

THE THEOLOGICAL JOURNALS IN 1957

(As usual, this survey purports to be no more than a brief selection from articles in English in journals fairly readily available.)

THE LAST SURVEY was mainly concerned with archæology: some brief

notes on new developments may therefore come first. The publication of results of the Hazor expeditions has continued, and those who have not opportunity to read his book may refer to Y. Yadin's article in *Biblical Archaeologist*, pp. 34ff. Equally interesting have been the excavations at Shechem, to which the whole February and December issues of *BA* are devoted. Special reference may be made to the article by L. E. Toombs, pp. 92ff., and to G. E. Wright, in *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 148, pp. 11ff. The excavations illustrate the prominence of Shechem noticeable in the patriarchal narratives. As in the Old Testament, no trace has been found of the capture of the city in the Conquest period. 'The major break in the city's history . . . is not at the time of Joshua, but nearer the time of Abimelech, whose destruction of Shechem and its temple-tower is described in Judges ix. 45ff.' Jeroboam's rebuilding of the city (1 Ki. xii. 25) has been traced: it appears to have been a makeshift affair.

In *BASOR* 146, pp. 6ff., W. L. Reed reports an interesting analysis of grain, belonging to periods between Saul and Hezekiah, found at Dibon, which helps to explain the use of Moab as a refuge by Israelite families such as David's (1 Sa. xxii. 3-4) and Naomi's. B. J. S. Isserlin (*Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, pp. 133ff.), surveying Israelite and pre-Israelite names in Palestine, shows how the historical and economic geography reflected in them accords with the biblical data concerning Joshua, the Judges period, and the early monarchy. He finds no evidence from the place-names to support the suggestion that the Northern and Judahite tribes had different origins.

In the same journal, pp. 55ff., Eva Danelius gives the first part of a study of the Western boundary of Ephraim and Manassch. She shows the sacredness of tribal boundary-marks; the importance of the blessing of Ephraim in Genesis xlviii. 14ff.; and (as is frequent nowadays), an important tradition preserved by the Chronicler (1 Ch. vii. 20ff.) of Ephraimite settlement in the Sharon plain. She promises to complete her task without abandoning, as so many do, the text of Joshua xvi-xvii.

The publication of the Qumran 'Nabonidus' story will certainly evoke increasing discussion. D. N. Freedman (*BASOR* 145) is typical of many in representing two tendencies: to regard Nabonidus, rather than Nebuchadnezzar, as the king in the original form of the story in Daniel iv, but at the same time to give far more weight than was ever allowed before to the Babylonian background of the historical sections of Daniel. Quite a different interpretation is offered by D. J. Wiseman in a Third Programme broadcast published in abridged form in *Christianity Today*, November 25th, pp. 4ff. He deals with the evidence of several documents; the important Neo-Babylonian chronicle published by him in 1956, the Qumran Nabonidus story, and recently discovered Nabonidus tablets from Haran. These show that Nabonidus went to his long sojourn in Tema after opposition to his religious policy, and that he eventually found his subjects better disposed. Among those eager for peace was 'the King of the Medes'. This is Cyrus: but the title he is given recalls 'Darius the Mede'. Is Darius, after all, only another name for Cyrus? Daniel vi. 28 might be translated ' . . . even in the reign of Cyrus the Persian'. This is tantalizingly brief, and we look forward eagerly for more.

Professor G. E. Ladd presents a valuable series of articles on eschatology. In *Evangelical Quarterly*, pp. 94ff., he points to the frequently overlooked difference between the book of Revelation and Jewish apocalyptic. In *Expository Times*, pp. 268ff., he expounds the two great acts uniting New Testament eschatology: the Messianic mission in two stages, the Kingdom in two forms, eternal life at two levels, and the New Testament concept of the future as creating the present. In 'Why not prophetic-apocalyptic?' (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, pp. 192ff.), he relates these considerations to the Lord's teaching.

'The Rock that followed them' (1 Cor. x. 4) has always been a crux, and Paul's allusion to a Rabbinic legend postulated. Earle Ellis (*JBL*, pp. 53ff.) suggests that Paul and the Rabbis are in fact independently using certain passages in Psalms and Isaiah, and Paul employing valid typology. In *EQ*, pp. 23ff., Ellis has a suggestive note on 'Thus saith the Lord' in the New Testament. B. M. Metzger (*Journal of Theological Studies*, pp. 118ff.) suggests that in 1 Cor. xv. 4, Paul declares the *resurrection*, not the third day, to be 'according to the scriptures'.

On the Old Testament brief mention might be made of I. Lewy, *Vetus Testamentum*, pp. 322ff.) who holds that the so-called 'Deuteronomic' sections of the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxii. 20-26, xxiii. 1-9) are presupposed in David's time, and a stratum of Deuteronomy in that of Amos. Some of the ground will be familiar to conservative readers: it is interesting to find it traversed in another direction.

Fourah Bay College, Sierra Leone.

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