VT* 11 p. 373) who seeks to remove a whole series of difficulties and obscurities by the help of Arabic vocabulary. It is for lexicographers to judge of his success. One of his most startling results is the uprooting of the tree of life from Gen. 2.9. *Hayyim* here, he argues, is not 'life', but derived from a root whose Arabic cognate means 'to make known'. Both halves of the verse thus refer to the same tree, which yields the divine attribute of omniscience.

Hirschberg also postulates a number of erotic and fertility terms which have Arabic cognates, and which would remove the notorious difficulty at Amos 5.26 (Asherah and another fertility symbol replace Siccuth and Chiun - who, where or what?), explain Josiah's action in 2 Kings 23.8 (they were not 'high places of the gates' but phallic symbols) and suggest that Canticles in its primary reference celebrates a royal wedding that *has taken place*.

A word study on *nešāmā* and its cognates by T. C. Mitchell (*VT* 11, p. 177) argues that this work is used in the Old Testament to designate the breath of God, which, when imparted to man, made him unique among the animals. A related,

and somewhat controversial, article comes from another conservative scholar, R. Laurin, on the concept of man as a soul (*ET* 72 p. 131). Starting from the Old Testament designation of man as *nephesh*, he sees the New Testament affording an extension, rather than an annulment, of the Old Testament concept. One effect of the Resurrection is that the Christian becomes a different kind of man – a spiritual soul, while the non-Christian remains a fleshly soul. Certain of Laurin's positions are criticized by W. D. Stacey (*ibid.* p. 349) who holds that in the Old Testament *nephesh* is a constituent of man, rather than the man himself, and that it is precisely the insignificance of *nephesh* that is significant for the New Testament. (He will have none of an intermediate state which Laurin finds in 2 Cor. v). On one thing Stacey and Laurin are agreed. 'In his entirety (man) must be saved, and in his entirety he will enter the life of heaven'. Among other essays in Biblical Theology one may point to the study of the concept of time (*HTR* 54 p. 225) by James Muilenberg (always a stimulating and refreshing interpreter), and the remarks on translation problems (his experience with NEB is of course in mind) by C. H. Dodd (*ET* 72 p. 268). Professor Dodd has illuminating remarks on the difficulties of translating, for instance, the *dikaion* group by language more 'contemporary' than 'justify'. A forensic sense in numerous contexts is accepted, but the connotation of the English 'acquit', while it serves in Rom. 4.5, is negative, while *dikaion* is positive ("The desired unimpeachable status

is granted *sola gratia* on the basis of faith'). No English word seems to allow for all the Pauline nuances, so "it seems necessary to accept 'justify', 'justification' as terms which do indeed belong to current English, but are here used in a sense which is not current, in fact as technical terms, which must either explain themselves from the context to the attentive reader, or await the commentator".

The relationship of Qumran to Christian origins stands at the forefront of much modern New Testament Study. A useful corrective to some extravagances comes from H. H. Rowley (*BJRL* 44 p. 119) who compares Qumran and New Testament concepts on certain crucial matters. New Testament Messianism is Davidic, with no place for the priestly Messiah, and whatever the fate of the Teacher of Righteousness there is no indication that his death and resurrection dominated his followers' thought of faith (as Cullmann remarks, Philo and Josephus can describe the Essenes without mentioning him). The teaching of Jesus is on many matters (e.g. the *lex talionis*, Sabbath – at Qumran ox and man stay in the pit! – Temple, and orders of precedence) opposed to that of Qumran. Organisation is dissimilar, and baptism and the eucharist have a totally different significance from ablution and sacred meal at Qumran. At much more detailed point, the use of Old Testament quotations, is studied by J. A. Fitzmyer (*NTS* 7 p. 297). He finds the use of quotations may be assigned to the same few general categories in the New Testament and the Qumran texts; but that the

Qumran writers are much more concerned with the coming fulfilment of the Old Testament, and he sees no trace of a uniform pattern of exegesis (of the type revealed by Dodd's *According to the Scriptures*). Qumran quotation formulae resemble those of the New Testament rather than the Mishnah: a statement which, as Fitzmyer disarmingly points out, really means that the New Testament writers quote Scripture like their contemporaries.

No less than three essays have appeared on the influence of one group of Old Testament passages on one group of New Testament passages, the Passion narratives. The largest, richest and most significant is that by F. F. Bruce (*BJRL* 43 p. 336), a lecture which deserves not only study but meditation. There is a careful study of the shepherd and flock motif both in Zech. 9-14 and in the Passion narratives: we see how the flock which has rejected the faithful shepherd receives a harsh and oppressive one: we see how the 'little flock' ('the poor of the flock' of Zech. 11:11?) takes the place of Israel. Many of the incidents in the last days of the Lord's life on earth are found to be presented almost as a commentary on Zechariah and other prophetic Scriptures; yet they remain real events, not the vapid allegories that some scholars declare them, and the origin of the 'commentary' is in our Lord's own practice. Professor Bruce enforces Fitzmyer's point already mentioned: 'There is in this interpretation of Zech. ix-xiv something quite difference from the atomistic procedure which characterizes the Qumran commentaries on the Old Testament.

One dominating principle – here, the portrayal of the shepherd-king – is discerned throughout the whole section of prophecy, and becomes determinative for the application of any part of it.' An interesting aspect of the methodology is its use of the Fourth Gospel: 'The undesigned coincidences between the Johannine and Synoptic accounts of the feeding and its aftermath are too impressive to be dismissed as accidental, and we are perfectly justified in making judicious use of details in the one account to illuminate details in the other'. Zechariah is used by the Jewish scholar Cecil Roth as a key to the narrative of the cleansing of the Temple (*NT* "4 1960" p. 176). Jesus fulfils the prophetic conditions by his entry, and then turns to rebuke his followers – either because they were misunderstanding his action and behaving like a den of robbers (Josephus' word for the nationalist extremists) or because they were interpreting 'Canaanite' in Zech. 14.21 in an ethnic rather than a commercial sense, permitting trade in the Temple but excluding 'all nations' for whom the 'house of prayer' was designed. Yet another study of the Messianic entry in the light of Zechariah, the oracle of Judah in Gen. 49, and much else, comes from J. Blenkinsopp (*JBL* 80 p. 55).

One of the perennial critical problems of the Passion narratives is the chronology. In the last few years, the presentation of this problem has been completely altered. Few are now prepared to regard it as a simple choice between the Synoptics and John, with the odds against the latter, or as something

so confused and 'theologized' in our present records as to be quite unrecoverable. Even those who do not feel bound to accept the brilliant reconciliation of Mlle Jaubert (who seems to have made another convert in A. Gilmore, *SJT* 14 p. 256 - a useful summary of some recent study on the Last Supper) are made wary by it. Another calendrical study is made by M. H. Shepherd (*JBL* 80 p. 123 - cf. his *Pascha Liturgy and the Apocalypse*). Clearly we know less about the first century than we would like to think.

This is becoming equally apparent in the learned and complex studies of the Lord's trial. A small recent addition is that of O. Linton (*NTS* 7 p. 258) who, pointing to the apparent reference to both Dan. 7.13 and Psalm 110.1 in the Lord's reply to the High Priest, suggests that the 'blasphemy' lies in a literal interpretation of Psalm 110). A commonsense comment at the end meets a great deal of erudite objection to the dual trial. Nothing would be more likely in the circumstances, Linton argues: after all, 'non-Christian Jews of that time had not the same interest as liberal Jews in our days to excuse the Jews and place all responsibility on the Romans'.

Other parts of the Gospel Tradition have not lacked attention. B. van Iersel (*NT* "4 1960" p. 161) gives a form-critical analysis of the story of the finding of Jesus in the Temple, and, instead of declaring it a 'profane' wonder-story, concludes that it enshrines a pronouncement story the point of which was what the ordinary reader finds in the present text: the contrast between the Lord's

putative father and his real Father, a contrast to which Mt. 13.55, Jn. 6.42 also point. G. H. Boobyer analyses Mk. 4, commonly regarded as something of a rag-bag, and finds it seamless robe of linguistic and conceptual unity (*NTS* 7 p. 59) (verses 10-13 being no exception). Ernest Best offers a new interpretation of the Beatitude of the poor in spirit, based on the equivalence of the phrase with the Qumran description of the 'faint-hearted' (*NTS* 7 p. 255). 'He who feels equal to the task will not receive the Kingdom, only he who knows his own inadequacy.'

To H. W. Montefiore's series on Josephus and the New Testament in *Novum Testamentum* is now published as a monograph. The final instalment (*NT* '4 1960' p. 307) seeks to connect the prodigies mentioned by Tacitus and Josephus with the Resurrection, Ascension and Pentecost, on the assumption that Jewish tradition has transferred these events to the Romano-Jewish conflict, while preserving the memory of the months in which they occurred. (To one reader some of the parallels in his previous articles appeared more striking.)

Professor Bruce's notable Pauline paraphrases have continued: 2 Corinthians has been concluded and 1 Thessalonians begun (*EQ* 33 pp. 44, 163, 238) R. Berry (*SJT* 14, p. 60) refutes the thesis of a contradiction between 2 Cor. 5 and 1 Cor. 15. Paul's attitude to death is of double aspect, as one might both welcome and dread a surgical operation. The significance of Paul's doctrine for the communion of saints is that "our oneness with the dead in Christ resides in the fact that both they

and we are joined to the same Lord, and not in their still belonging with us in the corporate solidarity of the Church. No direct dealings with them are possible; we can reach them only through our Lord". Even if Mr. Berry's conclusion that prayer on their behalf is a proper exercise of our concern does not seem to follow, his remarks on the vanity of the invocation of saints are immensely valuable. Some further thoughts on Philipians by B. S. Mackay (*NTS* 7 p. 161) are well worth pondering: besides suggesting a new and attractive *sitz in Leben* he wreaks destruction upon B. Rahtjen's recent partition theory. (And should not this sentence provoke us to good works: "Beare's estimate is seven weeks, but Lightfoot reckons a month. As Lightfoot produces detailed references to support his estimate, his figure is to be preferred.")

The atonement in the Epistle to the Hebrews and its implications is suggestively studied by S. S. Smalley (*EQ* 33 p. 36). T. C. G. Thornton weighs the theory that 1 Peter is a Paschal liturgy, and finds it wanting (*JTS* 12 p. 14). G. D. Kilpatrick, who formerly argued that in the Fourth Gospel *alethes* was used predicatively and *alethinós* attributively without distinction of meaning, finds the same idiom in 1 and 3 John (*JTS* 17 p. 272) and underlines that stylistic connexion of gospel and epistles, which has been more disputed in this generation than of old time.

To hold common authorship the Johannine Gospel and epistles is less daring than to raise anew the question of the apostolic authorship

of the Johannine Apocalypse. Yet A. Helmbold (*NTS* 8 p. 77) does this, pointing to the clear reference to, and attribution to John bar-Zebedee of, Rev. 1.9 in the *Apocryphon of John*. This work has long been extant, but was seen through a glass darkly until the labours of Dr. Till and the pressures of Nag Hammadi brought it to light. Now current estimates for the date of the Apocrypha are as early as 150, perhaps even 100 A.D. If this is established, what shall we think of the authorship and date of the Apocalypse?

ABBREVIATIONS

(The volume number and first page of each article is given.)

<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
<i>EQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ET</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies (New Series)</i>
<i>NT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i> (The volume has the date 1960, apparently in error).
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>