

about a variant word, or variant case, overthrows the whole belief. Meaning is commonly conveyed through groups of words, and variations of single words need not affect the total meaning. Certainly no primary doctrine of revelation rests solely upon a doubtful reading. There is, for example, no doubt about the omission of the trinitarian statement in 1 John v. 7 (AV), and the doctrine of the Trinity was not drawn from this verse.

If we ask why God has not preserved the copyists from error, there is no answer. One can only draw a slight analogy from the created order and from the Incarnate Word. The created order was originally perfect, but has been marred in transmission, and contains difficulties and apparent discrepancies. Similarly the Lord Jesus Christ is perfect God and perfect Man, but the Church has not been protected from error and misunderstanding concerning His Person.

To sum up: the conservative cannot hold a double view of truth. If historical and scientific research establish something as true, then this will be identical with biblical truth. For myself I can only say that my great interest in the discoveries of science, archæology, psychology, and parapsychology, is for the light that these subjects throw upon the interpretation of the Bible. The conservative, like all Bible students, knows that the Bible must be interpreted, and that external facts have their part to play, as, for example, in the date and extent of the Flood, or over the identity of Darius. The conservative, however, has an advantage; he starts with a foundation which provides reliable evidence. Thus the question of the priority of Ezra is not an open question; the conservative admits the problems, but believes that they are capable of solution in line with the biblical position; he can employ all the methods of problem-solving, admit the strength and weakness of the arguments of the other side, and in the end can emerge with an honest defence of the biblical position.

Tyndale Hall, Bristol.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT, M.A.

THE THEOLOGICAL JOURNALS IN 1956

(This survey, like the last, takes account only of journals that are fairly readily accessible, and of articles in English.)

WE ARE SEEING perhaps the most exciting movements on the frontiers of biblical knowledge since that sudden Victorian flowering of modern archæological science which set believer and sceptic groping for each other's theological throats. The caves lay bare their treasures in an Ali Baba profusion. The journals concerned with Near Eastern archæology alone now run into dozens. The manuscript finds from the Dead Sea area continue to challenge the keenest wits and broadest erudition for their elucidation; the first of the Gnostic documents from Nag-Hammadi, — perhaps to prove almost equally important for the biblical scholar, but so strangely overlooked by the publicists, — has been published; new textual materials, like the Bodmer papyrus of John's Gospel, have appeared; a Babylonian chronicle throwing unsuspected light on the last years of the kingdom of Judah has been presented; Palestinian sites fecund of biblical allusions have been zealously attacked by the British, American, French and Israeli institutions; and the study of the documents from Alalakh, Mari, Ras Shamra and other sites in Mesopotamia and the Levant continue to offer vivid illustrations of what life was like when the Canaanite was in the land, and occasionally to illumine some dark place in the earlier books of the Old Testament: sometimes, indeed, showing that what has been taken to be due to late re-writing in fact reflects a primitive tradition, quite possibly contemporaneously recorded. These things must explain why on this occasion this survey is so largely concerned with archæology.

The so-called Dead Sea Scrolls are now a subject on their own, and reference here will be restricted to the interesting notes in the *Biblical Archaeologist* (xix, pp. 75-96) where P. Benoit and each of the other members of the team now engaged on the scrolls report on the editing of the so far unpublished manuscript fragments. The progress of study of the Nag-Hammadi manuscripts is not yet far advanced: those interested in taking the matter beyond the essays in F. L. Cross's *The Jung Codex* may be referred to recent issues of the Dutch journal *Vigilæ Christianæ* where those concerned with the discovery contribute (usually in English or French).

The Babylonian chronicles, published last year by the Trustees of the British Museum, have been attractively edited by a member of the Tyndale Fellowship, Mr. Donald J. Wiseman, under the title *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings*. Among many other interesting sidelights on biblical history, it includes an account from the Babylonian standpoint of the fall of Jerusalem in 597 B.C. and the appointment of Zedekiah. Their importance is discussed by J. P. Hyatt (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxxv, pp. 227-284), D. N. Freedman, (*Biblical Archaeologist*, xix, pp. 50-60), W. F. Albright (*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 143, pp. 28-33) and, for the Chronology of Kings, by E. R. Thiele (*ibid.*, pp. 22-27). They provide a *Sitz im Leben* for the disputed oracles of Jeremiah xiv-xlix; and for some scholars, such as Hyatt, suggest that the Babylonians, and not the Scythians, are Jeremiah's foe from the north. F. F. Bruce, in *Evangelical Quarterly* (xxviii, pp. 195-197), modifies his former resolution of the chronological difficulty of Daniel i. 1 in the light of the Nebuchadnezzar chronicles, now dating the siege mentioned in Daniel in September 605 B.C. before the hasty return of Nebuchadnezzar reflected in the chronicle, or during the Syrian campaign of the winter 605-604 B.C.

Of the excavations of biblical sites in Palestine, Miss Kenyon's at Jericho are the best known, though we are far from a definite interpretation of her results. The American Schools of Oriental Research have published reports on work at Hazor (Y. Yadin, *Biblical Archaeology*, xix, pp. 2-11); the cities of Joshua xv. 61 (F. M. Cross, *ibid.*, pp. 12-17); Petra (W. H. Morton, *ibid.*, pp. 26-36); Bethel (J. L. Kelso, *ibid.*, pp. 36-43); Dothan (J. P. Free, *ibid.*, pp. 43-48, and *BASOR*, No. 143, pp. 11-17); Gibeon (J. B. Pritchard, *BA*, xix, pp. 66-75); Shechem (G. E. Wright, *BASOR*, No. 144, pp. 9-20); and Jazer (G. M. Landes, *ibid.*, pp. 30-37). General Yadin estimates the population of Hazor at no less than 40,000 — 'for Hazor was beforetime the head of all those kingdoms' (Jos. xi. 10). What is more he has found evidence of the destruction of the city during the period now usually allocated to Joshua's conquest (*cf.* Jos. xi. 13), whereas previous excavators had, on rather negative evidence, suggested an earlier date. At Bethel Kelso records an almost total destruction by Joshua's troops; followed by a cultural revolution — small, crude houses and poor pottery — and, even more interesting, a religious revolution: the Canaanite cult objects, commonly found previously, suddenly disappear after the Israelite victory. Apparently the graven images were abolished, as commanded. Destroyed once more by the Babylonians in their advance, Bethel and Ai together have only 223 men in Ezra's census return (Ezr. ii. 28); and their rough homes, made from stones from the ruined city wall, have been discovered. At Shechem, a large temple doubtless preserves the Temple of Ba'al Berith of Judges viii-ix. Mention may also be made of the tentative suggestion by the late J. J. Rothschild (*Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, lxxxviii, pp. 50-57) that curious ancient huts found in the Sinai peninsula and the Judean foothills are the *succoth* built by the Israelites of the Exodus (Ex. xvi, Lv. xxiii).

The texts from Ras Shamra, discovered before the war, and those from Alalakh, published a few years ago by Mr. Wiseman, yield much exegetical fruit. For instance, it has been a commonplace that I Samuel viii. 4-17, Samuel's denunciation of kingship, is a piece of Deuteronomistic interpretation of the national history, in conflict with another tradition in the same book. In *BASOR* (No. 143, pp. 17-22) I. Mendelsohn examines the passage and concludes that almost every item of Samuel's declaration can be paralleled from Ras Shamra or Alalakh. It is 'an authentic description of the semi-feudal Canaanite society as it existed prior to and during the time of Samuel . . . its author could conceivably have been the prophet himself or a spokesman of the anti-monarchical movement of that period.' In the following *Bulletin* (pp. 20-23) E. A. Speiser shows that the phrase 'all those that went in at the gate' in Genesis xxiii. 10, 18, and the converse in Genesis xxxiv. 24 represent technical terms in Mesopotamian society — 'city fathers' and 'able-bodied men'. The former passage is, of course, usually regarded as P; in this case, says Speiser, if the hand is late, the voice is ancient and genuine tradition. In the first number of the new *Journal of Semitic Studies* (pp. 60-2) D. Daube and R. Yaron suggestively study Jacob's reception by Laban in the light of Semitic law: 'when Jacob was offered a reward for his work it was degradation, not promotion: having lost his status in the family, he became a hireling.' In the same journal (pp. 322-333), Martin

Noth draws some interesting analogies between practices referred to in the David stories and the Royal Archives of Mari. Finally, modesty does not forbid us to refer to the article by K. A. Kitchen in the *Tyndale House Bulletin* (No. 2, pp. 1ff.) in which he draws attention to an important recently published Egyptian papyrus reflecting slave and prison conditions in Egypt similar to those of the Joseph narratives.

Turning to Old Testament theology, H. H. Rowley has a characteristic article on *Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets* (*JSS*, i, pp. 338-360) which has the merit of dealing appreciatively with recent studies of cultic prophecy while eschewing the speculative excesses to which the inferential game has led; and of recalling that the Law and the Prophets are not governed by irreconcilable ideas of the will of God. J. D. W. Watts, in *Expository Times* (lxvii, pp. 232-237), contributes a study of the doctrine of the People of God in the Pentateuch, which is essentially a study of a *Pentateuchal* doctrine, and not of the theological traditions of sources widely different in date.

Special attention may be drawn to two theological articles in the *Evangelical Quarterly*: Professor D. J. Theron's 'Adoption in the Pauline Corpus' (pp. 6-14), and Stephen Smalley's 'Eschatology of Ephesians' (pp. 152-157), in which no support is found in the Epistle for universalist teaching.

In the realm of criticism, M. S. Seale, *ET* (lxvii, pp. 333-5) puts forward glossing and the use of synonyms as characteristics of the style of the author of Genesis, and finds this undermines the whole JE theory as it relates to that book. In the same issue (pp. 341-2) Donald Guthrie refutes the implication sometimes drawn from Tertullian that the early church countenanced a pupil's writing in the name of his master. The December number of the same journal contains an important article by W. C. van Unnik on 'Christianity according to I Peter', where the now fashionable hypothesis that this letter is an Easter baptismal liturgy is criticised. The oft debated question of Quirinius of Luke ii is adverted to by E. C. Hudson, in the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (xv, pp. 103-107), who concludes in favour of Ramsay's (and therefore of Luke's) substantial accuracy. An interesting offshoot of the recent Tyndale Commentary on Thessalonians will be found in the note by Leon Morris on I Thessalonians ii. 18 in the new journal *Novum Testamentum* (i, pp. 205-8).

*Fourah Bay College,
Sierra Leone.*

A. F. WALLS, M.A., B.LITT.

WORLDLINESS IN THE CHURCH ✓

OF THE TWO EXCUSES usually advanced for worldliness in the Church, that concerning the raising of money is perhaps more excusable than that concerning the attraction of young people. For as the world in general is largely controlled by economic considerations, church policies also are often dictated too much by the pecuniary factor, and even godly men may be driven by the sheer necessity of making church ends meet to employ methods of raising money which violate their own principles.

One Church Assembly at least has repeatedly declared in categorical terms that it is wrong and against Christian principles and the rules of the church practice to indulge in any form of gambling, however light-heartedly, for the raising of church finance. And it has taken years for such statements to convince many church leaders that this rule should be observed whatever the pressure from the worldly-minded. Still there are many with absolutely no conscience on the matter who are ready to flout these injunctions whenever they can get away with it, and even boast of their deeds with almost religious fervour. Such people have little understanding of basic moral principles. Of course the gambling instinct is inherent in man, and needs to be lifted out of itself to an inordinate degree before it can be fitted into a moral and Christian framework — if ever; for even the heroic 'gambles' of the prophets, apostles, saints and martyrs were all 'dead certainties'! For faith in the faithful God is never a chance and can never be misplaced, for faith is 'substance' and 'evidence' of Him in whom no chance or change can be.

But gambling apart, what of the dances, whist drives, concerts, sales of work, cafés, bazaars, fetes, teas and coffee mornings of every sort? Even where money is not an urgent necessity these go on for the social pleasure people find in them. And yet the primary aim is the making of money. How