ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

SEMINARY STUDIES

VOLUME XII JULY 1974 NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

A Tribute to Siegfried H. Horn 81

Gane, Erwin R. The Intellect-Will Problem in the Thought of Some Northern Renaissance Humanists: Nicholas of Cusa 83

Johnston, Robert M. Patriarchs, Rabbis, and Sabbath 94

Richards, W. L. Textual Criticism on the Greek Text of the Catholic Epistles: A Bibliography 103

Uhlig, Siegbert. Die Typologische Bedeutung des Begriffs Babylon . . 112

Worschech, Udo Ch. F. The Problem of Isaiah 6:13 126

Book Reviews 139

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY PRESS
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN 49104, USA

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
SEMINARY STUDIES

The Journal of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
of Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES publishes papers and short notes in English, French and German on the following subjects: Biblical linguistics and its cognates, textual criticism, exegesis, Biblical archaeology and geography, ancient history, church history, theology, philosophy of religion, ethics and comparative religions.

The opinions expressed in articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES is published in January and July of each year. The annual subscription rate is $6.00. Payments are to be made to Andrews University Seminary Studies, Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104, USA.

Subscribers should give full name and postal address when paying their subscriptions and should send notice of change of address at least five weeks before it is to take effect; the old as well as the new address must be given.

The articles in this journal are indexed, abstracted or listed in: Book Reviews of the Month; Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus (Biblica); Index to Religious Periodical Literature; International Bibliography of the History of Religions; Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete; New Testament Abstracts; Orientalistische Literaturzeitung; Orient-Press; Religious and Theological Abstracts; Seventh-day Adventist Periodical Index; Subject Index to Periodical Literature—Mosher Library; Theologische Zeitschrift; Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

DEDICATED TO

SIEGFRIED H. HORN

SIEGFRIED H. HORN

A TRIBUTE TO SIEGFRIED H. HORN

In 1963 the first number of *AUSS* came from the press under the capable editorship of our esteemed colleague Siegfried H. Horn. Carrying this journal from the stage of an annual number to its present biannual status (beginning in 1965) and from a publication carrying only articles to one containing book reviews as well (beginning in 1967), he has constantly fostered those high standards of scholarship which within a few short years gave *AUSS* its present well-deserved recognition by the scholarly world.

It is with regret that the other members of the *AUSS* staff at this time bid farewell to Horn as editor. Most of us have had the privilege for a number of years of working at his side in editorial capacities for *AUSS*, and all of us have had the pleasure of being his colleagues on the teaching staff of the Theological Seminary of Andrews University. We are pleased that in his new role as Seminary dean (begun this present academic year) we can look forward to continued association with him and that we can still keep in close touch with him for counsel in matters related to *AUSS*.

Even though officially a change in editors has now taken place, portions of the present number are to be credited to his editorship. Also, we look forward to having him as our guest editor for some forthcoming reports of the 1973 Heshbon Archaeological Expedition, of which he was the director.

As he now steps out of his editorship of *AUSS*, but carries other heavy administrative responsibilities instead, we in the *AUSS* staff dedicate this present number to him. We do this in deep appreciation for the excellent service he has rendered this journal ever since its inception, and we also wish him all the best in the heavy new duties he carries. We will put forth every

effort to follow his lead in maintaining for *AUSS* the high quality of scholarship he has given it, and we are grateful that we still have him close by as a beloved friend and as a helpful counselor.

The *AUSS* Staff

THE INTELLECT-WILL PROBLEM IN THE THOUGHT OF SOME NORTHERN RENAISSANCE HUMANISTS: NICHOLAS OF CUSA

ERWIN R. GANE
Pacific Union College

This essay and a subsequent one will attempt to demonstrate the inadequacy of the definition of Renaissance humanism as a movement which sought primarily secular "wisdom" by the exercise of man's wholly autonomous intellect and will. Such a definition implies that humanist thought involved a radical separation of the realm of faith-grace from the realm of intellect-will. It would exclude certain Christian scholars in the North, including Colet and Erasmus, who saw some place for human intellect and reason in the study of human behavior and its causes, but who insisted upon a distinct revelational element in the quest for ultimate truth and wisdom. They rejected the natural theology of the Scholastics, preferring rather to confine the exercise of independent intellect and will to those matters only which are distinctively human. But, in respect to their concept of wisdom and the means of achieving it, they were prepared to accord a position of primacy to revelation and grace, without denying the co-operative effectiveness of human intellect and will.

The depiction of humanism as a movement which employed reason as the primary means of returning man to the ethical virtues of classical antiquity also excludes a figure such as Montaigne, who categorically rejected intellect and reason, along with revelation, as sources of unequivocal and universally applicable truth. He does not fit easily into either the revelationist or the secularist category, as so neatly differentiated for us by Eugene F. Rice.[1]

[1] Eugene F. Rice, *The Renaissance Idea of Wisdom* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958); and "John Colet and the Annihilation of the Natural," *HTR*, 45 (July, 1952), 141-163.

It would seem that any adequate attempt to explain Renaissance humanism as a movement must take account of the central concerns of a whole series of scholars, without attempting to exclude any because of their commitments in areas of thought not necessarily characteristic of the movement as a whole. Erasmus' "philosophia Christi" could not be regarded as characteristic of humanism generally. Because it was important to Erasmus, and yet involved respect for revelation, would we reject him as a humanist? The fact is that Erasmus, like humanists generally, discarded the natural theology of the Scholastics and came to certain conclusions in regard to man on the basis of a different use of intellect and will. This use of intellect and will in the search for truth about man was not identical for all humanists, and it did not necessarily involve repudiation of major elements of the Christian tradition.

In a certain sense, Nicholas of Cusa (ca. 1400-1464) was a pioneer humanist in the North and a forerunner of the more famous transalpine humanists of the early 16th century. It will be fitting therefore to treat him in this initial brief essay. Erasmus, Colet, and Montaigne will be dealt with in a subsequent study.

1. *The Influence of Cusa's Philosophy*

Adolph Harnack regarded Nicholas of Cusa as the 15th-century forerunner and leader of the writers who in the following century, inspired by a Platonic view of the cosmos, "brought so strong and fresh a current of real illuminism into the world."[2] These thinkers laid the foundation for the scientific investigation of nature and were the restorers of scientific thought. John Dolan agrees, despite his recognition of the distinctively medieval aspects of Cusa's thought. Dolan argues, "His emphasis on the quantitative rather than the rational, marks him as a pioneer in the breakthrough that was to produce the prevailing ideologies

[2] Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma* (New York, 1900, 1961), 6, 171.

of man in the western world."[3] Modern philosophers have depicted Cusa as a forerunner of Kant, recognizing the *Learned Ignorance* as paralleling in purpose and scope the *Critique of Pure Reason.*[4] Ernst Cassirer treats the thought of Cusa as the natural starting point for a systematic study of Renaissance philosophy.[5] Using the philosophical language of Scholasticism, Cusa expressed "thoughts which in their actual content and tendency pointed far beyond the boundaries of Scholasticism."[6]

Eugene F. Rice, on the other hand, represents Cusa's concept of wisdom as a superlative statement of the Augustinian medieval tradition that wisdom is "a Revelational knowledge of the Christian God."[7] In fact, Rice sees Nicholas of Cusa's *De sapientia* (1450) as the most important work on wisdom in the Middle Ages. Although it represented a reaction to the kind of rationalism that Aquinas employed, *De sapientia* is a thoroughly medieval document, since the Augustinian tradition which it perpetuated was the salient strand of thought in the Middle Ages. According to Rice the philosophical skepticism and religious mysticism of Cusa were just as characteristic of the late Middle Ages as was scholastic rationalism. Hence Rice identifies Cusa's philosophy, not as the forerunner of a characteristic Renaissance motif in respect to wisdom, intellect, and will, but as the epitome of that medieval traditionalism against which Renaissance humanism in general was a reaction. The central emphasis of Renaissance humanism, Rice tells us, involved the secularization of wisdom. "Wisdom is acquired, that is, by man's own unaided efforts, and describes a natural human perfection. It is in the area of nature, not in that of redemption; and has, consequently, no necessary

[3] John Patrick Dolan, ed., *Unity and Reform: Selected Writings of Nicholas de Cusa* (Notre Dame, Ind., 1962), p. 3.

[4] Ibid., p. 4.

[5] Ernst Cassirer, *The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy* (New York, 1963), p. 7.

[6] Ibid., p. 19.

[7] Rice, *Ren. Idea of Wisdom*, p. 19.

relation to Christianity."[8] This was a humanist repudiation of "Gothic barbarism" and "darkness" and a reappropriation of the classical concept of wisdom and the means of attaining it.[9]

Rice presents the thought of those Renaissance humanists who followed Cusa's lead as a medieval survival. He includes the Florentine Neo-Platonists, John Colet, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, and the 16th-century Reformers. But we may ask, Was not the line of development followed by Cusa, Colet, and the humanist Reformers equally characteristic of the Renaissance as was the trend that led to the radical separation of wisdom from the Christian message? Must we accept the idea that the humanists who secularized wisdom and thereby invested man with autonomous intellect and will, indeed with "a natural human perfection,"[10] were the *only* genuine Renaissance figures?

It would seem possible to trace a line of development from the late medieval natural theologians to the Renaissance secularists. Both emphasized the efficacy of natural reason and will in respect to ethics, even if the secularists demoted the intellect as a means of grasping first causes. But just as the concerns of the secular humanists may be represented as a sharp break with the past, despite their medieval undergirding, so also the concerns of those "Christian humanists" who stayed close to Cusa may be represented as in many ways quite distinct from characteristic medieval motifs. In this respect, it appears that Harnack, Dolan, and Cassirer have the better of the argument.

2. *Cusa and the Neo-Platonic Hierarchies*

The major influences on the thought of Nicholas of Cusa are identified by Paul Sigmund as the medieval Neo-Platonists and mystics. The Neo-Platonic cosmology and theology were available

[8] Ibid., p. 28.
[9] Ibid., p. 29.
[10] Ibid., p. 28.

directly to Cusa in the writings of Proclus (418-485). Copies of the latter's works with heavy marginal comments are in the library at Kues.[11] Furthermore, even if Cusa had not read the writings of Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite before writing the *De docta ignorantia,* he must have been exposed to Dionysius' major theories from the works of Eriugena, Bonaventura, and Albertus Magnus.[12] Sigmund thinks that the outline of his hierarchical system in the first book of *De concordantia catholica* is sufficient evidence that Cusa had derived knowledge of Dionysius' views at least from secondary sources.[13] Cusa's ideas of learned ignorance and the coincidence of opposites are traced by Sigmund to Augustine, Bonaventura, and Eckhart.[14]

> Eckhart drew on the negative theology of Christian Neo-Platonism to undermine the Plotinian conception of a hierarchical universe proceeding by emanation from God to the lowest orders of creation. For Eckhart, there was no question of an overflowing or emanation; God was present everywhere and identified with everything. The soul could commune directly with Him, and was not required to rise through the various levels of creation. God was a superessential Nothingness, who could not be described except by negations, yet He was present in the individual soul. Paradoxically, the negative theology by removing God from creation brought Him closer to it. A similar turning of Neo-Platonism against itself took place in Nicholas of Cusa's thought when he composed his *On Learned Ignorance.*[15]

Nevertheless, Sigmund considers that Cassirer and Hoffmann have exaggerated Cusa's break with the medieval hierarchical universe.[16] Sigmund argues that Cusa retains a hierarchy of value in the created universe.[17] Even the idea of a vast gulf between finite man and the infinite God was not foreign to the "negative theology" of the Middle Ages and the thought of

[11] Paul E. Sigmund, *Nicholas of Cusa and Medieval Political Thought* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), p. 44.
[12] Ibid., pp. 247-249.
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid., pp. 62, 246, 247.
[15] Ibid., p. 62.
[16] Ibid., pp. 256-257.
[17] Ibid., pp. 257-258.

the Neo-Platonists. Sigmund thinks that Hoffmann is correct in tracing this idea to Plato's *chorismos.* Plato separated the finite world of appearances from the infinite, real world of Ideal Forms. But Sigmund argues that this idea was never rejected by the Neo-Platonic tradition of the Middle Ages.[18] A hierarchically ordered universe is essential to Cusa's *De docta ignorantia.* Sigmund quotes from Book II of the *De docta ignorantia.* "For any given finite being, there is a greater or lesser necessarily to be found," but there is nothing greater or lesser than the infinite.[19] In the universe, genera of being are divided into species, each of which is composed of individuals. Some of these are on a higher level of existence than others. But Sigmund seems to have overlooked the fact that in Cusa's view mystical intuition was not preceded by dialectical ascent. He states:

> While it is true that, according to Nicholas, one can never by the study of these genera and species . . . arrive at an adequate understanding of the Godhead, this was also admitted in the Neo-Platonic theology. At the end of the dialectical ascent to union with God, there is still an infinite distance which can only be traversed by mystical intuition.[20]

In Cusa's scheme there were intermediary beings between God and man, but the intermediary were not mediators between the two.

It is, however, the radical existential element which is so characteristic of Cusa's faith. He wrote, "For if aught could mediate between human nature and the absolute mediator, human nature would not then be united unto Thee in the closest degree."[21] The "absolute mediator" was Christ. The finite believing man who is linked by faith with Christ, the "most perfect image" of humanity as well as divinity, has some apprehension of

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid., pp. 258-259.

[20] Ibid.; cf. Nicolaus Cusanus, *Of Learned Ignorance,* trans. Fr. Germain Heron (New Haven, Conn., 1954), p. 16.

[21] Dolan, p. 169.

the infinite, unknowable God.[22] It is the immediacy of this relationship which is the distinguishing element in Cusa's concept of man's quest for knowledge of the Divine. It is this element which Cassirer so effectively delineates:

> For in this union, we see ourselves taken beyond all empirical differences of being and beyond all merely conceptual distinctions, to the simple origin, i.e., to the point that lies beyond all divisions and antitheses. In this kind of vision, and only in it, the true *filiatio Dei* is attained which Scholastic theology had sought in vain to reach, even believing itself able, so to speak, to extort it by means of the discursive concept.[23]

Although Cusa never attacked the Neo-Platonic view of the cosmos, and although his ideas were still very much rooted in the general medieval conception, the "classical" Aristotelian and Scholastic view contradicted his fundamental principle in two ways.[24] First, the Scholastic vision arranged the element of the heavens and the four earthly elements "in a spatial relationship that also implies a gradation of values."[25] Cusa rejected any such concept of nearness or distance between the visible and the unseen worlds. Second, since perfection is not a demonstrable quality in the sensible world, the cosmos is not a perfect sphere or an exactly circular orbit.[26] Hence the question of the central point of the universe was irrelevant to Nicholas. God is the center of everything that exists. He is not only the central point in the universe but also its circumference. His essence includes all other essences within itself.[27] It was Cusa's view of the cosmos which, according to Cassirer, led to the rejection of the geocentric conception of the universe and the new approach to astronomy.[28]

The important point for this essay is that Cusa's idea of learned ignorance was based on two presuppositions: God's

[22] Ibid., p. 171.
[23] Cassirer, p. 14.
[24] Ibid., p. 25.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid., pp. 26-27.
[27] Ibid., p. 27.
[28] Ibid.

infinite exaltation above any hierarchy of existence, and man's possibility of very partial knowledge only on the basis of an immediate faith-love relationship with the infinite. Since God is the unknowable One, He cannot be discovered in any degree by natural reason. It was Cusa's existential theology that constituted a break with the past.

3. *Cusa's Concept of Man and Human Knowledge*

The *De docta ignorantia* clearly teaches the impotence of the human will, apart from Christ, in respect to matters spiritual.

> At a higher level the intelligence recognizes that, even when the senses are subjected to reason by the denial of the passions which are so natural to it, man would still be incapable of attaining by himself the end of his intellectual and eternal aspirations. For man is begotten of the seed of Adam by carnal pleasure which in the act of propagation triumphs over the spirit. And therefore, his nature, originally rooted in carnal delights—for through these did man take origin from his parents—remains quite impotent to transcend temporal things in order to embrace spiritual. . . . No man was ever yet able of himself to rise above himself and above his own nature, so subject from its origin to carnal desire, and, thus freed, ascend to eternal and heavenly things, save He who came down from heaven Jesus Christ. . . . In Christ then, human nature itself by its union with God is raised to the highest power and escapes the weight of temporal and downward-dragging desires.[29]

This is the Augustinian concept of original sin minus the doctrine of inherited guilt. The atonement of Christ, Cusa tells us, renders possible the purification of human nature from carnal propensities. This occurs when, with faith formed by love, degraded humanity enters into union with the "maximal of human nature" (Christ), so that "if we possess Him we possess all things."[30] Nevertheless the individuality of man remains intact.[31] The will of man is bound until released by the divine Source.

De pace fidei presents another compartment of human nature

[29] Dolan, p. 75.
[30] Ibid., pp. 75-76.
[31] Ibid.

apart from the "lower nature" which is "detained in ignorance."[32] This is the intellectual and interior man which is part of the life of God. The atonement and mediatorial work of Christ are designed to enable man "to walk according to his interior rather than his exterior nature."[33] Cusa thought of man's soul as triune since it was created in the likeness of the Trinity.[34] The three parts are the mind, the intellect or wisdom, and the will or love. "The mind exercises the intellect or wisdom from which comes the will or love. . . ."[35] Man, therefore, has his being from the divine Being but is in himself a three-fold productive being. If this were not so, Cusa says, the world could not exist. As Cassirer points out, Cusa considered man to be a kind of "created God," "the divine in the form and within the limits of the human."[36] It is doubtful, however, whether Cassirer is correct in identifying a significant Pelagian spirit in Cusa's thought.[37] The doctrine of learned ignorance stresses what man cannot do in the apprehension of the divine. Freedom to choose faith or non-faith is not distinctively Pelagian. Moreover, Cusa's notion of the predominance of human intellectual freedom, exercised in the areas of judgment, comparison, and evaluation, only after the act of faith, would seem to rule out any radical bias toward Pelagianism. On the other hand, the concept of faith formed by love, as distinct from *sola fide,* is semi-Pelagian.

By the concept of "learned ignorance" Cusa attempts to convince us that only in a frank admission of the complete impotence of human intellect and reason in the search for absolute truth, coupled with reliance by faith on that relative knowledge of himself which the Absolute chooses to reveal, is it possible for

[32] Ibid., p. 198.
[33] Ibid., pp. 198-199.
[34] Ibid., pp. 209-210.
[35] Ibid., p. 209.
[36] Cassirer, p. 43.
[37] Ibid.

man to transcend the intellectual barrenness of his fallen condition. Absolute truth is impossible to us in this life and that which is to come.[38] The truth is "absolute necessity, while, in contrast with it, our intellect is possibility."[39] "It is reason (which is much lower than intellect) that gives names to things in order to distinguish them from one another. The reconciliation of contradictories is beyond reason. . . ."[40] Only in the Absolute Maximum are such contradictions reconciled. God comprises all things in his absolute unity.[41] Only negative propositions concerning him can be used. Such negative theology resolves itself into a one-word description of God – Infinite.[42]

Dolan and Cassirer both argue that, since in Cusa's thought the intellect is superior to the will, the knowledge made available by Christ is a kind of intellectual grasp.[43] Dolan argues that "the entire philosophic structure of Nicholas is conceived as the indoctrination by means of which we are able to fully grasp the ultimate significance of Christ."[44] It would seem that Dolan has not fully realized the mystical nature of the knowledge concerning which Cusa speaks. His emphasis is not on the efficacy of any kind of indoctrination but on a mystical relationship in which the finite intellect of man becomes merged with the infinite intellect of the Supreme Maximum. Cassirer calls this *amor Dei intellectualis*.[45] It is an intellectual vision, a kind of mystical beatific vision based on the intellect rather than the will.[46] Cassirer seems to have missed the point, however, when he asserts that Cusa's theology "demands . . . a new type of mathematical logic. . . ."[47]

[38] Cusanus, pp. 12, 61.
[39] Ibid., p. 12.
[40] Ibid., p. 54.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid., p. 60.
[43] Dolan, p. 189; Cassirer, p. 13.
[44] Dolan, p. 189.
[45] Cassirer, p. 13.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid., p. 14.

Rather, the impression gained from reading Cusa's works is that the mathematical discussions are simply incorporated for illustrative purposes. They prove nothing and were not intended to. If Cusa had replaced Scholastic logic by mathematical logic he would have effectively negated the concept of "learned ignorance."

4. *The Implications of Cusa's Thought*

Since Cusa thought of the universe as a unity in diversity, in every part of which the Absolute Maximum is manifested, the ideal of political and religious order and harmony was, to him, quite realistic. He was a political and religious universalist.[48] His conciliar theory was based on the possibility of the unanimous agreement of Christians.[49] If contradictions are reconciled in Christ, all those who have faith should be able to achieve a Christian consensus. Harmony would be achieved, he thought, when each part of the Church and Empire was functioning in accord with its inherent pattern.[50] The salient point in *De pace fidei* is that at the heart of all religions is recognition of God as the Maximum.[51] The Christian religion is superior to all others, but there is a basic agreement in them all. He urges reconciliation of differences so that unity may be achieved. But this reconciliation involves compromise, even for his Church, in those areas which are more related to outward practice of religion than to the central elements of faith.[52]

[48] Dolan, p. 35; Sigmund, pp. 122-123.
[49] Dolan, p. 25.
[50] Ibid., p. 32.
[51] Ibid., p. 187.
[52] Ibid., p. 197.

PATRIARCHS, RABBIS, AND SABBATH

ROBERT M. JOHNSTON
Andrews University

Justin Martyr, in his argument with Trypho the Jew,[1] cites Adam, Abel, Enoch, Lot, Noah, and Melchizedek as examples of ancients who were uncircumcized but approved by God, and then he adds: "Moreover, all those righteous men already mentioned, though they kept no Sabbaths, were pleasing to God; and after them Abraham with all his descendents until Moses. . . ."[2] The assertion that none of the pre-Mosaic saints kept the Sabbath, made in support of Justin's primary point that the Sabbath was only a temporary requirement limited to the Jews, imposed because of their weakness, is repeated by Justin several

[1]The identification of Trypho with the famous 3rd generation Tanna, R. Tarphon of Lydda, has been often made and as often denied, but it remains attractive. See, for example, Emil Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ,* 2d ed., Div. 1, 1 (New York, 1886), 377. Ṭarpôn corresponds well to the Greek Truphōn; in fact, the more Hellenized form טרפון is actually found in Jer. *Bikkurim* 2:1 (64c). Eusebius' description of Trypho as "a most distinguished man among the Hebrews of that day" (*Church History* iv.18; *NPNF,* 2d series, 1, 197) well fits Tarphon's status both as priest (Jer. *Yoma* 3:7) and illustrious teacher (*Sanhedrin* 101a; Mekilta *Baḥodeš* 9). When legendary references are eliminated there is nothing to render unlikely the possibility that an aged Tarphon might have fled to Greece after the disaster of 135 (cf. Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* i; *ANF,* 1, 194), where it might really have been safer to practice Judaism than in Palestine during the Hadrianic reprisals. But what especially makes Tarphon the likely candidate for Justin's antagonist is his well-known antipathy to Christianity, shown in his vehement declaration: "May I bury my son if I would not burn them [Christian books] together with their Divine Names if they came to my hand. For even if one pursued me to slay me, or a snake pursued me to bite me, I would enter a heathen Temple, but not the houses of these people, for the latter know yet deny, whereas the former are ignorant and deny" (*Shabbath* 116a; Jer. *Shabbath* 16:1). It is also possible that Justin's dialogue is imaginary, and Tarphon's name was merely used by Justin to represent "a typical antagonist," as suggested by I. Abrahams (*Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels,* 1st Series [Cambridge, 1917], p. 101).

[2]*Dialogue with Trypho* xix; *ANF,* 1, 204.

times;[3] and the same argument is echoed almost verbatim by Irenaeus[4] and Tertullian.[5]

When Trypho not only fails to contest this line of reasoning, but explicitly admits that though the Patriarchs are indeed saved, they kept no Sabbaths,[6] the reader might be inclined toward surprise, until he realizes that Justin is simply appealing to what was common ground between himself and the prevailing conceptions of Rabbinic Judaism, as seen in the opinions of the post-Jamnian Tannaim and early Amoraim.

Perhaps related to a decline of interest in proselytism and the withering of any incipient tendencies toward universalism was the growth in Rabbinic Judaism of an emphasis on the uniqueness and particularity of the Sinai revelation, though survivals of alternative views were not altogether lacking. Only Israel, said the Rabbis, was willing and able to keep the 613 commands given at Sinai, while the Gentiles could not even manage to keep the most minimal precepts.[7] The Torah, it was said, is like the wife of another to the heathen.[8]

A rationale for this conception was provided by the doctrine of the Noachian law, which reached its definitive formulation by the second half of the 3d century A.D., especially in the teaching of the Palestinian Amora, R. Levi. Levi's teacher, R. Johanan, taught that six precepts (*miṣwôt*) for all mankind were given to Adam.[9] As slightly modified by Levi, the list included prohibitions against the worship of other gods, blaspheming the name of God, cursing judges, murder, incest, and robbery.[10]

[3]Ibid. xxiii (p. 206—this ch. misprinted as xxxiii); xxix (p. 209); xlvi (pp. 217-18). The link between the asserted Patriarchal nonobservance and Gentile nonobservance is explicit in xxvi.

[4]*Against Heresies,* 4.16.2.

[5]*An Answer to the Jews* 2 (*ANF,* 3, 153); 3 (ibid.).

[6]Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* xlvi.

[7]Ex. R. 27:9; 30:9; Gn. R. 49:2; *Shabbath* 88b; Tos. *Sotah* 35b.

[8]Ex. R. 33:7.

[9]*Sanhedrin* 56b.

[10]Gn. R. 16:6.

After permission to eat flesh had been given, Noah received the additional prohibition against eating a limb from a living animal (or eating of flesh with the blood of life in it, Gn 9:4).[11] This list became standard, though earlier lists from Tannaitic times exhibit many variations from it.[12] These seven precepts are known as the Noachian law; only these are binding upon all mankind.[13]

It was further taught that additional commands were given to the Patriarchs, as seen in Scripture. To Abraham was given circumcision (Gn 17:9-14), and to Jacob the prohibition of the sinew that shrank (Gn 32:32).[14] But it was not until Sinai that Israel received the whole Torah; the Sabbath was not included in the Noachian law, and consequently it was not binding upon the uncircumcized Gentiles; nor had it been observed by the Patriarchs.

Indeed, the Sabbath was not merely unrequired of non-Jews; it was forbidden to them! Simeon b. Laqish (also known as Resh Laqish, a Palestinian rabbi of the mid-3d century) said: "A Gentile who keeps the Sabbath deserves death."[15] It was a common enough sentiment; earlier Rabbis were just as emphatic:

> R. Jose b. Hanina said: A non-Jew who observes the Sabbath whilst he is uncircumcised incurs liability for the punishment of death. Why? Because non-Jews were not commanded concerning it. And what is your reason for saying that a non-Jew who observes the Sabbath becomes liable to the punishment of death? R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan: In mundane

[11]Tos. *Abodah Zarah* 8:4; *Sanhedrin* 56a.
[12]*Sanhedrin* 56a,b; Song R. 1:2:5.
[13]*Sanhedrin* 59a; Song R. 1:2:5.
[14]Cf. *Hullin* 7:6.
[15]*Sanhedrin* 58b. J. D. Eisenstein ("Gentile," *The Jewish Encyclopedia,* 5, 623) believes that this dictum was "probably directed against the Christian Jews, who disregarded the Mosaic laws and yet at that time kept up the observance of the Jewish Sabbath." In view of the fact, however, that all of the maledictions are pronounced specifically on the coupling of Sabbath-keeping with uncircumcision, and of the fact that Christian Jews were called *Minim* but never called Gentiles, while this malediction is expressly upon Gentiles, Eisenstein's remark does not go far enough. Resh Laqish is in fact inveighing against all Sabbath-keeping Christians, certainly not only Jewish Christians.

> affairs, when a king and his consort are sitting and conversing together, should one come and interrupt them, does he not thereby make himself liable to punishment of death? So, too, the Sabbath is a reunion between Israel and God, as it is said, "It is a sign between Me and the children of Israel" (Ex. 31:17); therefore any non-Jew who, being uncircumcised, thrusts himself between them incurs the penalty of death. The Rabbis say: Moses declared before God: "Master of the Universe, just because the Gentiles have not been commanded to observe the Sabbath, wilt Thou show favor to them if they do observe it?" God replied to him: "Do you really fear this? By your life if they fulfill all the commandments in the Torah, yet will I cause them to fall before you."[16]

The Sabbath was Israel's own bride and belonged to no other. Ex 16:29 was interpreted in an exclusive sense: The Lord hath given *you*—Israel—the Sabbath, but hath not given it to the heathen.[17]

This, then, was the prevailing conception, apparently shared by Trypho/Tarphon, of what had become normative Rabbinic Judaism. But there were other views.

The conception that many or all of the Sinaitic laws, and the Sabbath in particular, antedated Sinai is a motif often associated with the apocalyptic strain of Judaism, a strain which was all but destroyed in the debacles of 66-73 and 132-135; but this strain continued to reemerge from time to time, carrying its peculiar views with it. It left a literary deposit typically in the more or less well-known pseudepigraphic works, many of which we now know were closely associated with the movement which produced the Qumran community.[18] It was a movement which most characteristically eschewed the oral tradition of the Pharisees and their successors the Rabbis and which looked rather to visions and revelations as the source of up-dated truth. Yet it has left its imprint here and there in the Rabbinic literature, and

[16]Dt. R. 1:21.

[17]Ex. R. 25:11.

[18]See, for example, James A. Sanders, "The Dead Sea Scrolls—A Quarter Century of Study," *BA* 36 (1973), 129.

even in the Talmud itself.[19]

The Book of Jubilees is an early example of this tradition. It teaches the eternal transcendance of the law given at Sinai, which was merely a transcript of what was prescribed on "the heavenly tablets" (Jub 3:30-31 et passim). This law had been revealed bit by bit to the various Patriarchs prior to its revelation as a whole on Sinai.[20] In respect to the Sabbath there is a peculiar combination of ideas, for on one side it provides an antecedent for the standard Rabbinic view, and on the other it contains the germ of more universalistic ideas. On the one hand we read that God "kept Sabbath on the seventh day and hallowed it for all ages, and appointed it as a sign for all His works" (Jub 2:1), and that the two higher orders of angels have kept the Sabbath ever since it was instituted (Jub 2:16-20), which are certainly universalizing conceptions of the Sabbath. But on the other hand we read concerning Israel, "Behold, I will separate unto Myself a people from among all the peoples, and these shall keep the Sabbath day . . ." (Jub 2:20-22). We even find the angel telling Moses: "We kept Sabbath in the heavens before it was made known to any flesh to keep Sabbath thereon on the earth. And the Creator of all things blessed it, but he did not sanctify all peoples and nations to keep Sabbath, but Israel alone" (Jub 2:30-33).

Touching more directly on the relation of the Patriarchs to the Sabbath are two parallel works which are based on a 1st-century A.D. Jewish original. Here we read that the archangel Michael told Seth not to mourn for Eve on the seventh day, because on it the Lord rested from all His works, and because "on the seventh day is the sign of the resurrection and the rest of the age to come."[21] It was, of course, standard in Judaism that

[19]A striking example of this is the chiliastic speculation recorded in *Sanhedrin* 97a, b, which can be paralleled, for example, in 2 Enoch 32:2, 33: 1-2.

[20]A summary with references is given by George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*, 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), 275.

[21]*Vita Adae et Evae* 51: 1-2; Apoc. of Moses 43: 1-3.

there was to be no mourning or fasting on the Sabbath.[22]

Before noting more direct influence of this line of tradition upon later Judaism, it is necessary to see what is said about the Patriarchal Sabbath in two other corpora whose speculations on this subject are difficult to connect with apocalyptic. The first of these is Philo Judaeus, whose motives for giving a universalistic interpretation to the Sabbath can be easily understood. Scarcely could a more universal view of the Sabbath be found than this:

> But after the whole world had been completed according to the perfect nature of the number six, the Father hallowed the day following, the seventh, praising it, and calling it holy. For that day is the festival, not of one city or one country, but of all the earth; a day which alone it is right to call the day of festival for all people, and the birthday of the world.[23]

The second special corpus to be considered here is the standard Rabbinic materials themselves. In *Yoma* 28b we find the Rabbis struggling with the text, "Because Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws" (Gn 26:5). How did this text square with the doctrine of the Noachian law plus circumcision? Rab (the important early 3d-century Babylonian Amora) boldly concludes that "our father Abraham kept the whole Torah." R. Shimi b. Hiyya more cautiously suggests that the text refers to the Noachian law, or perhaps the Noachian law plus circumcision, but his suggestion is rejected. R. Ashi goes even so far as to say that Abraham kept both written and oral Torahs! R. Johanan, Levi's teacher, asserted that Joseph "early observed the Sabbath before it was given,"[24] an inference he draws from Gn 43:16. It is of interest that these speculations come from the same time when the Noachian doctrine was finally developed.

Since by now it will have become clear that the question of whether the Patriarchs knew the Sabbath is bound up with the

[22]Cf. Gn. R. 100:7; Lam. R. 1:16:51.
[23]Philo, *The Creation of the World* xxx.
[24]Num. R. 14:2.

question of whether the Sabbath is of universal obligation, it will not be amiss to cite the famous story of the dialogue between R. Akiba and the Roman governor Tinneus Rufus concerning the Sabbath:

> The wicked Tinneus Rufus asked R. Akiba: "Why does this day differ from other days?" "Why does one man differ from other men?" he retorted. "What did I ask you and what did you answer me?" inquired he. "You asked me," he replied, "why does the Sabbath differ from all other days," and I answered you, "Why does Rufus differ from other men?" "Because the emperor desired to honor him," said he. "Then this day, too, the Holy One wished to honor." "How can you prove it to me?" "Let the river Sambatyon prove it, which carries stones the whole week but allows them to rest on the Sabbath."[25] "You are evading the question," he exclaimed.

Akiba then challenges Rufus to test the truth of the Sabbath through necromancy, "for every day he [the dead] comes up but not on the Sabbath."

> He went and made a test with his own father: every day he came up, but on the Sabbath he did not come up. After the Sabbath he brought him up again. "Father," he said, "have you become a Jew after death? Why did you ascend during the whole week but not on the Sabbath?" "He who does not keep the Sabbath among you of his own free will must keep it here in spite of himself." "But what toil have you there?" he demanded. "The whole week we undergo judgment, but on the Sabbath we rest."[26]

It is clear that the conception set forth by this legend places Gentiles in a precarious position indeed. According to Resh Laqish and Jose b. Hanina, Gentiles are damned if they observe the Sabbath; according to this legend they are damned if they do not observe it. But the threat of punishment for not keeping it is in any case an indirect assertion of its universal obligation.

Finally we turn to a curious Rabbinic work known as *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer,* the final redaction of which is dated by Friedlander at 750 A.D.[27] It is clearly dependent upon such earlier apocalyptic literature as Jubilees, 1 and 2 Enoch, the Testaments

[25]The legend of the River Sambatyon is recounted by Josephus in *JW* 7.5,1.
[26]Gn. R. 11:5.
[27]This and the following information is taken from the Introduction to

of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Apocalypse of Baruch. Here, in a striking way, the apocalyptic tradition has reemerged into Rabbinism. Here also we find a curious juxtaposition of particularity and implied universalism with regard to the Sabbath. On one hand we read: "The day of blessing and holiness which was before Him, He did not desire to give it as an inheritance except to Israel. . . . When the Israelites went forth from Egypt, whilst yet the Torah had not been given to them, He gave them the Sabbath as an inheritance. Israel kept two Sabbaths whilst as yet the Torah had not been given to them. . . ."[28] On the other hand we find R. Judah quoted as saying: "The Holy One, blessed be He, kept the Sabbath first in the heavenly regions, and Adam kept the Sabbath first in the lower regions."[29] It is the view of this work that Adam kept the Sabbath and was the author of Ps 92, but R. Simeon is quoted as saying: "The first man said this psalm, and it was forgotten throughout all the generations until Moses came and renewed it according to its name. . . ."[30] This might imply that the Sabbath itself was forgotten between Adam and Moses. On such a view, Moses was a reviver of the Sabbath rather than an introducer of it.

In fine, it can be said that the Rabbis considered the Sabbath a special privilege for Israelites. They generally denied its obligation for Gentiles, and as an exegetical consequence denied that it had been kept before Moses. Those who doubted this view or differed from it, in whole or in part, were not lacking. But there seem to have been few left in Judaism during the second century of our era who retained the universalistic vision of the second half of Isaiah, which (as Moore points out[31]) held up for even

Gerald Friedlander's translation of *Pirkē de Rabbi Eliezer* (London, 1916; reprinted New York, 1971), pp. xxi-lv.

[28] P. R. E. 19 (Friedlander, p. 137).

[29] P. R. E. 20 (Friedlander, p. 143).

[30] P. R. E. 18 (Friedlander, p. 126).

[31] *Judaism*, 1, 276.

Gentiles a religious ideal calling for mainly three things: pure monotheism, moral life, and the Sabbath.

> And the foreigners who join themselves to the Lord,
> to minister to him, to love the name of the Lord,
> and to be his servants,
> every one who keeps the sabbath, and does not profane it,
> and holds fast my covenant—
> these I will bring to my holy mountain,
> and make them joyful in my house of prayer. . . .[32]

This was lost in the struggle for identity in the face of Gentile oppression. Thus, paradoxically, Jewish observers of the Sabbath and Christian nonobservers shared common ground in their hostility to Christian Sabbath-keepers, whose troublesome existence was acknowledged.[33]

[32]Is 56:6, 7a (RSV).
[33]Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* xlvii. Cf. *supra*, n. 15.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

It is worth noting that the "nonstandard" tradition of Patriarchal Sabbath-keeping has been enshrined in the liturgy of the synagogue. In the Sabbath afternoon service (*Minha*) the following prayer is inserted into the recitation of the Eighteen Benedictions (translation in Samuel M. Segal, *The Sabbath Book* [New York, 1957], p. 122, with slight modification):

> Thou art One and thy name is One, and who is like thy people Israel, a unique nation on the earth? Glorious greatness and a crown of salvation, even the day of rest and holiness, thou hast given unto thy people:—Abraham was glad, Isaac rejoiced, Jacob and his sons rested thereon:—a rest vouchsafed in generous love, a true and faithful rest, a rest in peace and tranquility, in quietude and safety, a perfect rest wherein thou delightest. Let thy children perceive and know that this their rest is from thee, and by their rest may they hallow thy name.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM ON THE GREEK TEXT OF THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES: A BIBLIOGRAPHY

W. L. RICHARDS
Andrews University

Speaking of the Catholic Epistles, Jean Duplacy wrote in 1958, "Ni l'histoire du *corpus* ni celle du texte n'ont été très étudiées."[1] But it now appears that at long last the Catholic Epistles will take their deserved place in the field of textual criticism. The most notable evidence of this is the extensive energy presently being devoted to the Greek text of the Catholics at the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung in Münster. Nothing anywhere today can equal the efforts that are being made there.

The past neglect of the Catholic Epistles so far as textual criticism is concerned is readily made evident by a look at the two major bibliographical works on textual criticism.[2] Other than relatively recent developments and the work of von Soden over 60 years ago, the only text critical work done in this section of the NT has been on single pericopes. As already indicated, the scene is now changing, however. In addition to the activity in Münster, two doctoral dissertations have been written in the past ten years on the Greek text, at least one other is now being written,[3] and some major studies on the Greek lectionaries and versions have been done.

In view of the prominence now being given to these NT books, it is the purpose of this article to provide a bibliographical picture of what has been done in text critical studies on the Greek text of the Catholics. Two further articles are planned for future issues of *AUSS*, one which will deal with textual criticism on the Catholic Epistles in the versions, in the Greek lectionaries, and in

[1] *Où en est la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament?* (Paris, 1959), p. 64.
[2] Those of Bruce M. Metzger and Jean Duplacy. See entries under "Bibliographies."
[3] See entries under "Books and Dissertations."

the quotations in the church fathers; and another which will deal with text critical aids for the Catholic Epistles. The bibliographical references in the present article appear under four headings in the order of the date of publication: (1) Bibliographies, (2) Articles, (3)Books and Dissertations, and (4) Commentaries.

I. BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Bruce M. Metzger compiled a bibliography on the text critical studies that were produced during the years 1914-1939;[4] and Jean Duplacy has been periodically providing reports from 1940 to the present, first in *Recherches de Science Religieuse*,[5] and from 1968 in *Biblica* with the assistance of C. M. Martini. Both Metzger and Duplacy cover a wide range of text critical studies and tools: handbooks on textual criticism, catalogs, Greek MSS, versions, citations in the church fathers, classification of MSS, studies on specific passages, etc. The work of these text critics has been a valuable source for locating much of the material given below.[6]

1. Bruce M. Metzger, *Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament 1914-39.* Vol. 16 of *Studies and Documents,* eds. Silva Lake and Carsten Hoeg (Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard, 1955).

2. Jean Duplacy
   (a) *Où en est la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament?* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959). This book brings three articles together that originally appeared in *RechSR* 45 (1957), 419-441; 46 (1958), 270-313, 431-462.
   (b) "Bulletin de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament, I" *RechSR* 50 (1962), 242-263, 564-598; 51 (1963), 432-463.
   (c) "Bulletin de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament, II" *RechSR* 53 (1965), 257-284; 54 (1966), 426-476.
   (d) "Bulletin de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament, III" *Bib* 49 (1968), 515-551; 51 (1970), 84-129.
   (e) "Bulletin de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament, IV" *Bib* 52 (1971), 79-113; 53 (1972), 245-278.

[4]This work covers the same period of time as Werner Georg Kümmel's "Textkritik und Textgeschichte des Neuen Testaments 1914-1937," in *TRu,* N.F. 10 (1938), 206-221, 292-327; 11 (1939), 84-107.

[5]Hereinafter: *RechSR.*

[6]To indicate Metzger's entry numbers and to indicate a comment that has been taken from Duplacy's notation, the name of the text critic is given in parenthesis at the end of an entry.

II. ARTICLES

There are eleven entries in Metzger's *Annotated Bibliography* on 1 Jn 5:7 which are not cited here: the entries are 1090-1098, 1002 and 1180. Duplacy also refers to several studies on I Jn 5:7 on page 64 of *Où en est. . . .* Most of these articles are on the Latin text.

1. Wilhelm Bousset, "Neues Testament: Textkritik," *TRu* 17 (1914), 143-154, 187-206. "An interpretative survey of the literature from 1908-1913" (Metzger).
2. Adolf von Harnack, "Zur Textkritik und Christologie der Schriften des Johannes." *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* 1915, pp. 534-573 (Metzger, 879).
3. J. Belser, "Zur Textkritik der Schriften des Johannes," *TQ* 98 (1916), 145-184. A critique of Harnack's article above (Metzger, 842).
4. J. Rendel Harris, "Emendations to the Greek of the New Testament," No. 12 of *The After Glow Essays* (London, 1935). Passages: 1 Pe 1:12 and 3:19 (Metzger, 886).
5. I. A. Herkel, "Konjekturen zu einigen Stellen des neutestamentlichen Textes," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 106 (1935), 314-317. Passage: 1 Pe 3:4 (Metzger, 890).
6. E. Klostermann, "Zum Texte des Jakobusbriefes," in *Verbum Dei Manet in Aeternum,* Festschrift O. Schmitz, ed. W. Foerster (Witten: Luther Verlag, 1953).
7. D. Hemmerdinger-Iliadou, "II Pierre, II, 18 d'après l'Éphrem Grec," *RB* 64 (1957), 399-401. C preserves the best text in the passage and the reading in B at this point is corrupt.
8. F. W. Beare, "The Text of I Peter in Papyrus 72," *JBL* 80 (1961), 253-260. The manuscript is not the work of a careful scribe, but the underlying text seems to be of good quality. Two lists given: (1) singular readings, (2) readings which relate to known variants, with a table of agreements/disagreements P^{72} has with B ℵ A C Ψ sah, and Stephanus.
9. Hellmut Lenhard, "Ein Beitrag zur Übersetzung von II Ptr 3:10d," *ZNW* 52 (1961), 128-129. Contextually and grammatically the text should read "Aber die Erde (=Menschheit) und die auf (in) ihr geschehenen Taten werden (vor Gottes Gericht) offenbar werden" (see no. 11 below).
10. Floyd V. Filson, "More Bodmer Papyri," *BA* 25 (1962), 50-57. General discussion of the Bodmer Papyri; P^{72} indicates that the text of the Catholic Epistles was rather well preserved.
11. Frederick Danker, "II Peter 3:10 and the Psalms of Solomon 17:10," *ZNW* 53 (1962), 82-86. Publication of P^{72} is occasion for re-examining 2 Pe 3:10. Writer argues for an alternate text and sees clarification in a Psalm of Solomon; the new reading: "The earth shall be judged according to the deeds done in it." The reading of B and ℵ is corrupt.

12. E. Massaux. "Le texte de l'Épître de Jude du Papyrus Bodmer VII (P^{72})," *Scrinium Lovaniense. Mélanges historiques Étienne van Couwenbergh* (Louvain: University of Louvain, 1961), pp. 108-125. P^{72} essentially belongs to the "Hesychian" text and is also a witness to the "wild texts."

13. E. Massaux, "Le texte de la I^a Petri du Papyrus Bodmer VIII (P^{72})," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 39 (1963), 616-671. P^{72} in 1 Pe is closer to the minuscule witnesses of the "Hesychian" group, and because it agrees at times with witnesses from other groups, Massaux concludes that it is a "témoin de ces textes sauvages qu'il devait encore en circuler au IIIe siècle" (p. 671).

14. J. N. Birdsall, "The Text of Jude in P^{72}," *JTS* 14 (1963), 394-399. In response to E. Massaux, the antiquity and widespread attestation of P^{72} is defended.

15. Marchant A. King, "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript," *BS* 121 (1964), 54-57. King looks at unique readings and concludes that the Alexandrian text is the basis of this papyrus and that although not of first rank among NT papyri, it is a good witness.

16. Jerome D. Quinn, "Notes on the Text of the P^{72} 1 Peter 2:3; 5:14; and 5:9," *CBQ* 27 (1965), 241-249. Quinn selects these three passages to illustrate the contribution P^{72} can make to textual criticism.

17. M. M. Carder, "A Caesarean Text in the Catholic Epistles?" *NTS* 16 (1970), 252-270. An article based on her Th.D. dissertation. She uses Colwell's method and concludes that Gregory 1243 is not Byzantine in Catholic Epistles, but has high proportion of Alexandrian and Western readings, and since Caesarean is the only text with this ratio the MS could be Caesarean.

18. Jean Duplacy, "Le texte occidental des Épîtres Catholiques," *NTS* 16 (1970), 397-399. Author summarizes opinions of a seminar held in Frankfurt which concluded that the problem of a Western Text in the Catholic Epistles is unsolved and perhaps even more difficult than in the Gospels (because Bezae does not contain Catholic Epistles). Any solution will require more research.

19. J. T. Gallagher, "A Study of von Soden's H-Text in the Catholic Epistles," *AUSS* 8 (1970): 97-119. He uses a modified form of Colwell's method, and concludes that von Soden was wrong to exclude 1739 from the H-text of James, but was correct in including P in the H-text.

20. Kurt Aland, "Bemerkungen zu den gegenwärtigen Möglichkeiten textkritischer Arbeit aus Anlass einer Untersuchung zum Cäsarea-Text der Katholischen Briefe," *NTS* 17 (1970), 1-9. The person who takes into account all of the recent developments in textual criticism may only accept the following with certainty: the existence of Egyptian, Byzantine, and D texts; even the early text was not uniform. Strong criticism of Carder's article (see no. 17 above). Only those MSS which can be brought into congruence either with Origen or Eusebius in the critical places can claim the title *Caesarean*.

III. BOOKS AND DISSERTATIONS

1. H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt.* I Teil: Untersuchungen, III Abteilung: die Textformen, B. der Apostolos mit Apokalypse (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1911). The section on the Catholic Epistles is covered on pages 1840-1898 and represents the only classification ever done on the Greek text of the Catholic Epistles until the 1960s. See entries 7 and 9 for subsequent studies on classification in terms of his work, and also under *Articles,* entry 19.

2. M.-J. Lagrange, *Critique Textuelle II, La Critique Rationnelle* 2nd ed. (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1935). Von Soden's work is discussed and questioned, e.g. the problem of von Soden's formation of sub-groups on the basis of incomplete collations; existence of the I-text has not been proved, much less can it be a representative of the D-text. Many citations from Jas are used to illustrate the problems noted and to illustrate the characteristics of the B-type.

3. Sakae Kubo, "A Comparative Study of P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus" (University of Chicago Ph.D. dissertation, 1964). First major investigation into the Greek text of the Catholics since von Soden. In the appendix the question of MS classification for the Catholic Epistles was reopened. See next entry.

4. Sakae Kubo, *P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus.* Vol. 27 of *Studies and Documents,* ed. Jacob Geerlings (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1965). Essentially the work mentioned in number 3 above without the appendix. The text of P^{72} is compared with B and then evaluated. With singular readings excluded, P^{72} emerges as a text superior to that of B. B is not as free from improvements as has been previously thought. Methodology of Zuntz was used. Collation provided from page 155 on.

5. Sergio Daris, *Un nuovo frammento della Prima Letera di Pietro (1 Petr. 2,20-3,12)* in *Papyrologica Castroctavina Studio et Textus,* 2 (Barcelona, 1967). P^{81} contains with lacunae the portion of 1 Pe mentioned in the title. Confidently dated in the fourth century (Duplacy).

6. J. Harold Greenlee, *Nine Uncial Palimpsests of the Greek N.T.* Vol 39. of *Studies and Documents,* ed. Jacob Geerlings (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968). Four of the nine uncials contain portions of the Catholic Epistles: 0209, fragments of 2 Pe 1 and 2; 0245: fragments of 1 Jn 3 and 4; 0246: fragments of Jas 1; 0247: fragments of 1 Pe 5 and 2 Pe 1; 0247: a few words from 2 Pe 1. MSS are collated, 0209 has a few important non-Byzantine readings; the other Catholic Epistles uncials are either Byzantine, or it is impossible to identify the textual affinity.

7. M. M. Carder, "An Inquiry into the Textual Transmission of the Catholic Epistles" (Victoria University [Toronto] Th.D. dissertation 1968). Deals with 1 Pe and 1-3 Jn. The MSS used in the dissertation are discussed "according to von Soden's classifications," although only a few of the 25 MSS used were actually classified by von Soden. In ch. 2 the textual characteristics which are identified as Alexandrian and those which are

identified as Alexandrian and those which are identified as Byzantine are set forth. A delineation of textual groupings (using Colwell's method) is given in ch. 3, and then in ch. 4 the question is asked, "Was von Soden's classification correct?"

8. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971). Metzger writes in the preface: "One of the chief purposes of the commentary is to set forth the reasons that led the committee, or a majority of the members of the committee, to adopt certain variant readings for inclusion in the text and to relegate certain other readings to the apparatus." The commentary on the Catholic Epistles is on pages 679-730.

9. W. L. Richards, "The Textual Relationships of the Greek Manuscripts of the Johannine Epistles: Establishment and Classification of the Manuscript Groupings" (Northwestern University Ph.D. dissertation, 1974). Classification is based on the analysis of 82 fully collated MSS. Selection of MSS insured that a minimum of three MSS were used from the only previously named groups, those of von Soden. Analysis was aided by a computer.

10. Books on textual criticism. Although the authors of these books draw most of their examples from the Gospels, some have cited passages from the Catholic Epistles. Westcott and Hort (*The New Testament in the Original Greek,* 1881) cite 1 Pe seven times, 2 Pe three times, 1 Jn four times, 2 Jn once, and Jude five times. Lagrange cites Jas many times and a few others (see no. 2 above). Greenlee (*Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism,* 1964) cites 1 Jn 3:1. Metzger (*The Text of the New Testament,* 1964) cites 1 Pe 3:19 and 1 Jn 5:7. V. Taylor (*Text of the New Testament,* 1964) gives none.

IV. COMMENTARIES WITH GREEK TEXT

The commentaries listed here are not only based on the Greek text, but are commentaries which have said something about the text beyond a mere listing of variants and their support.[7] The judgments made about the quality of a witness often reflect the influence of Westcott and Hort.

General

1. Bernhard Weiss, *Die Katholischen Briefe* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1892). Around 90 pages devoted to the nature of the Greek text under four headings: (1) Representatives of the later uncial

[7]This means that such commentaries as the following are not listed, even though they used the Greek text: H. von Soden, *Hebräerbrief, Briefe des Petrus, Jacobus, Judas,* 1892; F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter 1:1-2:17,* 1898; E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter,* 1946; Rudolf Bultmann, *Die drei Johannesbriefe,* 1967; etc.

manuscripts, K L P; quality of these manuscripts is inferior (pp. 2-23). (2) Representatives of the older uncials, ℵ A C; their strengths and weaknesses are discussed (pp. 24-56). (3) Relationships between these first two groups K L P / ℵ A C separately and collectively (pp. 57-79). (4) A comparison of B with the other codices (pp. 88-91).

2. W. Robertson Nicoll, ed. *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910). Vols. 4, 5 include the Catholic Epistles.
   (a) W. E. Oesterley on Jas. Brief section on text; after listing 7 uncials, author states that the cursives are cited by their numbers, but only when they offer interesting readings (4:414).
   (b) J. H. A. Hart on 1 Pe; no separate section on the Greek text, but witnesses are cited in the commentary with evaluative remarks, e.g. "the three great uncials" or "MSS of secondary importance."
   (c) R. H. Strachan on 2 Pe; author cites variants and lists the MS support both of the Greek and of the versions and the editors of published NT Greek texts.
   (d) David Smith on 1-3 Jn. Text used is 1560 Stephanus: "Constructed from a few late and inferior MSS . . ., it is far from satisfactory; and the principal variants are presented in the critical notes" (5:165). Nestle's text "is probably a very close approximation to the sacred autographs" (5:165). Lists major uncials and mentions that there are more than 200 minuscules (5:165-166).

James

1. Joseph B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James* (London: Macmillan, 1913). Uncials are listed with a discussion of the quality of B and ℵ. Mayor mentions that there are 416 minuscules and lists 13 which he considers to be "of most value"; he uses Westcott and Hort, Alford and Tregelles, Tischendorf and others for his *Apparatus Criticus*. Rather extensive discussion of variants in the commentary.
2. James H. Ropes, *Epistle of James*. Vol. 40 of *ICC* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1916; reprint 1954). Gives the MSS containing James by century and mentions along with the commonly cited uncials 3 papyri MSS (Oxyrhynchus 1171 [P21]; Oxy 1229, Oxy frag *papiri greci e latini*, i, 1912, No. 5). Lists 33 and 69 and states that there are ca. 475 medieval MSS in Gregory's and von Soden's lists. K L P S have no distinctive readings which commend themselves as originals (p. 85). Although B is not free from error, it should be followed where internal evidence of readings is not decisive (p. 85). Cites witnesses for support of variant readings in the commentary.

Petrine Epistles and Jude

1. Ernst Köhl, *Die Briefe Petri und Judae*, of the Meyer's *Kommentar*, 6th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1897). Variants are given in footnotes where Köhl often speaks of the judgments of his contemporaries in textual criticism and why he has accepted or rejected a particular reading.

2. Charles Bigg, *Epistles of St. Peter and Jude.* Vol. 41 of the *ICC* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902). Discusses variants and lists their support.
3. J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan, 1907; reprint 1965). Mayor presents in ch. 12 the textual problems he is concerned with from both books. In those instances where B is either unsupported by other uncials, or by just one or two others, Mayor indicates those he has accepted and those he has either rejected or about which he has a question (pp. cci-ccii). The textual problems in Jude are greater than in any other NT book (p. 245).
4. G. Wohlenberg, *Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief.* Vol. 14 of *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament,* ed. T. Zahn (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Werner Scholl, 1915). Seven uncials are mentioned, their content and their von Soden classification. "Die etwa zu berücksichtigenden Minuskeln werden jeweilig, wo es not ist, kurz charakterisiert werden" (p. 1). Supporting evidence for readings given in the footnotes.
5. F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes.* 2d ed. rev. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958). In the first chapter Beare lists the nine uncial MSS which contain these epistles and singles out four minuscules which "are of exceptional interest" (p. 1). He mentions his own evaluations of the various MSS, speaking highly of B among the uncials, and of 1739 among the minuscules. In his commentary the witnesses are often cited where variants are involved.
6. Karl Hermann Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe, Der Judasbrief,* 3d ed. in Herder's *Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament,* eds. Alfred Wikenhauser and Anton Vögtle (Basel: Herder, 1970). Schelkle lists the nine uncials and categorizes them into two text-types, Egyptian and Byzantine (p. 16), and mentions several of the key minuscules (out of 500 containing these Epistles). P^{72} is Egyptian and often agrees with B A and 1739 (pp. 16, 17).

Johannine Epistles

1. Brooke Foss Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John,* 3d ed. (London: Macmillan, 1892). Westcott lists in chapter one the "primary" and "secondary" uncials and refers to "more than 200" cursives, including several he singles out. He gives a list of 59 readings he has adopted against the TR; and as might be expected, all 59 are supported by B. His disdain for the minuscule MSS and high regard for the "ancient uncials" is apparent in several remarks as well as in his comments in the text where variants appear.
2. Bernhard Weiss, *Handbuch über die drei Briefe des Apostel Johannes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1888). The Greek text is not given as such—detailed comments on Greek including variants.
3. A. E. Brooke, *Johannine Epistles.* Vol. 42 of *ICC* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912; reprint 1948). Brooke begins with a list of "most of the older

and more important MSS . . ." (p. lxii). Good summary account of von Soden's assignment of variants for his different groups: I-H-K readings, uncertain readings and *Sonderlesarten* from von Soden's various categories (pp. lxv-lxix). In the commentary itself Brooke lists many variants with the MS support.

4. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe.* Vol. 13 of Herder's *Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament,* eds. Alfred Wikenhauser & Anton Vögtle, 2nd ed. rev. (Freiburg: Herder, 1963). The most important witnesses for the Johannine Epistles are representatives of the Egyptian text; minuscule representatives of this text are 6, 33, 81, 104, 323, 326, 1175 and, of special value, 1739. K L S and most of the minuscules represent the Koine-Text. The uncertainties of the early textual history require one to decide on the merits of a reading separately. The problem of the "Comma Johanneum" is not a problem for the Greek MS tradition, but rather it is a concern that belongs to the history of the Latin text of the Bible (p. 45).

(To be continued)

DIE TYPOLOGISCHE BEDEUTUNG DES BEGRIFFS BABYLON

SIEGBERT UHLIG
Magdeburg, Deutsche Demokratische Republik

Das Problem entzündet sich beim Vorkommen des Begriffs in der Apk, aber auch schon im AT. Jene Texte verbieten oft eine Interpretation, die bei der historisch fixierten Grösse Babylon stehenbleibt, sie gebieten, dass der Schriftleser die neue Deutung, die der Text vollzogen hat, nachvollzieht und akzeptiert.

1. *Der Zusammenhang von Geschichte und Typologie*

Zunächst muss die Möglichkeit einer Erweiterung der Geschichte generell erörtert werden. Ist es legitim, einen geschichtlichen Ablauf unter bestimmter Voraussetzung als nicht abgeschlossen anzusehen? Kann ein geschichtlicher Ablauf als Ausgangspunkt für weitere geschichtliche Ereignisse angesehen werden mit dem Ziel, die historischen, also perfekten Abläufe, besonders aber die zurückliegenden Drohungen oder Verheissungen auf andere Personen oder Menschengruppen zu erweitern? Ist man berechtigt, das Objekt des Handelns im ersten Geschehen gewissermassen stellvertretend für andere erweiterte Objekte besonders zu akzentuieren? Ausgangspunkt für die Diskussion muss die Feststellung sein, dass es verschiedene Arten typologischen Verständnisses gibt: die Verallgemeinerung, die im Sprichwort vorliegt, die mythische Analogie von Himmlischem und Irdischem, die bis in die späthellenistische Epoche hinein zu verfolgen ist[1] und die für das AT charakteristische Analogie von Urzeit und Endzeit.[2]

[1]Vgl. O. Eissfeldt, *Ras Schamra und Sanchunjaton* (Halle [Saale], 1939), pp. 109 ff.: In einem Gedicht wird Berytos (Beirut) als *aitheros eikon* bezeichnet.

[2]G. von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments*, Evangelische Theologie 12 (NF 7; 1952/53), 18. Dort auch die Aufzählung.

Bei dem Versuch einer Definition wird klar, dass die sprachliche Bedeutung—Modell, Vorbild künftiger Personen oder Ereignisse—für die theologische Wertung nicht ausreicht.[3] Der Zusammenhang der Schrift verdeutlicht, dass es primär nicht um räumliche Analogie geht,[4] sondern um zeitliche Analogie,[5] also um das weitere und tiefere Verstehen der Geschichte als Handeln Gottes, das mit der geschichtlichen Vollendung von Personen oder Völkern nicht endet.[6] Daraus ergibt sich gleichzeitig: die Typologie gehört wesenhaft zum übergeordneten Bereich der Prophetie beziehungsweise des prophetischen Schriftverständnisses. Während jedoch die Weissagung, also die Prophezeiung im engeren Sinn, eine Rede im Auftrage Gottes ist, bezieht sich die Typologie auf das Handeln Gottes in zeitlicher Analogie.

Die alttestamentlichen Texte lassen sich nicht als in sich geschlossene religiöse Aussagen abgrenzen, sie stehen vielmehr in einem grossen "sachlichen Kontext";[7] in ihn sind sie auch stets einzuordnen. Es stellt sich also die "Frage nach dem grossen Sinn, dem das jeweilige alttestamentliche Phänomen zugehört, in dem sich etwas Analoges ereignet und von dem her es dann seinem Wesen nach besser begriffen werden könnte."[8]

Wenn man den umfassenden sachlichen Kontext einbezieht, wenn man das spezifische alttestamentliche Geschehen als ge-

[3]Literatur zu diesem Problemkreis. Im wesentlichen wurde die Diskussion von L. Goppelt, *Typos; Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen* (Gütersloh, 1939) begonnen. Nach dem Krieg nahmen deutsche Zeitschriften die Frage auf: *ThLZ*, 75 (1950), 205 ff.; 81 (1956), 641 ff.; 88 (1963), 401 ff.; 89 (1964), 321 ff.; auch Evangelische Theologie 12 (1952/53), 17 ff., 34 ff.; 22 (1962), 31 ff. Französische und auch englische Literatur (G. W. H. Lampe und K. J. Wollcombe, *Essays on Typology* [London, 1957]) liegt vor.

[4]Wie Ex 25: Gegenüberstellung von himmlischen und irdischen Dingen.

[5]Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (5. Aufl.; Berlin, 1969), 2, 388.

[6]Von Rad vertritt gegen Bultmanns These vom Einfluss der altorientalischen Periodenlehre allerdings die Meinung, dass in der Typologie stärker der Gedanke der Entsprechung als der der Wiederholung vorliege; *Typologische Auslegung*, p. 19.

[7]H. W. Wolff bei von Rad, *Theologie*.

[8]Von Rad, *Theologie*, p. 392.

schichtliches Heilshandeln Gottes beurteilt, dann lassen viele AT-Worte oder ganze Berichte nicht zu, ein Perfektum des geschehenen Ereignisses anzunehmen, sie werden vielmehr später wieder aktuell,[9] ja die Aktualisierung trägt sie bis über die "Schwelle des Neuen Testaments,"[10] wobei dann der Ausgangspunkt der Typologie zum Schatten wird angesichts der neuen, perfekten Wirklichkeit des Handelns Gottes.

Freilich ist die Intensität der Typologie im AT unterschiedlich. Sie beginnt bei den frühen Propheten und prägt sich bei den Exils- und Nachexilspropheten stärker aus. Parallel verbirgt sich Gott zunehmend dem verschuldeten Volkskollektiv—er offenbart sich dem einzelnen Gläubigen, auch dadurch, dass er sein geschichtliches Handeln durch die Typologie verständlich macht.

Die typologische Deutung hat Grenzen. Sie künden sich in der Kirchengeschichte bald an: aus dem prophetischen und typologischen Schriftverständnis entwickelt sich bei den "Apostolischen Vätern" die Allegorese,[11] die bei Origenes den Boden der Geschichte verlässt.[12] Auch später, so im 17. und 19. Jahrhundert, treibt man unkontrolliert "Symbolik,"[13] eine spiritualistische, geschichtslose Interpretation besonders des AT.[14]

Die Grenzen der Typologie liegen in der Schrift selbst, nämlich dort, wo sie, naturgemäss vorwiegend in späten Schriften des AT und im NT, keine Belege bietet, die über das "damalige" Gesche-

[9]Von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung*, p. 29: Erfüllte Verheissungsworte sind "Angeld" noch grösserer Ereignisse; es bleibt alles in Bewegung.

[10]Von Rad, *Theologie*, p. 447.

[11]Obgleich Typologie und Allegorie klar zu unterscheiden sind: jene bleibt bei grosser Freiheit gegenüber dem Buchstaben sachlich an den Typos gebunden, diese dagegen ist an den Buchstaben gebunden, in der Deutung aber ungezügelt; von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung*, p. 20.

[12]Dass auch keine gemeinsame Basis mit der jüdischen Allegoristik besteht, zeigen deren Charakteristika; vgl. J. Heinemann, *Altjüdische Allegoristik* (Breslau, 1936), p. 34.

[13]Andererseits ging durch den Rationalismus (Semler, Michaelis!) die Typologie verloren und war bis heute in ihrer Breite nicht wiederzugewinnen; von Rad, *Typologische Auslegung*, p. 21.

[14]Von Rad, *Theologie*, p. 389. Ein guter Überblick in *RGG*, 3. Aufl., 6, 1095 ff.

hen hinausgeht, wo sie also nicht die Geschichte in einer erweiternden Wertung neu interpretiert.

2. *Das geschichtliche Babel in der Auseinandersetzung mit Israel*

Bereits bei einer rein geschichtlichen Betrachtungsweise ergeben sich bei "Babel" – im NT "Babylon" – Schwierigkeiten, da mindestens drei Bedeutungen unterschieden werden müssen: die Stadt, die Landschaft, das Reich. In den alttestamentlichen Texten ist das nicht immer ganz durchsichtig, jedoch steht die Stadt selten ohne Bezug auf das Reich; die Landschaft scheidet nahezu aus.[15] Dabei umfasst Babylonia nicht primär eine ethnische und nicht eine geographische, sondern eine politische Grösse, die vor allem geographisch nur ungenau abgegrenzt werden kann.[16]

Wenn Babel als definitive Grösse schwer zu fassen ist, mag es auch daran liegen, dass die Bedeutung der Stadt, durchaus nicht immer Residenz, zugleich religiös begründet ist: die Könige von Babel verstanden sich als göttlich Beauftragte[17] und trugen ihren städtischen Astralkult in die Lande. Marduk, geehrt mit dem Titel "bel" = Herr = Götterkönig, bestieg zu jedem Neujahrsfest im Frühjahr seinen Thron und trat damit jährlich neu die Weltherrschaft an.[18]

Eine weitere Schwierigkeit, Babels geschichtliche Bedeutung zu definieren, besteht in der schwer zu fixierenden Einflussnahme auf die Umwelt. Zwar begründete Delitzsch 1902 mit seinem Vortrag über "Babel und Bibel" die Schulmeinung des Panbabylonismus; sie tendierte zur völligen kulturellen und damit literarischen Abhängigkeit der Nachbarstaaten und sprach konsequent auch von Motiventlehnungen des AT. Doch angesichts der archäologischen und religionsgeschichtlichen Ergebnisse der letz-

[15]Ausnahme Dan 2:48: "Landschaft," "Provinz."

[16]Pauly/Wissowa, *Realenzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, II, zu "Babylon"; vgl. auch M. Noth, *Die Welt des Alten Testaments* (Berlin, 1962), p. 225.

[17]Noth, p. 256.

[18]Ibid., pp. 261, 262.

ten Jahrzehnte lässt sich diese These nicht mehr halten. Zwar ist es wahr, dass Israel geistige Schablonen ("Patterns") übernommen hat, es füllte diese jedoch eigenständig.[19] Bereits in Altisrael zeichnet sich eine Protesthaltung gegen andere Religionen ab. Markantestes Merkmal dafür ist die Ausschliesslichkeit, ja Intoleranz, Jahves. Mit diesem Urteil soll allerdings der weitreichende Einfluss Babels in Magie, Mathematik, Gewerbe[20] nicht allgemein geleugnet werden. Zugleich aber lässt sich aus der religiösen Protesthaltung Israels schliessen, dass im AT eine nur geschichtliche oder gar unreligiöse Wertung Babels nicht zu erwarten ist. Babel war eine religiöse Grossmacht—wegen seines Götterkultes und seines blasphemischen Anspruches eine für Israel besonders bedrohliche Grossmacht.

Hier seien zur Erinnerung die wichtigstens Daten der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Babel und Israel genannt:

705 Lösung Judas unter Hiskia und anderer Völker wie Babel von Assyrien.

625 Gründung des neubabylonischen Reiches (Nabopolassar), damit Verfall und 612 Einnahme Ninives (Prophet Nahum). So Möglichkeit der politischen und kultischen Reformen Josias.

604 Nach der Niederlage Ägyptens (Necho) ist Babylon (Nebukadnezar) Beherrscher des Vorderen Orients.

597 Jojakim hatte sich gegen die babylonische Herrschaft gerichtet—Belagerung und Einnahme Jerusalems; Jojakin wird nach Babel geführt.

586 Zedekia, als Vasall Babels über das dezimierte Juda eingesetzt, lässt sich von revolutionären Stimmen hinreissen, gegen die Hoheit Babels zu agitieren—Jerusalem wird eingenommen, Zedekia deportiert, seine Söhne getötet. Ende des Königtums.

562 Mit dem Tode Nebukadnezars steigt die Hoffnung auf die Befreiung von der babylonischen Herrschaft.

539 Einnahme Babylons durch die Perser; ein neues Verhältnis zu den Vasallen wie Juda: Statt der Deportation Duldung der Landeskulte und Landeskultur unter der Regierung von Provinzstatthaltern.

Bereits vor einer Betrachtung der Schriftworte lässt sich aus dem geschichtlichen Ablauf eine starke Opposition gegen Babel erwarten. Man versteht auch die religiöse Grundlage des Widerstandes; Juda musste in Babylon—wie in Assyrien—die Macht

[19] *RGG*, 3. Aufl.; 1, 823.

[20] RAC zu "Babylon"; 1 (1950), 1118 ff.

wider Gott sehen. Das Königtum, der Arm Gottes, war ausgelöscht, die Bruderstämme durch die Deportation vernichtet, der Tempelkult Jahves aufgelöst. Es konnte nicht anders sein: Babel war die "Repräsentantin der gottfeindlichen Macht."[21]

3. *Die Wertung Babels in den Prophetentexten*

Zwei Gruppen von Texten sind zu unterscheiden; sie grenzen gleichzeitig die beiden grossen Epochen des israelitischen Volkes ab, die Zeit des politischen Aufschwungs, etwa parallel zur Königszeit, und die Zeit des nationalen Niedergangs, etwa gleich der hohen Prophetenzeit.

Die rein geschichtliche Erwähnung Babels—ab 2. Kön 17 in 2. Chr, Esr, Est—hat für die vorliegende Betrachtung keine Bedeutung. So die mehr als 40-fache Formel: "Nebukadnezar, König von Babel." Ähnlich unreflektiert 2 Kön 17: 24, 30; 24:15-17; 25:5, 27-30. Diese und andere Stellen zeugen von der neutral geschichtlichen, untypologischen Betrachtungsweise der Königszeit, in der Israel selbst zu stark ist, um äussere Feinde wirklich zu fürchten. Auch 2 Kön 20: 12, 14, 17 gehört sachlich zur rein geschichtlichen Bewertung dieser Epoche.

Mit dem Auftreten der Propheten zu Beginn der Dekadenz in der Königszeit, mit dem Niedergang und dem Herannahen des Exils vollzieht sich eine deutliche Wandlung: Neben berichtender Darstellung steht zunehmend Polemik, neben Geschichtswort typologische Deutung, obgleich um der Typologie willen der geschichtliche Boden nie verlassen wird.

Hier können nur die bedeutungsvollsten Texte kurz gewertet werden:[22]

Mi 4:6-14. Dem Abschnitt liegt eine geschichtliche Situation zugrunde. Dennoch deuten einige Typen selbst eine Erweiterung an: "Tochter Zion" (v. 8), "Geburtswehen der Gebärenden" (v. 9), die Hinkenden

[21]Ibid.

[22]Es wird absichtlich auf die Einsicht der Kommentare verzichtet. Nur die Texte selbst sollen im Zentrum stehen, wenngleich die Exegesen als Korrektiv ihre unbestrittene Bedeutung hätten.

werden zum Überrest, die Schwachen zum mächtigen Volk (v. 7). Vergleichbare Elemente finden sich in der Polemik (Vs. 11 ff).

Jes 13 f. Es begegnet dem Leser schärfste Gerichtsdrohung, auf weiten Strecken untypologisch (13: 18 ff.); neben Babyloniern werden Assyrer, Meder, Perser und Araber genannt. Zugleich findet sich eine erweiternde Wertung; die gefördert wird durch die poetische Sprache des *maschal* von 14: 4 ff., in dem sich anfangs (Vs. 4-8) noch geschichtliche Anklänge nachweisen lassen, der sich aber bis zur Ankündigung völliger Vernichtung zunehmend apokalyptisch erweitert. Kennzeichnend für den Vorgang der Typologisierung ist 14: 9 ff., wo politische Grössen den Ausgangspunkt bilden. Dennoch wird die Typologisierung bis zum Extrem der Personifikation des Bösen vorangetrieben.

Jes 21: 1 ff. Der Abschnitt, eine deutliche Parallele zu 13 ff., zeigt einerseits, dass der geschichtliche Boden nicht verlassen wird[23] (die Gerichtssprüche betreffen reale Mächte), während er andererseits deutliche Tendenzen zur typologischen Deutung bietet—so die Wächterszene (Vs. 6-8), die Generalisierungen (Vs. 3-5), charakteristisch auch das Schreien der Gebärenden (V. 3). Aufschlussreich ist V. 9, wo prophetisch vom wirklichen Sturz des babylonischen Reiches gesprochen wird. Es wird also eine geschichtliche Aussage gemacht. Der Schluss des Verses dagegen, der vom Niederschmettern der Götzen spricht, hat eine starke religiöse Wertung zum Inhalt. Hier wird typologisiert.

Jes 48:12 ff. Auch hier liegt eine geschichtliche, eine auf aktuelles Geschehen bezogene Verheissung vor, wozu Anhaltspunkte den in Versen 14 und 20 gegeben werden. Aber gerade in diesen Versen wird die Verquickung von Geschichte und Typologie augenfällig. Erweiteru ngen finden sich in den eschatologischen Sätzen der Verse 12, 13 und 16, in der Verheissung von Vers 17, im Regress auf die Bundesgeschichte und auch in der Generalisierung in Vers 22. Dass selbst in einem Vers Geschichte und typologische Deutung miteinander verflochten sind, beweist Vers 20. Der erste Teil ist aus einer durchsichtigen, geschichtlichen Situation zu verstehen, die übrigen Teile des Verses erweitern den Ruf im Sinne einer typologischen Deutung.

Jer 25: 1 ff. Das Kapitel, Daten und Zeitangaben enthaltend, erinnert in seiner Sachlichkeit an das Werk des Chronisten.[24] Erstaunlich ist die positive Beurteilung der unmittelbar bevorstehenden chaldäischen Strafmassnahme. Singulär dürfte die Würdigung Babels als Knecht Jahves (*'ebed*) sein.[25] Dieser nüchterne reportähnliche Stil wird in den Versen 12 und 13 beibehalten. Allerdings können die Verse 10, 11a und 12c eine leichte Tendenz zur Generalisierung nicht verbergen.

Jer 50. Die geschichtliche Sicht dominiert eindeutig. Selbst wo sich verbale Berührungspunkte zu Jes finden, fehlt die ausgesprochene Neigung zur Typisierung,[26] auch dann, wenn Jer farbige Bilder einbezieht wie in Versen 88 ff. Das Kapitel neigt gegen Ende zur Verallgemeine-

[23]Vgl. Vs. 1, 2, 9, 13, 14 und 17.

[24]Vs. 1, 3, 11 f.

[25]Selbst bei mangelhafter Textbezeugung—vgl. Kittel's BH, 3. Aufl.,—dürfte der Terminus aufgrund von Jer 27:6 als gesichert gelten.

[26]Vgl. V. 8 mit Jes 48:20.

rung und eschatologischen Weiterführung der Gedanken: die Geburtswehen in Vers 43, wie auch das Erbeben der Erde in Vers 46, usw. Dennoch bleibt die polemische Schilderung weithin untypologisch.

Jer 51. Der geschichtliche Zug dominiert offensichtlich auch in diesem Kapitel (sieh Vs. 4, 6, 30-32, 42, 43). Allerdings ist die typologisierende Deutung gegenüber dem Vorkapitel verstärkt (Vs. 8-10, 14-19, 25, 38-40, 53). Charakteristische Elemente dieser Deutung sind zu sehen im Rückgriff auf die Schöpfungsgeschichte (Vs. 15 ff), in dem Begriff "Tochter Babel" (V. 33), und im Emporsteigen bis zum Himmel (V. 53), usw.

Dass es sich in diesen Wertungen nicht um die Differenzierung verschiedener Quellen handelt, liegt auf der Hand. Vielmehr soll belegt werden, dass die Propheten "Babylon" in seiner Geschichtlichkeit aufnahmen, zugleich jedoch in den umfassenden Zusammenhang des göttlichen Heilshandelns einbezogen als Typos für andere Ereignisse in der Begegnung zwischen Gott, Mensch und Satan.

Etliche wichtige Texte mussten hier unberücksichtigt bleiben. Dennoch dürfte sich das Bild durch ihre Hinzunahme nicht ändern. Vielmehr würde sich der Eindruck verstärken, dass von gewissenhaften Strukturanalysen, wie der Frage nach der Tendenz zur Polemik und der Typologie, auch andere Bereiche der Theologie berührt würden, so zum Beispiel die Einleitungswissenschaft. Ist die These von der linear steigenden Typologie richtig, dann lässt sich die Entstehung des Dan, auch in seinen Visionen, nicht aus der Makkabäerzeit verstehen, in der die Polemik gegen "Babel" ohne Polemik,[27] Typologie und Eschatologie positiv als Geschichtstatsache akzeptiert.

Allerdings erfordert der merkwürdige Tatbestand des Schwankens der Typologie eine Erklärung. Die beiden Propheten, die sich hauptsächlich mit Babylon auseinandersetzen, tun dies in deutlich unterschiedener Form: Jesajas Prophetie bietet stärkere Typologisierungen als Jeremias, dessen Sprache sonst zumindest poetische Anklänge erkennen lässt. Als mögliche Gründe dafür könnten gelten: Apokalyptik ist bei grösserem zeitlichen Abstand einleuchtender als bei geringerem; für Jeremia ist Babel ein

[27]Auch Kapitel 4 (Nebukadnezars Wahnsinn) ist keine Ausnahme; hier wie in Kapitel 3 wird der eine Herrscher und nicht das System attackiert.

existentielles Problem, also eine geschichtliche Tatsache, erst in zweiter Linie haben Erweiterungen Platz.

4. *Vorchristliche und frühchristliche Polemik gegen Rom*

Das Material, das diesem Abschnitt zugrunde liegt, sollte nicht übergangen werden. Einmal werden hier die Linien zwischen AT und NT deutlicher ausgezogen, zum anderen kommen die frühchristlichen "Väter" zu Wort, was für das Verständnis "Babylons" in der Apk wichtig ist.

In der spätjüdischen und in der ausserbiblischen Antike lässt sich "Babylon" als Typos von Städten und Mächten nachweisen. Babylon galt bei Griechen und Römern wegen seines Reichtums und seiner Pracht als Symbol einer orientalischen Riesenstadt. Viele sprichwörtliche Redensarten sagen den Babyloniern Hang zur Verschwendung nach.[28]

Es kommt hinzu, dass die Entwicklung zur Typologie durch den Gebrauch von Decknamen in politisch bedrängter Situation gefördert wurde. In der rabbinischen Literatur finden sich beispielsweise viele solcher Gleichniselemente für das Römische Reich: "Esau," "Edom," "Perser," "Wildschwein," "frevelhaftes, gottloses Königreich" usw.[29] So wurde das typologisierte Babylon zum Instrument im geistigen Widerstand gegen das politische Rom.[30] Nach 66 n.Chr. kennt die Polemik keine Grenzen mehr. Rom wird charakterisiert als Dirne, mit dem Namen "Babylon," dem Namen des Erzfeindes Israels,[31] an der Stirn. An dieser Stelle

[28]Pauly/Wissowa, a.a.o.

[29]N. Wasser, *Die Stellung der Juden gegenüber den Römern nach der rabbinischen Literatur* (Diss. Phil. Zürich, 1933), p. 8.

[30]Belege bei H. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch,* 3 (München, 1926), 816. Es finden sich sogar Belege für die Verwendung der Formel "die grosse Stadt" *(babel rabta)* aus Dan 4:27 als Charakterisierung Roms; so wird Rom mehrfach nur *karakh gadol* ("grosse Stadt") genannt (Pesiq R 14) oder auch *karakh gadol šebrome* ("die grosse Stadt in Rom"; Pes 118 b; Sanh 21 b; Midr Qoh 5, 7).

[31]H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt*

zeigt sich im Rückweg der Erweiterung auf die Basis der Polemik, also auf das alte geschichtliche Reich, dass das Judentum seinen Hass gegen diesen Widersacher nie aufgekündigt hat.

Ohne Kommentar wird in der jüdisch geprägten Literatur am Ende des ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts Rom mit dem Schmähnamen "Babylon" belegt: ". . . und wird verbrennen das tiefe Meer und Babylon selbst und das italische Land."[32] Babylon, nämlich Rom, wird charakterisiert mit den Begriffen Zauberei und Ehebruch, und gilt als eine gänzlich unreine Stadt.[33] Auf gleicher Ebene liegt wohl der Gebrauch in 1 Ptr 5, wo Rom, "überpolemisiert bis zur Sachlichkeit,"[34] gemeint ist. Hier liegt fast wieder eine unreflektierte Ortsbestimmung vor.

Neben den Sibyllinen sind aus der apokalyptischen Literatur noch die Werke Baruch und Esra zu nennen.[35] Die Verfasser verstehen sich als Mitbetroffene der babylonischen Gefangenschaft; sie richten sich gegen Rom: "Dies aber sage ich, Baruch, dir zuwider, Babel . . ."[36]

Zur Kennzeichnung der römischen Macht gehören:

1. In der Esra-Apokalypse Übermut, Hass gegen die Geraden, Bedrängung der Stillen, das Schleifen der Mauern der Harmlosen u.a.m.;

2. In der Baruch-Apokalypse Gewalt, Macht, Grausamkeit u.a.m.

Wie die jüdischen Schriften benutzen auch die "Kirchenväter" häufig die alttestamentliche Terminologie in ihrer Polemik. Fast immer findet man da Urteile über Schlechtigkeit und das Zufügen von Leid.[37] Hieronymus, der allerdings schon von der Johan-

(Berlin, 1938), p. 20. Vgl. auch M. Mieses, "Hebräische Fragmente aus dem jüdischen Urtext der Apokalypse des Johannes," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums,* 74 (NF 38; 1930), 357.

[32]Sibyllinen 5, 159 f.

[33]Fuchs, a.a.o.

[34]RAC, a.a.o.

[35]Wohl Anfang des 2. Jahrhunderts.

[36]Vis. 2, 2, 29.

[37]So Chrysostomos, Gregor Nyss.

nesapokalypse beinflusst ist, spricht vom christlich gewordenen Rom als von dem "Sündenbabel."[38] Origenes deutet erwartungsgemäss alle Aussagen über Babylon allegorisch und fragt nicht nach dem historischen Hintergrund. Für ihn ist sie die Stadt des Teufels und der gottfeindlichen Macht, von der alle Wirkung des Bösen herkommt.[39] In gleicher Vehemenz und Intensität wie Origenes gebraucht Augustin Babel typologisch für Rom, für die Stadt des Teufels, die im ewigen Kampf mit "Zion" liegt. Freilich verlässt auch Augustin stark den realen Ausgangspunkt. Die Deportation ins babylonische Exil vergleicht er mit der Evangelisierung der Heiden, und die Rückführung nach Juda mit dem Einzug der Gläubigen in das himmlische Jerusalem.

Obgleich das Aufgehen des Begriffs Babel in der Symbolik zur beherrschenden Deutung der Patristiker wurde,[40] gibt es dennoch in De Civitate Dei[41] etliche Bezüge auf Rom als "occidentalis Babylon" bzw. umgekehrt. Babylon wird "prima Roma" (18, 2) genannt, was nicht nur auf die Stadt, sondern auf das Reich zu beziehen ist; denn beide Reiche stimmen, im Gegensatz zum Gottesreich, in ihrer Machtgier überein.[42]

Damit dürfte erwiesen sein, dass "Babylon" eine der vielgebrauchten Typen in Widerstand gegen das politische Rom gewesen ist, aber auch als Typos des christianisierten Rom galt.

5. *Folgerungen für den Gebrauch in der Apokalypse*

Allgemein ist zu sagen, dass das AT in der Apokalypse sehr häufig Verwendung findet. Dennoch lässt sich kaum eine der über 400 Anführungen als Zitat bezeichnen,[43] sondern sie sind durchweg Reminiszenzen. Damit ist eine bewusste Herübernahme aus dem AT, mehr dem Geist als dem Wortlaut nach, festge-

[38]RAC, a.a.o.
[39]Ibid.
[40]Ibid.
[41]16, 17; 18, 2. 22. 27.
[42]Fuchs, p. 75.
[43]E. Hühn, *Die alttestamentlichen Zitate und Reminiszenzen im Neuen Testament* (Tübingen, 1900), p. 270: "Das Fehlen einer Zitierformel in der Apk ist durch den Charakter des Buches bestimmt."

halten.[44] Dennoch verfährt die Apokalypse sehr frei mit den Elementen aus der Tradition, so frei, dass man versucht ist, anders als beispielsweise bei den Erfüllungszitaten des Mt, teilweise von "pattern" zu sprechen.

Wie andere Termini wird "Babylon" in der Apokalypse frei, ohne starke innere Bindung an die Tradition gebraucht.[45] Durch die typologische Deutung der AT-Bilder geht die Apokalypse weit über das AT hinaus. So stammt die Aufzählung von Kap. 18:12 ff. sachlich nicht aus dem AT, sie ist von der Apokalypse selbst gestaltet,[46] obgleich die Termini teilweise Semitismen sind, also aus dem AT-Bereich stammen.[47] "Babylon" steht für Rom, d.h. der Verfasser der Apokalypse verwendet die "von der Schriftprophetie dargebotene Bezeichnung Babel, um das typische Wesen dieses Antichristentums hervorzuheben."[48] Dass sich die Apokalypse nicht nur mit einzelnen Kaisern und ihren blasphemischen Egozentrismen auseinandersetzt, geht aus den Generalisierungen, die mit "Babel" verbunden sind, eindeutig hervor. Allerdings bieten Domitians Hofdichter Martial und Statius interessante Parallelen zur Sprache der Apokalypse, so für *pantokratōr, potens terrarum;* für *kyrios tēs gēs, terrarum Dominus.*[49] Besonders die Verwendung hymnischer Elemente[50]

[44]Vgl. T. Holtz, *Die Christologie der Apokalypse des Johannes* (Berlin, 1962). Holtz selbst kommt aufgrund vieler Belege wiederholt zu dem Ergebnis, dass die Apokalypse stark die alttestamentliche Tradition, selten aber deren sachlichen Inhalt aufnimmt, ohne ihn zu modifizieren.

[45]W. Foerster, "Die Bilder in Offenbarung 12 f. und 17 f.," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* 104 (1932), 307.

[46]Foerster, pp. 299, 300.

[47]Zu *ergazesthai* 18, 17 vgl. die Untersuchung von C. Lindhagen, "ERGAZESTHAI," *Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift,* 5 (1950): 5 ff.

[48]W. Hadorn, *Kommentar* (1928), p. 235. Ähnlich die meisten Exegeten. Damit wird der geschichtliche und also der zeitgeschichtliche Hintergrund nicht aufgelöst. Anders E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (2. Aufl.; Tübingen, 1953), Exkurs zu V. 17, pp. 145 ff: Schon in AT und Judentum ist Babel der "Innbegriff der gottfeindlichen Macht, die sozusagen einer bestimmten Lokalisation nicht mehr bedarf." Damit löst Lohmeyer den Geschichtszusammenhang a priori auf.

[49]Belege bei R. Schütz, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes und Kaiser Domitian* (Göttingen, 1933), pp. 35, 36.

[50]*Hagios—sacer, doxa—terrarum gloria, sōteria—salus;* ibid.

erhärten den Verdacht, dass die Polemik gegen die antichristliche Macht Rom aus keinem anderen Grunde als dem des religiösen Anspruchs motiviert ist. Es liegen keine politischen, ökonomischen oder anderen Motive zugrunde.[51]

Unter der Voraussetzung also, dass die Johannesapokalypse nicht das vorgezeichnete und das anschliessend in der frühen Kirchengeschichte weiterlaufende Verständnis des Begriffs Babylon unterbricht,[52] lässt sich für seinen Gebrauch in der Apokalypse folgern:

1. Die erfahrene Geschichte "Babylon" bleibt stets als realistisches Moment im Hintergrund und verhindert so die Allegorese.

2. Von der Prophetenzeit an lässt sich, insgesamt betrachtet, eine ständig zunehmende Typisierung des Begriffs beobachten, wobei Rom als Stadt und Staat immer deutlicher in das Blickfeld rückt.

3. Die Polemik gegen Rom wird mit dem Material der alttestamentlichen Unheilsdrohungen gespeist, d.h. die Abwehr gegen Babel wird übertragen auf das Verhältnis der Juden bzw. Christen gegenüber Rom.

4. Der mit diesem Begriff genährte Widerstand richtet sich nicht gegen Äusserlichkeiten, er richtet sich vor allem gegen den Geist Roms: es wird Front bezogen gegen die blasphemische Anmassung Babylons = Roms, göttliche Verehrung zu fordern.

5. Damit ist eine religiöse Wertung vollzogen. Der Gäubige erkennt Babel als eine Versuchung, ja als Instrument des Widersachers.

6. Möglicherweise fällt vom Gebrauch dieses Begriffs in der Apokalypse auch ein Licht auf seinen Fall: Wenn Babylon "fällt,"

[51]Das sollte bei der heutigen Exegese ebenso bedacht werden; antikommunistische Polemik stimmt nicht mit der Intention der Apokalypse überein.

[52]Das müsste freilich noch eingehender untersucht werden, als es in diesem Rahmen möglich ist. Doch Hieronymus' und Hippolyts und mit Einschränkung Augustins Verwendung deutet auf eine kontinuierliche Deutungslinie, die sich sachlich auf die Apokalypse stützt.

so ist aufgrund des typologischen Verständnisses die Bedeutung von "Niederstürzen" offenbar nicht ganz neutralisiert. Babylon fällt, das ist Gericht, aber zugleich auch Evangelium.

THE PROBLEM OF ISAIAH 6:13

UDO F. CH. WORSCHECH
Seminar Marienhöhe, Darmstadt, Germany

A difficult *crux interpretum* in the book of Isaiah has been the last verse in Isaiah's inaugural vision (Is 6:13). The fact that the famous St. Mark's Isaiah scroll from Qumran (1QIs^a) reads *ḇmh* instead of the MT *ḇm* aside from another textual variant has led W. H. Brownlee, F. Hvidberg, S. Iwry, W. F. Albright and G. R. Driver[1] to extraordinary reinterpretations which make this text refer to a typical "high place." These reconstructions with their emendations are reflected in the NEB's rendering of Is 6:13 which follows the LXX in omitting the last clause, "a holy seed is its stump." The NEB reads thus:

> Even if a tenth part of its people remain there,
> they too will be exterminated
> [like an oak or a terebinth,
> a sacred oak thrown out from its place in a hill-shrine].

It should be noted that the omission of the last clause ignores its presence not only in the Targumim and Peshitta but particularly in 1QIs^a which supports the MT providing superior textual evidence in favor of retaining "a holy seed is its stump." It is our purpose to discuss briefly major scholarly reconstruction of Is 6:13 before we proceed to discuss the Hebrew text phrase by phrase.

1. *Emendational Reconstructions*

As early as 1951 W. H. Brownlee attempted to reconstruct the Hebrew text of Is 6:13 with the aid of the reading *mšlḵṯ* and *ḇmh* of 1QIs^a in place of the *hepax legomenon ḇšlḵṯ* and *ḇm* of

[1] W. H. Brownlee, "The Text of Isaiah vi, 13 in the Light of DSIa," *VT*, 2 (1951), 296-298; Flemming Hvidberg, "The Maṣṣēba and the Holy Seed," *Interpretationes (Mowinckel Festschrift)* (Oslo, 1955), pp. 97-99; Samuel Iwry, "Maṣṣēbāh and Bāmāh in 1Q IsaiahA 6:13," *JBL*, 76 (1957), 225-232; W. F. Albright, "The High Place in Ancient Palestine," *VTS*, 4 (1957), 242-258; G. R. Driver, "Isaiah 1-39: Textual and Linguistic Problems," *JSS*, 13 (1968), 38.

the MT. The reading *bmh* is associated with *mṣbt*, "a sacred column of a high place," and the phrase "and as the terebinth" is transposed to a position after *mšlkt* for the sake of poetic parallelism and metrical reconstruction. The translation he offers is as follows:

> "And if there be yet a tenth in it,
> It in turn shall be for burning,
> As an oak when it is thrown down,
> and as the terebinth by the sacred column of
> a high place."[2]

Among the problems of Brownlee's reconstruction are the following: (1) The lack of textual or versional support for his transposition of *mšlkt* and the separation of the phrase "and as a terebinth or as an oak."[3] (2) The omission of the last phrase of 6:13 in 1QIs[a]. (3) The rendering of *bmh* as "the sacred column of a high place." As a matter of fact Brownlee has pointed out in a more recent publication that the intended meaning of *bmh* is not related to the idea of a high place.[4]

In 1955 F. Hvidberg's article appeared with another translation for Is 6:13 also based on 1QIs[a]:

> "Like the terebinth and the oak, that lie flung
> down (musloekoet, see 1 Kgs. 13vv. 24, 25, 28)
> upon the masseba in the bama. The holy seed is
> its (the bama's) masseba!"[5]

He interprets "the holy seed" by resorting to Is 17:10-11 and considers this term as an expression of Ba'al's virility. The *maṣṣeboth* in the holy places and their holy seed are interpreted as the spirits of an alien god which shall be destroyed altogether.

S. Iwry also worked on the basis of 1QIs[a] independently of both

[2] Brownlee, 297f.

[3] See Gerhard F. Hasel, *The Remnant, The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah* (AUM, V; 2d ed.; Berrien Springs, Mich., 1974), p. 236, n. 85, for a critique. E. A. Leslie, *Isaiah* (New York, 1963), p. 26, accepted Brownlee's transposition but also retained the last clause.

[4] W. H. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible* (New York, 1964), p. 239.

[5] Hvidberg, p. 99.

Brownlee and Hvidberg. He resorts to four emendations in his reconstruction ([*w*]*'šr*[*h*] [*h*]*mšlḵt* [*m*]*mṣḇt ḇmh*) and treats the last clause (*zrʿ qdš mṣḇth*) as a later added gloss:

> "Like a terebinth, or an oak, or an
> Asherah,
> When flung down from the sacred column
> of a high place."[6]

With two emendations W. F. Albright recast this verse into a poetic form. He reads also *'šr*[*h*] *for 'šr,* pluralizes *mṣḇt and* adds *ḇ* so that he arrives at the following translation:

> "Like the terebinth goddess and the oak of Asherah,
> Cast out with the stelae of the high place."[7]

Albright's own freedom with regard to his emendational reconstruction, with the omission of the entire last clause which is textually well supported, is quite surprising in view of his own verdict that "we may rest assured that the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible, though not infallible, has been preserved with an accuracy perhaps unparalleled in any other Near-Eastern literature."[8]

This representative survey has indicated that a number of recent scholars have dealt with the Hebrew text of Is 6:13 with an unusual degree of freedom. Emendations, transpositions, and omissions have been their rule. No *communis opinio* has been achieved. It seems, therefore, mandatory to discuss the individual phrases of Is 6:13 in some detail.

2. *The Hebrew Text*

The consonantal text of the first phrase of vs. 13 is *wʿwḏ bh ʿśryh.* The ordinal *ʿśryh,* "tenth," an attributive adjective,[9] is translated in the LXX with *to epidekaton.*

N. H. Tur-Sinai suggests the translation "a (group of) ten (men)" for *ʿśryh.*[10] But *ʿśryh* is an ordinal and the context does not cor-

[6] Iwry, p. 232.

[7] Albright, *VTS,* 4, 255.

[8] W. F. Albright, "The Old Testament and the Archaeology of Palestine," *The Old Testament and Modern Study,* ed. H. H. Rowley (London, 1951), p. 25.

[9] R. J. Williams, *Hebrew Syntax, An Outline* (Toronto, 1967), p. 23, par. 98.

[10] N. H. Tur-Sinai, "A Contribution to the Understanding of Isaiah I-XII," *Scripta Hierosolymitana,* 8 (1961), 168.

respond with that of Amos 5:3 or Gn 18:32 which is cited as proof for the suggested meaning.

Recently R. Fey commented on the "tenth" of our passage. According to his view vs. 13 refers to the destruction of the tenth part of the "field's produce" (*Feldertrag*) based on Is 5:10. [11] The idea that the "tenth" represents the "field's produce" cannot be upheld. Contextually *'śryh* refers to the people of the land (*h'rṣ*, vs. 12). In vs. 11 the destruction of the cities and the land is described; vs. 12 refers to the removal of the people of which there will be a remnant. But vs. 13a indicates that even this small remnant (*'śryh*) shall again be consumed. [12]

In the second Hebrew phrase *wšḇh whyṯh lb'r* (vs. 13b) the Piel inf. cstr. of the verb *b'r* has been variously interpreted. The LXX translates *eis pronomēn*, "for foraging," and Symmachus employs the synonym *kaṯaboskēsin*, "for a feeding."[13] This seems to point to the picture of animals grazing on the land. A number of scholars, however, take *b'r* in this text to mean "burning,"[14] which is also the suggested meaning for this text by L. Köhler.[15] On the other hand, it is to be observed with K. Budde,[16] J. P. Seierstad,[17] H. Wildberger[18] and others[19] that in

[11] Richard Fey, *Amos und Jesaja* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1963), pp. 106-109.

[12] On the remnant motif in Is 6:11-13, see Hasel, pp. 233-248.

[13] E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (New York, 1957), 2, 643.

[14] E.g. R. B. Y. Scott, "Isaiah, 1-39," *Interpreter's Bible* (Nashville, 1956), 5, 213; W. Eichrodt, *Der Heilige in Israel* (Stuttgart, 1960), p. 14; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja* (2d ed.; Zürich, 1960), I, 93.

[15] L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden, 1958), p. 140; so also W. L. Holladay, Jr., ed., *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1971), p. 44.

[16] K. Budde, "Über die Schranken, die Jesajas Botschaft zu setzen sind," *ZAW*, 41 (1923), 167.

[17] J. P. Seierstad, *Die Offenbarungserlebnisse der Propheten Amos, Jesaja und Jeremia* (Oslo, 1946), pp. 107f.

[18] H. Wildberger, *Jesaja* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1968), p. 233.

[19] H. W. Hertzberg, *Der Erste Jesaja* (Leipzig, 1936), p. 17; O. Kaiser, *Der Prophet Jesaja, Kap. 1-12* (Göttingen, 1963), p. 57; M. Buber, *The Prophetic*

both Is 3:14 and 5:5 *b'r* in the Piel is used for the "grazing" of animals in the vineyard (of Yahweh). Since in these two passages the object of *b'r*, "grazing," is Israel as represented by the vineyard, the same meaning of "consume, devour"[20] seems appropriate also for 6:13.

The reference to trees in the phrase *k'lh wk'lwn* (vs. 13c) is of great importance for the understanding of *mṣbt* in the next part (vs. 13d). If *'lh* and *'lwn* are literal trees, then *mṣbt*, being part of the relative clause with *'šr*, stands in thought-relation to *'lh* and *'lwn* and cannot have the connotation of "stone-pillar" or "sacred column." The meaning of a "stump" or "root-stock" which is left standing after the felling of the literal trees would be the natural corollary.

Both Iwry and Albright felt the inconsistency in translating "sacred column" for *mṣbt*. Iwry defends his translation by stating,

> In Canaanite cultic tradition *Elt* and *Aṯrt* are synonymous names for the same goddess. As trees they represent female deities, and frequently in the Bible they are found in conjunction with *maṣṣēbôt* and *bāmôt*. . . .[21]

Albright is quick to point out,

> Here we have first *'elah*, literally 'the goddess,' Canaanite *'Elat*, whose name is also coupled with that of Asherah in the Ugaritic epics. Her tree, *par excellence*, was the terebinth, to which her name came eventually to be applied in Hebrew. . . .[22]

Only if *'lh* and *'lwn* are interpreted as representing female deities is the translation "sacred column" for *mṣbt* justified.

As ingenious as this interpretation may seem, the comparison of *'lh* and *'lwn* with 'Elat, Anath, or Astarte is unfounded.[23] Neither

Faith (New York, 1960), p. 133; Hasel, p. 235; H. Ringgren, *"b'r," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum AT*, 1 (1973), 731.

[20] So F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT* (Oxford, 1907), p. 129.

[21] Iwry, p. 230.

[22] Albright, *VTS*, 4 ,255.

[23] It is significant that in one of Albright's latest publications in which he

the LXX nor the Targum nor the Peshitta, much less the MT, provides any hint or even remotely suggests that such an interpretation is warranted.

Ivan Engnell's view is that *'lh* and *'lwn* refer to the ideological world of sacral kingship symbolizing the tree of life concept.[24] He sees the *mṣḇṯ* as embracing both the "Tammuz" figure and the king. A. Mackay suggests that *'lh* and *'lwn* refers to the male and female palm-tree pillar of the temple.[25] A crucial problem pertains to the interpretation of Israelite concepts on the basis of cultic concepts of extrabiblical religions. It is imperative to investigate the way Isaiah uses *'lh*. A passage which throws light on the meaning of the reference to *'lh* and *'lwn* in 6:13 is Is 1:29f. The term *'lh* is employed in Is 1:29f. in a twofold sense. In vs. 29 Isaiah refers to the *'lh* as a cult object in connection with the gardens of delight, the centers of idol worship. Albright has pointed out correctly that the oak was a cult object consecrated to the goddess Asherah.[26] This cult object with its cult[27] had become an object of the prophet's attacks.[28] In vs. 30 Isaiah refers to *'lh* again, but this time in a literal sense using the term as an object lesson for his people. Hence, it is clear that *'lh* stands as a symbol for the cult and the people of Judah. The withering of the oak referred to in vs. 30 symbolizes the consummation of false religion and its ungodly followers.

This writer, therefore, suggests that *'lh* and *'lwn* in Is 6:13 are used with subtle reference to their cultic use but primarily as representing the people of Judah who follow the abominable practices of the Canaanites. The felling of the *'lh* and *'lwn* thus

speaks of the deification of the "terebinth" and "oak" and citing biblical passages which refer to these trees no word is said about Is 6:13; see his *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Garden City, N.Y., 1968), pp. 180-191.

[24] I. Engnell, *The Call of Isaiah* (Uppsala, 1949), p. 49.

[25] A. Mackay, "The Sign of the Palm Tree," *CQR*, 126 (1938), 187-212.

[26] Albright, *VTS*, 4, 255.

[27] F. Zimmermann, "El and Adonai," *VT*, 12 (1962), 190-195.

[28] Wildberger, pp. 71f.

appears to be a picture of the destruction of pagan religion and the death of those who worship under the sacred trees.

Now we turn to the phrase *'šr bšlḳṯ mṣḇṯ bm.* Both Iwry and Albright propose *'šrh* for *'šr.* This emendation is made for two reasons: (1) to make the text agree with the idea that vs. 13 is a descriptive statement of a "typical cultic *bamah,*"[29] and, (2) for the sake of poetry. What has been pointed out above, namely that no other manuscript in Hebrew, Greek, or Aramaic allows such an interpretation, must be repeated. The introduction of a "high place" does not fit the content of the message of Is 6. Emendation for the sake of poetry is highly subjective and is not in harmony with current views. Present-day scholars caution against emending a text to reconstruct its poetic form.[30] Iwry argues that *'šr* has no place in a poetical verse and that the final *h* was dropped because of haplography.[31] However, Brownlee rightly defends the presence of *'šr* rejecting Iwry's double emendation.[32] It also has to be pointed out against Iwry that *'šr* occurs indeed before a participle elsewhere in the OT (Gn 7:8; Dt 1:4; 3:2; 4:6).

Albright makes only two important emendations (*'šr[h]* and

[29] Albright, *VTS,* 4, 255.

[30] O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament, An Introduction* (New York, 1965), p. 59: "It is open to question whether in the grouping together of short verses or in the parallelism of the members in the long verses it is also possible to go further and to recognize metrical regularity as well. . . . The utmost caution is necessary, especially in view of the fact that no traditions concerning Hebrew prosody have come down to us." See also S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Cleveland, 1963), pp. 361f.; G. Fohrer, "Über den Kurzvers," *ZAW,* 66 (1954), 209; Arthur Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development* (New York, 1966), pp. 24f.

[31] Iwry, p. 228, explains that the final *h* of *'šr(h)* was dropped as it was read together with the article *h* of the Hophal participle *hmšlḳṭ,* reading *m* instead of *b.* The *h* of the participle too was later lost.

[32] Brownlee, *Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls,* p. 238 n. 4 states that ". . . it is a mistake to make an invariable rule out of the tendency of poetry to omit particles. They may sometimes be included for the very purpose of filling out the rhythmic value of a stich. For the use of *'ŠR* in Isaianic poetry, cf. the following examples from the first eleven chapters: 1:29 (twice); 1:30; 2:20, 22; 5:5; 7:25; 11:16 (the last two passages being later additions). The double emendation which Iwry has to perform upon the word at 6:13 makes his results even less convincing."

[b]mṣbwṭ) in order to read poetry throughout. Yet, his translation still identifies the trees with fertility goddesses. These emendations and interpretations are based on purely subjective viewpoints. The following considerations will indicate why we are unable to accept them.

The expression *bšlḳṭ* which is made up of the prefix *b* and the Piel-type noun from *šlḳ* is a *hapax legomenon.* The form of *bšlḳṭ* may be considered either as a Piel inf. cstr. with a feminine ending[33] or as a feminine singular noun. 1QIs[a] has a different reading. Instead of *bšlḳṭ* St. Mark's Scroll has *mšlḳṭ*, a Hophal part. fem. sing. To determine the original reading is difficult. The identical Hophal participial form appears four times in the Old Testament.[34] The undisputed *lectio difficilior* is however MT's *bšlḳṭ* and its presence in the original text is likely to be understood as a Piel inf.[35] It is interesting to note that in a number of places where the Hebrew has *b* with the Qal or Piel inf. the LXX invariably renders these constructions with *hotan* and the subjunctive mood.[36] This also holds true for our text. It is there-

[33] So Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1965), I, 265. Franz Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah*, p. 203, comments: ". . . *shalleceth* here does not refer to the act itself of felling or casting away, but rather to the condition of a tree that has been hewn or thrown down; though not to the condition of the trunk as it lies prostrate upon the ground, but to that of the root, which is left in the earth."

[34] 1 Ki 13:24, 25, 28; Is 36:30.

[35] Against this view, see John Sawyer, "The Qumran Reading of Isaiah 6:13," *ASThI*, 3 (1964), 113, who does not give an alternate suggestion except the assumption that the syntax could have been different in the original.

[36] Compare:

	MT	*LXX*
Is 1:15	*bpršḳm*	*hotan ekteinēte*
Is 2:19	*bqwmw*	*hotan anastēi*
Is 27:9	*bswmw*	*hotan aphelōmai*
Is 30:25	*bnpl*	*hotan pesōsin*
Is 6:13	*bšlḳṭ*	*hotan ekpesēi*

This comparison indicates the consistency with which the LXX translators of Isaiah have rendered *b* with the infinitive with *hotan* and the corresponding subjunctive. The translation of the temporal *hotan* (when, whenever) for *b* is possible as *b* and the infinitive do have temporal meaning. See Oskar Grether, *Hebräische Grammatik für den akademischen Unterricht* (Glückästadt, 1955), p. 90.

fore possible that the LXX translators had *bšlḳṭ* in their *Vorlage* instead of *mšlḳṭ* and understood it as a Piel inf. cstr. However, a comparison can be made between 1QIs[a] and Symmachus' version. Both have feminine participles (*mšlḳṭ, apobalousa*) and may reflect Targumic influence.[37]

The noun *mṣḇṭ* appears again only in 2 Sa 18:18 where it means "standing-stone."[38] The LXX in Is 6:13 has *thēkē*, "monument," for *mṣḇṭ*. I. L. Seeligmann calls this a "coagulated equation" and explains it as being due to the scribe's mechanical translation without consideration of the context or the current Greek idiom.[39] Symmachus (*histatai*) has nothing to offer that would clarify the connotation of *mṣḇṭ* in this context.

The relative clause *'šr bšlḳṭ mṣḇṭ bm* has all the indications of reference back to the species of trees mentioned before so that it is contextually inconsistent to translate *mṣḇṭ* with "pillar," "monument" or "standing-stone" of which no mention is made in vs. 13 or anywhere in Is 6. The broader connotation of *mṣḇṭ* meaning "stem" or "stump" is therefore indicated by the context on the basis of the earlier references to trees. This contextual meaning seems to find support on the basis of an Akkadian cognate. V. Sawyer[40] has pointed to a series of Akkadian terms such as

[37] The Targum reads "like a terebinth and like an oak, which appear to be dried up when their leaves fall." See John F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah* (Oxford, 1949), p. 23. Although Symmachus by translating *bšlḳṭ* (*mšlḳṭ*?) with *apobalousa* comes much closer to the connotation of *šlḳ* than the LXX with *ekpesēi*, his translation seems to show Targumic influence. The whole clause reads, *hētis apobalousa (ta phylla) histatai monē*, "which having cast down the leaves stands alone." Symmachus had most likely the Targum's paraphrase of vs. 13 in mind and must have consequently understood *mṣḇṭ* as meaning "leaves" or "branches" as derived from the Aramaic *nṣḇ*, "to plant."

[38] Holladay, p. 210.

[39] I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (Leiden, 1948), pp. 48f., "The rather obscure phrase *hotan ekpesēi apo tēs thēkēs autēs* which stands for *'šr bšlḳṭ mṣḇṭ bm*, is rooted in the coagulated equation of *mṣḇṭ* with *thēkē*, gravestone, monument—with which the translator, was, of course, perfectly familiar."

[40] Sawyer, *ASThI*, 3 (1964), 113.

nanṣabu, mamṣabu, naṣabu, nenṣabu[41] which refer to a "support," "post," or "stand" of wood or other material which he believes provides "some evidence for the traditional translation 'stump.' "[42] The meaning of "stump" has many recent supporters[43] as has the extended meaning "root-stock."[44]

Another suggestion for the meaning of *mṣbṭ* is put forth by N. H. Tur-Sinai who on the basis of the Syriac reading *neṣbeteh* in vs. 13 suggests the meaning "new planting."[45] In Imperial Aramaic and in Syriac the nouns and verb derived from the root *nṣb* means "plantation, growth" and "to plant" respectively.[46] Tur-Sinai's suggestion has been incorporated into a recent Hebrew lexicon as one of two possible meanings for *mṣbṭ*.[47] It seems that the Syriac version put an extended meaning upon its rendering of *mṣbṭ* which implies that from the "trunk" or "stump" ("root-stock") of the trees which are fallen a new growth comes forth. This provides an indirect suggestion that the basic meaning of *mṣbṭ* in vs. 13 is indeed "trunk" or "stump" with its roots (thus "root-stock"). On the basis of contextual reasons and Semitic cognates the meaning "trunk, stump, root-stock" appears to have most support for *mṣbṭ*.

The concluding clause of vs. 13 has a significant variant in

[41] W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (AnOr 33; Roma, 1952), p. 31 par. 31b, indicates that the initial *w* is derived from the letter *m* when a root contains a labial.

[42] Sawyer, p. 113.

[43] S. H. Blank, "Traces of Prophetic Agony in Isaiah," *HUCA,* 27 (1956), 86 n. 12; H. S. Gehman, "The Ruler of the Universe, The Theology of First Isaiah," *Int,* 11 (1957), 270; E. G. Kraeling, *Commentary on the Prophets* (Camden, N.J., 1966), 2, 64; and others.

[44] K. Budde, *Jesajas Erleben* (Gotha, 1928), pp. 22, 28; O. Procksch, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Gütersloh, 1950), pp. 192f.; Seierstad, *Offenbarungserlebnisse der Propheten,* p. 109; and others.

[45] Tur-Sinai, *Scripta Hierosolymitana,* 8 (1961), 169.

[46] C. F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest* (Leiden, 1965), p. 184.

[47] Holladay, p. 210, suggests for Is 6:13 either "bare trunk" or "new growth." In later Aramaic the meaning for *mṣbh* is "planting," see J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim* (Leipzig, 1867), p. 60.

1QIs[a]. Compare the following renderings of Qumran scroll and MT:

1QIs[a]: *mṣḇṯ ḇmh zrʿ hqwdš mṣḇṯh*

MT: *mṣḇṯh bm zrʿ qdš mṣḇṯh*

Two things ought to be noted: (1) Instead of *bm* 1QIs[a] has *ḇmh*[48] and (2) there is a significant gap (6 mm) between *mṣḇṯ* and *bm* which does not correspond with the MT. According to 1QIs[a] the last clause of our text begins with *ḇmh*. The gap sets *ḇmh zrʿ hqwdš mṣḇṯh* off from the foregoing part of vs. 13 and points to the explanatory-like character of the last clause. According to Curt Kuhl these gaps serve as indications that new thoughts are introduced.[49] If *ḇmh* is to be read with *zrʿ hqwdš mṣḇṯh* then it cannot have the meaning of "high place" but can only mean "in/among them." The reading of "high place" which began with Hvidberg and Iwry is due to the unfounded rejection of *zrʿ qwdš mṣḇṯh*, while they retain *ḇmh* of the same clause to arrive at their arrangement and interpretation of the text. The last three words of vs. 13 which are present in both MT and 1QIs[a] are rejected without reason,[50] but the 1QIs[a] reading of *ḇmh* in place of *ḇm* of MT is accepted!

A few additional observations are in order with regard to the last clause of Is 6: 13. Sawyer pointed *ḇmh* as *bammeh*, a question, suggesting that the clause is to be translated, "Wherein is the Holy Seed? Its stump!"[51] The fact is, however, that the adjective

[48] It should be pointed out that *bmh* in 1QIs[a] does in no way require the meaning of a cultic "high-place" (so Brownlee, Hvidberg, Iwry, Albright, Driver). Iwry, *JBL*, 76 (1957), 229, is forced to admit that "we cannot be absolutely certain that the word *ḇmh* is not simply a longer form of MT *ḇm*." Brownlee, *Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls*, p. 239, has moved away from his earlier view that *ḇmh* refers to a high-place (*VT*, 2 [1951], 297f.). M. Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, 1958), p. 148, points out that "the word taken to mean 'high place' may still at least equally well mean 'in them,' as the Masoretic text takes it."

[49] C. Kuhl, "Schreibereieigentümlichkeiten," *VT*, 3 (1952), 311.

[50] For a critique of this omission, see Hasel, p. 237, n. 86.

[51] Sawyer, p. 112. He is now followed by K.-D. Schunck, *"bmh," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum AT*, 1 (1973), 677, who also rejects the meaning of "high-place" for *ḇmh* in Is 6:13.

in 1QIs[a] has the article (*hqwdš*) and that the noun it qualifies (*zrʿ*) stands without the article. Was the *h* before *zrʿ* omitted because of haplography (*ḇmh* (*h*)*zrʿ*)? Should the final *h* in *ḇmh* be read with *zrʿ* (*bm hzrʿ hqwdš*)?[52] If the latter were the case, then the final *h* in *ḇmh* would be a scribal error of a wrong word division. There is no certainty whether we have here a scribal error of a wrong word division or haplography. If it is haplography, then the final *h* in *ḇmh* still does not make it refer to a "high-place"[53] because a peculiarity of 1QIs[a] is an additional *h* after a pronominal suffix of the third person masculine and feminine plural.[54] It is a characteristic of the "vulgar" text of 1QIs[a] and may not be a scribal error at all.

The last three words of the MT have been omitted in the LXX. However, other Greek versions do have these words: Symmachus has *sperma hagion hē stasis autēs;* Theodotion translates *sperma hagion to stēlōma*; and Aquila reads *sperma hēgiasmenon stēlōsis autēs.*[55] Seeligmann thinks that these renderings represent the authentic Hebrew form.[56]

What may be the cause of the omission of these last three words in the LXX? Already in 1923 Budde demonstrated that the omission of *zrʿ qdš mṣḇṯh* in the LXX is due to homoioteleuton.[57] The exegetes who desire to eliminate the last three words of the Hebrew text cannot claim the LXX for support.[58] The fact that the last three words of Is 6:13 are present in both MT and 1QIs[a], the Targum, Symmachus, Theodotion, Aquila, and Syriac (Codex

[52] The Targum of Isaiah has the article with *zrʿ*; see Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah*, p. 23.

[53] Supra, n. 48.

[54] Is 34:7; 41:17, 27. Note the great number of additional examples cited by Iwry, *JBL*, 76 (1957), 228.

[55] See J. Ziegler, ed., *Isaias. Septuaginta,* 14 (Göttingen, 1939), 144.

[56] Seeligmann, pp. 63f.

[57] Budde, *ZAW*, 41 (1923), 166ff. Cf. Iwry, p. 226, and especially Engnell, pp. 13-15, who has argued convincingly that on the basis of text-critical analysis "there is no doubt that the MT represents the authentic and right reading."

[58] So correctly Wildberger, p. 234.

Ambrosianus), but are omitted from the LXX only because of a scribal error, makes it certain that they are original.[59] The unfounded rejection of the last three words of vs. 13 together with the unwarranted separation of *bmh* from the final clause in 1QIs[a] make the "emendational restorations" of the last verse of Isaiah's inaugural vision unconvincing.

In addition to the textual evidence for the genuineness of the last clause, there are forceful arguments for its inclusion to be brought forth on the basis of the call genre which always has a word of reassurance (Is 6:11b-13).[60] Stylistic considerations argue for the inclusion of the last clause[61] as do traditio-historical considerations[62] and the theological emphasis of the chapter.[63] In short, we do not find any compelling evidence in favor of departing from the MT. On the whole 1QIs[a] supports the MT in an unusual fashion, although its two textual variants have given rise to a series of ingenious emendational reconstructions which have found their way also into the NEB but which are not even faithful to the reading of 1QIs[a]. The variety of reconstructions of Is 6:13 fall short of textual, stylistic, traditio-historical, theological, etc., support. On the basis of the foregoing discussion the following translation of Is 6:13 is suggested:

> And though there is in it a tenth,
> in turn it shall be devoured;
> like the terebinth and the oak,
> of which at felling there remains a stump,
> a holy seed comes from its stump.

[59] Among the long list of supporters of the genuineness of the last clause of Is 6:13 are F. Delitzsch, C. von Orelli, H. Dittmann, J. Skinner, K. Budde, F. Feldmann, E. König, W. Hertzberg, J. Fischer, O. Schilling, I. Engnell, J. Hempel, H. H. Rowley, J. Bright, H. S. Gehman, L. Köhler, J. Ziegler, M. Buber, E. Kissane, B. Vawter, J. Lindblom, E. Seierstad, W. Harrelson, J. Scharbert, O. Eissfeldt, L. G. Rignell, and many others.

[60] See especially N. C. Habel, "The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives," *ZAW*, 77 (1965), 310-313.

[61] J. Ward, *Amos and Isaiah* (Nashville, 1969), p. 160.

[62] R. Knierim, "The Vocation of Isaiah," *VT*, 18 (1968), 55-57.

[63] Hasel, pp. 242-248.

BOOK REVIEWS

Bornkamm, Günther. *Paul.* Transl. by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, 1971. xxviii + 259 pp. $7.50.

Günther Bornkamm's *Paul,* described as "equally designed" for the professional theologian and the layman, is written on the premise that there is a "constant and radical interrelationship between Paul's life and history . . . and his gospel and theology."

Part I portrays Paul's life and work. Special attention is given to Paul's experience in Corinth and Ephesus, and also to Romans as "Paul's Testament." The ability that has placed Bornkamm in the front line of NT scholars is particularly evident in Part II which deals with Paul's "Gospel and Theology."

Although little new ground is broken, Bornkamm's approach is original and illuminating. In dealing with Paul's eschatology, he finds the typical formula "yes—but" or "yes—although" inadequate and suggests instead "because—therefore." This is good, but he overemphasizes the lack of coherence in Paul's eschatology and the degree to which traditional apocalyptic speculations and concepts fall away. He does not go as far as some, however, in this respect and considers the parousia, as also the resurrection, to be still very literal events to Paul. For him future existence was not "uncorporeal," and the "heavenly house" to which the righteous are to be transported along with the new "raiment" they are to wear refer to a new kind of body, a "new creation of a whole man occurring at the time of the parousia."

In dealing with the righteousness of God, Bornkamm says that one of the new and surprising elements in his gospel is that God, the Judge, is not himself subject to an "unchangeable norm greater than himself and inevitably determining his verdict." Rather he alone determines the meaning of righteousness, and in this sense righteousness is manifested "apart from law."

Bornkamm is particularly refreshing in his presentation of the relationship between reason and faith which he declares, contrary to common assertion, are not in hopeless opposition. Instead, he finds Paul making "vigorous use of reason, understanding, and conscience" and arguing with the purpose of "persuading and convincing" (p. 119). In a similar way he sees no conflict between spirit and reason in Paul.

In his conclusion Bornkamm grapples with the issue of "Jesus and Paul" and declares that Paul's gospel of justification by faith alone matches Jesus' turning to the godless and the lost. For both salvation means deliverance as "event and miracle," and for both the people who are really in danger are the "good" who need no repentance. He thereby emphasizes the continuity of Paul's gospel with that of Jesus, while at the same time he feels that we probably know more about him today than Paul did almost 2,000 years earlier.

Apart from a few minor typographical errors (e.g., Rom 1:13 f. should be 1:3, p. 246), one major difficulty throughout is Bornkamm's acceptance of only seven letters as authentic. He rejects the Pastoral Epistles, Ephesians, Colossians, and II Thessalonians, which fact is determinative of his under-

standing of both Paul's life and theology at several points. If any or all of these were to be regarded as authentic, considerable adjustment would have to be made. By working exclusively out of the uncontested writings, Bornkamm has taken the "safe route." But as is often the case in this approach, he has perhaps left out too much.

In a similar way Bornkamm is overly skeptical of Acts as a source of information on Paul. Time and again with drumming monotony he has occasion to describe Luke's account as something he simply "worked up," or as "absolutely inconceivable" or following a "defective pattern," so that in effect, the "real Paul" is "completely different" (p. xviii) from the man portrayed in the epistles. Bornkamm does not wholly dismiss the material in Acts but rather faithfully wrestles with it, even going so far as to describe the itinerary as "a very valuable source." He explains his regard for Acts in a 15-page introduction entitled, "Paul as Seen in His Letters and in Acts." Here he is certainly justified in his complaint against the uncritical acceptance of tradition and "simplistic conclusions." However, those critical scholars who feel that the evidence points toward a greater reliability of the account in Acts than this book grants will be disappointed and feel that the work is somewhat weakened thereby.

Notwithstanding, *Paul* is well written, well translated, and certainly worthwhile. Those who profited from Bornkamm's earlier *Jesus of Nazareth* and *Early Christian Experience* will find the present work similarly beneficial.

Walla Walla College
College Place, Washington

D. MALCOLM MAXWELL

Brown, Raymond E., Donfried, Karl P., and Reumann, John, eds. *Peter in the New Testament: A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House; New York: Paulist Press, 1973. ix + 181 pp. Paperback, $1.95.

Fifth in the series *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue,* this volume is a report of a group of theologians appointed by their respective churches to reassess the role of Peter in the NT. Their evaluation was also intended to serve "as background for ecumenical discussions of the role of the papacy in the universal church" (p iii).

The eleven scholars who contributed to this publication—five Lutherans, four Catholics, one United Church of Christ, and one Episcopalian—have been able to phrase the results of their investigation with an eye toward general intelligibility. Their report is written for the parish clergy and knowledgeable laity as well as for other scholars. In addition to the preface and some initial chapters having to do with the origins and presuppositions of the study, the remainder of the book is occupied with Peter's role in the NT writings in a roughly chronological fashion.

The volume assesses every reference to Peter in the NT, with strongest focus on passages that highlight his role in the ministry of Jesus and in the earliest church. Of particular importance, among others, are a few verses in Mt 16 which in recent centuries have become *the* text cited by the Roman Catholic Church as scriptural basis for its doctrine of papal authority.

After examining several possible ways of interpreting these verses, the report concludes its inquiry into the origin of the passage by declaring it most probable that its setting, "in whole or in part, was post-resurrectional." Oscar Cullmann's hypothesis which attributed the statement of Jesus in this case to the Passion story, later placed by Matthew in an earlier setting, has had no following in this Lutheran-Catholic quest.

In attempting to reassess the Petrine material no longer from the aspect of what it came to mean in the later church but from its "historical levels of significance," the report expresses other judgments that constitute major departures from traditional evaluations of Peter. By accepting the attitudes and methods common to contemporary biblical criticism, it denies the historicity of many scenes and sayings recorded in the Gospels as well as in the book of Acts, considering them no longer to be treated as "straight history." Many will question both the propriety and the reliability of this critical approach, underlining its limitations in reaching final theological conclusions.

Skillfully written, the study concludes that though the New Testament does not clearly state that Peter held "special authority" over the other apostles in the early church, the "great Christian fisherman," pastor, martyr, "receiver of special revelation," as well as "weak and sinful man," was "very prominent" among the followers of Jesus. Peter, in sum, represents a "trajectory"—a path through space or time—that in church history has certainly outdistanced those of the other apostles.

Peter in the New Testament provides ample documentation and footnotes—352 in all—and a select bibliography. Carefully worded, it suggests that there exists today a greater doctrinal harmony between the Lutheran and Roman Catholic traditions than had been previously expected. It will also remain, for some time to come, a major tool in many ecumenical dialogues.

Andrews University RAOUL DEDEREN

Brunner, Peter. *The Ministry and the Ministry of Women.* Contemporary Theology Series. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971. 39 pp. Paperback, $1.25.

Preus, Jacob A. O. *It Is Written.* Contemporary Theology Series. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971. 74 pp. Paperback, $1.75.

Scaer, David P. *The Apostolic Scriptures.* Contemporary Theology Series. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971. 68 pp. Paperback, $1.75.

Scharlemann, Martin H. *The Ethics of Revolution.* Contemporary Theology Series. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971. 56 pp. Paperback, $1.25.

This series is published by the Lutherans of the Missouri Synod who are presently experiencing a power struggle between conservative and liberal elements. The conservatives are now in power and their influence is reflected in these publications. In the first volume, Brunner argues against ordaining women for the pastoral office since the subordinate relationship of women to men was established at creation and this subordination is not congruous with the nature of the pastoral function. This unnatural union

would bring women into existential conflict with their being. Brunner presents his points clearly and cogently but some would question the very foundation of his thesis, i.e., that creation has placed women under this type of subordination. Others would find it difficult to accept Brunner's interpretation of the Pauline passages which deal with the subordination of women.

Preus, president of the Missouri Synod, sets forth a very inflexible, rigid stance on inspiration. His arguments will seem powerful and irrefutable to those who accept his premises, but those who do not will shake their heads and throw up their hands in despair as they see resurrected a view of the Bible they felt was long buried.

Scaer is in apparent disagreement with Preus on several points. Where the latter closes the door tightly, Scaer leaves open a little crack. He can discuss alternative views. He is even able to speak a favorable word for *Redaktionsgeschichte* and seems to indicate some problems regarding authorship of books. It is this very thing that has led him to develop his "apostolic scripture" concept which he places against inspiration in order to bring in a broader conception of the word of God. Inasmuch as the apostles' authority did not extend over secular matters, the authority of their writings must not be extended beyond their legitimate sphere of authority. The Spirit's inspiration is wide-ranging over the entire activity of the church as manifested in the various gifts of the Spirit mentioned in 1 Cor 12. "Mere possession of the Spirit does not raise a person or his writings to a position of permanent authority in the church" (p. 15). This kind of authority was delegated only to the apostles and their circle from which our NT comes, as is evident from the writings themselves. The approach of Scaer is new and has merit. His arguments for making the apostles successors of the prophets, however, is not compelling and his conclusion that the term "our brother" is a technical term for members of the apostolic circle is questionable.

Scharlemann writes very rigorously and forcefully with lucidity and preciseness in presenting his view that violent revolution is not Christian. He opposes those who promote "revolutionary ecumenism," and considers them irresponsible and basically anti-Christian. The basic assumptions of revolutionaries come from their belief in the perfectibility of man and society and the fulfillment of men arising from an order produced by political and economic justice. The revolutionaries fail to take into serious consideration the evil nature of man. Scharlemann is squarely opposing Moltmann and Alves and their theologies of hope. The only hope he sees is the promise of Christ's coming again and in the meantime in changes wrought through the power of the Gospel and in providing meaning for people. While one can agree with the author in many places, his limiting himself to the situation in North America is too shortsighted. What about South America or Africa? What kind of justification would there be for a Lutheran Reformation or an American Revolution? Did nothing change with the Revolution? Should Christians have stayed clear of any involvement or only of violent involvement? Perhaps Scharlemann would have provided as cogent reasons for a non-revolutionary position here as he has for other things but we would like to have had him deal with these problems too.

Andrews University SAKAE KUBO

Cobb, John B., Jr. *God and the World.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969. 138 pp. Paperback, $2.95.

The model for a viable understanding of God, one which permits an adequate understanding of the world as well (hence the title of the book), is subject rather than object. The latter leads to an unsatisfactory doctrine of transcendence, or alternatively to pantheism. Either God is not the world or he is identical with the world. On the one hand there can be no talk of God *and* the world; on the other, God is simply the sum total of the parts, or the parts lack self-determination. Cobb defends a version of pan-en-theism, believing that it permits both God and man (world) to be given due integrity.

This view, presented in unashamedly Whiteheadian language, it is proposed, provides the basis upon which a theology which is in harmony with the modern temper can be developed. It is also more adequate than others, and able to solve unsolved problems in traditional theology. For example, the latter disparaged man and discouraged his independence, when it talked of God; in addition, in speaking of God's power in a certain way, God was made responsible for everything that happened in the world, thus making impossible of solution the problem of evil and of faith.

So, if we start with the given reality of the world *as we know it* and with *what we think we know about the world because we cannot avoid thinking that way, we then* co-ordinate with this an adequate image of God based upon the Jesus Christ of Calvary—a God being edged out of the world, such is the powerlessness of his power. God, it is then confessed, works within the cosmic and historical process by being within it and providing the "lure" (a technical term) by which that process is drawn to its ultimate purpose. God, as lure, attracts the limited God within the totality of his own self-end.

Cobb sees process within the midst of history, the place where we now are. Such a vision of progress and maturity is based upon one aspect of man's development, namely the intellectual, where the cumulative nature of man's progress is most evident. The idea of development is then extended to the *cosmos* in the past, and to the future of human *history*. The metaphysical assumption, a "vision," is supported by data which indicate a teleological character within the world. We can then quite readily consider God. Cobb does so in four paragraphs (pp. 57-58): as unitary actuality, active, individual, and everlasting.

The basic problem with such a scheme is that it represents the coordination by comparing what are indeed quite diverse realities; namely, the reality of God in Jesus Christ, and the reality of "God" in the cosmos. Quite apart from the difficulty of giving meaning to the notion of God as "lure" in the cosmos, it is difficult to understand how a model of God *within,* but not identical with, cosmos can be spoken of in personal terms. Agreed that the task of theology, or perhaps philosophy of religion, is to coordinate religious with other phenomena and perspectives, it is difficult to see how the action of God in Jesus Christ can be brought under the same head as action of God in cosmos as lure or as process.

The following errata were noted: p. 29, "trancendence" for "transcendence"; p. 40, "tradition" for "traditional."

Nottingham, England EDWARD W. H. VICK

Hyma, Albert. *The Life of Desiderius Erasmus.* Assen: Van Gorcum, 1972. 140 pp. Paperback, Dutch Gld. 17,50.

Albert Hyma has gained wide recognition for his remarkably large number of well-researched contributions to historical scholarship, most of them relating to Renaissance and Reformation themes. It is indeed gratifying to have this new publication on Erasmus from his pen.

The "Prince of the Humanists" has, of course, received attention on a number of occasions from Hyma, whose most recent book-length treatment of Erasmus prior to the present one was the 2d edition (enlarged) of *The Youth of Erasmus,* published in 1968 (see the review in *AUSS* 8 [1970], 96). This new *Life of Desiderius Erasmus* covers the full span of Erasmus' career more completely than any of Hyma's earlier publications. It utilizes relevant information from those earlier publications as well as the results of further research. Moreover, as has become a common practice for Hyma, he gives in this book a large amount of up-to-date bibliographical information; and he also corrects various erroneous views held about Erasmus, including some for which he takes responsibility himself.

A particularly significant correction relates to Erasmus' contact with the so-called "Oxford Reformers." Hyma himself, as well as Erasmus scholars in general, has tended to classify Thomas More, John Colet and others with whom Erasmus had contact in England in 1499-1500 and again a few years later as "Oxford Reformers." Hyma notes that a book by Robert P. Adams, published in 1962 by the University of Washington Press in Seattle, refers more correctly to these individuals as "The London Reformers," and has accordingly adopted this designation. Indeed, he uses this terminology as the title for Chapter 8 in the present book.

Another striking feature of the present publication is the careful attention given to the last few years of Erasmus' career, especially after 1533. It is unfortunate that no mention is made of the chapter by Margaret Mann Phillips "Some Last Words of Erasmus" in the symposium edited by John C. Olin and others, *Luther, Erasmus and the Reformation: A Catholic-Protestant Reappraisal* (New York, 1969), pp. 87-113; but probably this material was not yet available when Hyma prepared his manuscript. It would have been useful to have his expert appraisal of Phillips' treatment, which in some ways parallels his own. To the reviewer it appears that both of these scholars have made vital contributions to our knowledge of a portion of Erasmus' career which is too often sadly neglected.

So as to give an overview of the contents and scope of *The Life of Desiderius Erasmus,* its sixteen chapter titles are here listed: "Birth and Early Childhood," "With the Brethren of the Common Life," "At the Monastery of Steyn," "The Book Against the Barbarians," "At the University of Paris," "The First Trip to England," "Life in Paris and the Low Countries," "The London Reformers," "The Grand Tour of Italy," "Thomas More and Erasmus," "Professor at Cambridge," "The Greek New Testament," "Louvain Versus Wittenberg," "The Colloquies," "Conversion," and "On the Separation of State and Church." It is worth observing that in the final chapter Hyma aptly indicates that the Northern Renaissance with its ideals had much more responsibility for religious liberty and toleration than did the major Reformation churches.

Hyma's volume is a worthy contribution to the recent literature on Erasmus which has been appearing in celebration of the 500th anniversary of that famous humanist's birthday (given variously between 1466 and 1469, with Hyma choosing—most likely correctly—1469).

Andrews University KENNETH A. STRAND

Kaufman, Gordon D. *God the Problem*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972. xx + 276 pp. $10.00.

The persisting Biblical emphasis upon God as acting has been an embarrassment to many theologians who wished to retain this way of speaking but could not really find a place for it in their thinking. *The* "problem," I take it, is to speak of God as agent in an intelligible way. That this is possible is the fundamental thesis of the book.

"Act of God" is a comprehensible concept. The book explores the analogy of "personal action," attempting a metaphysic of agency so as to fill the gap between Biblical imagery and modern understanding of the world. The difference between historical and personal knowledge (does Kaufman overlook it elsewhere?) is that the reality of God is now accessible whereas the reality of history is not, or at least, is accessible in a manner in which the reality of history is not. So the analogy from historical knowledge to theological knowledge is less adequate than that from personal knowledge to theological knowledge. How careful must one be to qualify the term "historical" in different contexts to make precisely clear what one wants to say!

God is "ultimate cosmic agency" (p. 106) and as such provides the ground for human agency. What sort of ground? Correcting Braithwaite and contradicting Whitehead's disciples, the author suggests an alternative to traditional conceptions of God. "I believe in God" needs translation from "I am convinced that God is" to "I am acting as if the world is what I think it to be as grounded metaphysically in personal Being." In defence of such grounding the concept of transcendence (revelation is explicable best on the analogy of the personal act of making known what would otherwise remain unknown) is defended against a pan-en-theistic doctrine of immanence. The totality "world" is purposive, but "agency" better describes the teleological movement than does the impersonal term "process." Such agency is met at the limits of our world and our experience. So the experience of limitation (contingency, dependence) is the locus within human existence of theological meaning. The essay on Transcendence makes the important and careful distinction between meaning and truth, prolegomenon to theology and theology proper.

What is revealed is reality, "the real God," "ultimate reality," "the transcendent God," the ultimately real (pp. 151, 261). But for Kaufman there must be a final agnosticism, and here further clarification is called for in order to explain the antithesis, "historical knowledge is not personal," "personal knowledge is historical." The God revealed is the "available God" in contrast to the "real God." The idea of the "available God" is based on the analogy with historical knowledge which we are told is not the fundamental analogy. The "object" in history is *unknown* if knowledge means "having direct and personal acquaintance with." I could not encounter Wash-

ington *in this way,* even if I wanted to. But if the historical-knowledge analogy is not fundamental, that is, if there are other ways to knowledge, then there is a serious *non sequitur* in the second and third sentences on p. 85. Kaufman elsewhere wishes to modify this agnosticism, tempering it with dialectical statements (p. 251) by pressing aspects of the person analogy. The other alternative is a thorough-going anthropomorphism which sees *all* images of God as subjectivistic, and this is not what Kaufman wants. I do not see that he has avoided it. I have not found here a satisfying answer to the question: If the real God is unknowable, how can the available God be "objective" and not simply a cultural product? If the real God is not available, how can I make the statement to that effect? That is already an approach to God à la *via negativa* which carries many further implications for statements about the real God once one starts on it.

I agree that it is in the realm of our presuppositions that faith is to be placed, *if* one makes a sharp distinction between presuppositions and experience, or data of experience. But the distinction must not be pressed so that it becomes an improper divorce. Here again the tendency to draw lines somewhat too sharply is evident. It is an oversimplification to argue: Revelation is *nothing else than* (p. 240) the appearance in history of a way of seeing human life, and the appearance (=acceptance?) of a decisive paradigm within the context of that seeing. Once again, this is to fail to press the analogy Kaufman wants to make central—that of personal revealing.

The book is interesting, illuminating, and somewhat fragmentary; hence the more than usual number of self-references in footnotes.

The following errata were noted: p. 94, "fundamaentally" for "fundamentally"; p. 249, "possible" for "possibly"; p. 259, "multilated" for "mutilated."

Nottingham, England EDWARD W. H. VICK

Meland, Bernard E., ed. *The Future of Empirical Theology.* Essays in Divinity, Vol. 7. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969. x + 387 pp. $11.00.

"Empirical Theology" is a name given to theologies of various approaches which share in common the insistence that any fruitful theology *must* both recognize that it has its roots in what is experienced, and make the account of that experience an essential ingredient in its treatment of religion. Theology has frequently succumbed to extremes: an over-confident rationalism that lays so much stress on the object that it has no time to speak about the subject, and on the other end of the scale an excessive subjectivism. Empirical theology is the only proper way to steer between excessive subjectivism and pure rationalism.

Hardly a word is more confusing nowadays than "empirical," and it is the merit of this collection of essays that it clarifies matters by exhibiting for us what the term may mean. If theology must be based upon "experience," it must fill in the content of the term by pointing to and describing what such experience is and how it manifests itself. The reader can then put the theology to the test by asking, "Does the range of my experience encompass the proposed basis of this suggested theology?" The very fact that we may be driven to interpret our experience may be therapeutic. We may then come

to recognize it as worthy of a theological exploration, and moreover may find it adequate to provide a basis for new theological interpretations. Bad theology cannot anchor itself in experience on the one hand, nor, on the other, let its categories be guided and shaped by what is delivered in experience. Then it becomes legalistic, objectivistic and sterile, or over-subjective. Objectivism in theology is very subjectivistic.

Since human experience is varied, it will of course be possible for an empirical theology to base itself on a wide variety of areas of such experience. It will be empirical provided it fulfill the definition of "pertaining to our common human experience" (Ogden, p. 65). There we shall find two basic sorts of experience—perception in the realm of sense, and "a more elemental awareness both of ourselves and of the world around us" (p. 78). The beginning of religion and of theology is in such value-experience.

For Christology, this will mean that the meaning of Christ will be looked for from within the limits of man's present experience. It will mean an effort to "empiricize Christ and to christify experience" (Hazleton, p. 222). The problem of Christology consists in the fact that within human life, experience "reports itself as being experience of the transcendent" (p. 232). The real problem of the theologian here, if we accept Ogden's definition of empiricism, is to bring out how this experience of the transcendence as universal is related to the sense of transcendence which is found in Christ.

The contribution of Gilkey addresses itself to this point, in the face of the secular judgments about the death of God. The contemporary *Geist*—it insists that contingency, relativity, and transience are characteristic of all that is (p. 352)—demands that only what immediately presents itself is meaningful. The theologian must not capitulate at this point, as do the God-is-Dead writers. Nor need we say, as did Hazleton above, that we can have Schleiermacher's or Otto's "religious" immediacy. The appropriate line to be taken is to start with secular experience and show that "ranges or regions of experience" to be found there "call for religious symbolization" (p. 355). In this way the dogmatism of neoorthodoxy is avoided, and so is its corollary, the disillusionment of finding no Word of revelation in any experience that can lead to knowledge of "God."

One thing such a book certainly does: by indicating a variety of ways of doing empirical theology, it drives one to demand that his way of doing it must, if viable, be open to all the evidence available. This may be called the "temper" of empirical theology, what Cobb claims to have been the valuable lesson learned at Chicago, where at Centennial Meetings these lectures were first delivered. As a corrective to arbitrariness and authoritarianism one would hope one can be optimistic that empirical theology will have a future. It may turn out to be the only future.

Nottingham, England EDWARD W. H. VICK

Miller, Donald G. *The Authority of the Bible.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972. 139 pp. Paperback, $2.25.

Miller, a former President of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary and now Pastor of Laurinburg Presbyterian Church in North Carolina, presented the contents of this book as the Carson Memorial Lectures (May, 1971) at the

First Presbyterian Church of Richmond, Virginia. The book, then, is not intended to be scholarly, original, or comprehensive. It is directed to laymen and not to scholars.

The book reflects the tumultuous period in American higher education of student riots and social activism at the time when the author was chief administrator of a Seminary. The author writes with conviction, conscious of the shortcomings and shortsightedness of so much he had to endure from students and other social activists. One gets the feeling that what he says here would not have persuaded the students. It is not written to persuade them, but to affirm his convictions and to confirm the saints, especially those who may have been somewhat influenced by this age without authority.

Miller writes lucidly with apt illustrations or quotations, most frequently from Scott Holland's *Creeds and Critics* (1918), and other old sources, as he admits.

Perhaps the most original chapter is "The Biblical Basis of the Authority of the Church," where Miller expresses his conviction that the church has failed in trying to achieve social change by direct social involvement. It is time to give up this strategy and return to the "old-fashioned" method of Wesley by changing men and through them society. "It is possible that if the church stuck to her unique task of bringing men into the sphere of God's redemption in Christ she might be more productive in effecting social change than she now is with direct methods" (p. 105). Somewhat similar in playing down the church's social role is Dean Kelley's recent book *Why Conservative Churches are Growing*. The reviewer, however, could not really find throughout this chapter the *authority* of the church discussed. The task of the church does not seem to me to be equated with the authority of the church. The relationship of the laity and the clergy to the church could have been spelled out.

This popular presentation will be welcomed by many who have not had time to rethink the question of authority and who feel uncomfortable about what is going on in the churches.

Andrews University SAKAE KUBO

Montgomery, John Warwick. *The Quest for Noah's Ark: A Treasury of Documented Accounts from Ancient Times to the Present Day of Sightings of the Ark and Explorations of Mount Ararat with a Narration of the Author's Successful Ascent to the Summit of Noah's Mountain.* Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, Inc., 1972. 335 pp. 12 numbered and several unnumbered illustrations. $6.95.

Montgomery's work is a combination of a source book in the history of explorations of Mt. Ararat and a report of the author's ascents of that mountain. The book contains four parts. Part One deals with the deluge and the ark of Noah, stressing the universality of the deluge tradition, comparing the biblical story with the Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic, and describing the ark's design and construction. All these subjects are presented in the form of excerpts of material taken over from books published by other authors.

Part Two contains testimonies concerning the survival and sightings of the

ark of Noah from the days of the Jewish historian Josephus to Fernand Navarra, the Frenchman, who in his book *J'ai trouvé l'arche de Noé* (1956) tells how in 1955 he found worked wooden beams above the timberline on Mt. Ararat, which, he believes, come from Noah's ark. Part Three presents the stories of numerous ascents of the mountain during the last 150 years, while Part Four relates the story of the author's own ascents in 1970 and 1971 under the title "Ark Fever: Today's Endeavor to Find Noah's Ark."

Montgomery has done a great amount of research work in bringing together much pertinent information about past explorations of Mt. Ararat. He also presents several reports of explorations for the first time in an English translation. However, he has dealt in a very unsatisfactory manner with the most elaborate and repeated efforts to find the ark of Noah carried out since 1960 by teams sponsored by two American organizations: the Archaeological Research Foundation (of which Montgomery mentions only the expedition of 1966) and the Search Foundation, Inc.

In spite of the mass of material collected which presents numerous alleged sightings of the ark on Mt. Ararat, the reader is not given any unassailable proof that facts are presented. Not one photograph of any such sightings is presented, and one wonders whether such a picture exists. The story of the Russian flyer (or flyers), who discovered the ark on a flight over the mountain during World War I (reported widely in newspapers some 30 years ago), turns out to be based on hearsay with even the name of the Russian flyer transmitted in different forms. Just as nebulous are the reports concerning an official Russian expedition sent to Mt. Ararat in 1916 to find the object seen from the air by the flyer mentioned above. This expedition is said to have found the ark, but its records disappeared during the Russian revolution. All we know of this expedition is what people remember of stories told by Russian soldiers, now deceased, who participated in the expedition. Also the records about the discovery of the ark made by a certain Mr. George Jefferson Greene are nonexistent. He is said to have sighted the "ark" from a helicopter in 1952 and photographed it. Unfortunately he perished ten years later in Guyana and with him also his photographs, with the result that we have to rely on the memory of those who claim to have seen Greene's pictures. Montgomery himself adds to the series of mystery reports. He presents a pencil sketch of a photograph (which he says that he cannot publish for security reasons!) of an unidentified object on the north face of Mt. Ararat which he suggests may be "absolutely petrify'd."

What tangible results have we obtained from all these expeditions? The only thing is the wood which Navarra brought back from Mt. Ararat in 1955, and the additional wood which he found as a member of one of the expeditions sponsored by the Archaeological Research Foundation—not mentioned in Montgomery's book. An analysis of this wood made in 1956 by the Forestry Research Institute of Research and Experimentation in Madrid, Spain, declared it to be of great antiquity and estimated its age at 5,000 years. However, radio-carbon tests made at the University of California at Los Angeles gave it an age of only 1,230 years.

The last word about Mt. Ararat has not yet been spoken. What is needed is an expedition to which reputable scholars of several disciplines are attached.

They should, under the guidance of Navarra, or someone else who knows the exact spot from which the wood has been obtained, objectively examine the evidence and publish it. It should also be one of their primary objectives to establish the nature of the structure from which the wood comes. Until this happens all reports of sightings of Noah's ark on Mt. Ararat brought back by amateurs will only produce sympathetic smiles on the part of skeptical readers of these reports.

Andrews University SIEGFRIED H. HORN

Morris, Leon. *Apocalyptic.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972. 87 pp. Paperback, $1.95.

This small paperback literally abounds with information on the topic indicated in its title. The author is, of course, particularly interested in NT apocalyptic, and he analyzes Jewish backgrounds so as to enlighten the Christian reader about the significance of this kind of literature. Virtually every important aspect of the subject is treated in the some two dozen sections into which the book is divided and which cover such topics as the following: "The Milieu of Apocalyptic," "Revelations," "Symbolism," "Pessimism," "Determinism," "Dualism," "Pseudonymity," "Ethical Teaching," "Prediction," "Historical Perspective," "Apocalyptic and Law," etc.

On the whole, the treatment is balanced; and one of its chief contributions is the fact that the author shows excellent acquaintance with literature in the field, together with a keen ability to evaluate this literature. Conclusions are not always definitely drawn, and probably should not and cannot be. Nevertheless, in the debate over various points regarding apocalyptic, Morris has endeavored to point in the direction of the solutions which he feels are the most tenable.

A particular point with which the reviewer has previously taken exception (*AUSS,* 11 [1973], 187-191) is the manner in which Morris contrasts the book of Rev with apocalyptic. In this particular publication, Morris has provided essentially the same analysis of this matter as he has in his earlier commentary on Rev (see the review immediately below).

It can hardly be said that Morris has solved the problems of apocalyptic, but this short book is an excellent contribution to the literature in the field. It will be especially helpful to the beginning student and to the layman in giving direction with regard both to the main scholarly concerns and questions relating to the subject and to the most important relevant literature on apocalyptic.

Andrews University KENNETH A. STRAND

Morris, Leon. *The Revelation of St. John: An Introduction and Commentary.* Tyndale Bible Commentaries, New Testament Series, Volume 20. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969. 263 pp. $4.50.

It is gratifying to see the number of publications which have recently appeared treating Rev, for this final NT book has too often in the past been precisely what Morris terms it: "a very neglected book" (p. 13). Morris

feels that the neglect "is unfortunate because its [Rev's] theology of power is of the utmost importance to an age as preoccupied with the problems of power as is ours" (ibid.). It is the author's purpose "to explain the significance of the symbolism and to show the bearing of the message of Revelation on the problems of the day." He does not claim to have solved all the problems, but he hopes that he has been able "to point towards the solution of enough of the more obvious difficulties for some modern readers to be able to discern the main thrust of the book." One difficulty that he immediately notes is "that there are various schools of interpretation" and that many "exegetes are quite sure that only their own particular approach will yield correct interpretation" (ibid.).

Elsewhere (*AUSS*, 11 [1973]), 187-191) I have dealt at some length with one particular point in Morris' Introduction: his list of so-called differences between the book of Rev and "typical apocalyptic" (pp. 23-25). Here it will be useful to give an overview of his publication in its entirety. The volume is divided into two main sections: an "Introduction" (pp. 15-41) and the "Commentary" itself (pp. 45-263). Between the two is a short outline or "Analysis" of Rev (pp. 43, 44). In the Introduction, Morris treats, first of all, the main schools of interpretation of the Apocalypse: preterist, historicist, futurist, and what he calls "idealist." His own approach is reflected in the following observation: "It seems that elements from more than one of these views are required for a satisfactory understanding of Revelation" (p. 18). The commentary itself would bear out this fact. He makes reference, from time to time, to writers such as H. B. Swete, a preterist; and, indeed, he has stated that we "must always begin with the situation of the church to which it [Rev] was written" (ibid.). Of the various approaches, he seems to be the most negative toward the historicist because of the contradictions in interpretation among different historicist expositors, as well as the tendency of historicists to limit historical fulfillments to western Europe (p. 17). It may, of course, be questioned whether these are not arguments against historicist expositors rather than against the historicist approach. As for futurism, he characterizes that position as robbing "the book of all significance for the early Christians, and, indeed, for all subsequent generations right up to the last" (p. 18).

Further points treated in the Introduction include the matter of the authorship and date of Rev. In the context of balanced and forthright presentations of the evidence and arguments on these subjects, Morris opts for apostolic authorship and for a date during the reign of Domitian.

As for the "Commentary" proper, some readers may find it a bit uninteresting because of the fact that it does not seem to utilize any particular approach to Rev. Rather, the author produces precisely the type of commentary he has proposed in his Introduction: one wherein he endeavors to provide spiritual lessons for our day. He does not ignore, however, such preterist concepts as the *Nero redivivus* myth when he deals with Rev 17; and, indeed, he seems to utilize preterist views more frequently than any others (nevertheless, he can hardly be classified as a preterist).

Strengths in this commentary include the author's own insights and his ability to present material from a wide spectrum of writers on Rev. Indeed, one of the important values in the volume is the author's extensive use of

relevant literature, both ancient and modern. Moreover, although Morris' approach may leave the reader with a feeling that the genuine perspective of Rev has not been fully developed because of his lack of attention to prophetic fulfillment, his commentary is well worth reading for its inspirational and homiletical tone.

There are, as might be expected, various points of interpretation where the reviewer would disagree with the author. One might ask, for example, if the seals, trumpets, and vials are *all* "plagues" as Morris suggests (see p. 93). Or has Morris possibly missed the key meaning of "seals" and of "trumpets"? Again, has the author grasped the real thrust of the message regarding the horsemen of Rev 6, especially when he claims that the first horseman is not a symbol of the "victorious progress of the gospel" (p. 104)?

In spite of such misgivings, the reviewer would recommend this commentary as a compendious treatment of various viewpoints, and also, as intimated above, for providing a number of insightful observations that contain homiletical and inspirational value.

Andrews University KENNETH A. STRAND

Mueller, David L. *An Introduction to the Theology of Albrecht Ritschl.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969. 214 pp. $8.50.

This book can be recommended as a balanced account of Ritschl's theology. Based, in the main, on the work of Ritschl which remains of major importance, *Justification and Reconciliation* (Volume III), and supplemented at points by additional sources of primary importance, e.g., *Christliche Volkommenheit,* the book is chiefly expository. The strength of the exposition is in its clarity and economy.

A final chapter is briefly historical and sets forth alternative possibilities of viewing the unity of Ritschl's system, Mueller himself endorsing an approach which recognizes the double focus at the center of Ritschl's method, on the religious and ethical poles, Reconciliation and the Kingdom of God, respectively. He feels that historical work still remains to be done on the mediating position between Reformation Theology, Schleiermacher and the "development of more anthropological and existential methodologies in the the twentieth century" (p. 160).

It is not true to say that Ritschl has been a neglected theologian. No one can question his widespread influence in the formation of the liberal tradition and the impetus he gave to reappraisal of attitudes to traditional formulations and to the practical discussion of Christian ethics. It is appropriate that after an eclipse of interest caused by the dominance of Barthianism in the fifties and to various alternatives offered in the sixties, a sustained and hopeful attitude be now paid to Ritschl again. The problems which he tackled for his time in his way are still the major problems of theology (see pp. 164-179). It may be a sign of vitality and courage in theology that Ritschl's problems, while not altogether *au fait* in the contemporary world, are being looked at again, with a view to reappraisal and restatement. Mueller's book will provide for many an excellent introduction to those problems.

An erratum was noted on p. 101.7: esence for essence.

Nottingham, England EDWARD W. H. VICK

Olsen, V. Norskov. *John Foxe and the Elizabethan Church.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1973. xii + 264 pp. $11.50.

The name of John Foxe has become famous as a martyrologist because of the popularity of his *Acts and Monuments,* commonly called the "Book of Martyrs." It is undoubtedly in this role that Foxe has gained the greatest amount of attention. The book now under review treats Foxe in a broader perspective; but as its title indicates, it focuses on ecclesiological concerns.

After a rather long "Prolegomena" (pp. 1-50), six chapters deal with the following aspects of Foxe's life and thought: "The Church in History" (pp. 51-100), "The Nature of the Church" (pp. 101-122), "The Marks of the Church" (pp. 123-151), "The Church and Its Ministry" (pp. 152-176), "Church and State" (pp. 177-196), and "The Church and Toleration" (pp. 197-219). An appendix provides material from Foxe on the Lord's Supper (pp. 220-223). There is an extensive bibliography (pp. 224-248), followed by topical, name, and Scripture indexes (pp. 251-264).

The "Prolegomena" contains a wealth of information which is significant for an understanding of Foxe and the general religious situation in England during Foxe's time. Among topics covered are a very brief biography of Foxe, the role of Foxe as an Erasmian and a Puritan, the relationship of Foxe to the Continental reformers, and an analysis of Foxe as historiographer and martyrologist. There is a valuable discussion of the rather confusing term "Puritanism," and Olsen concludes that "there are good reasons to propose" that Foxe "be named an Anglican Puritan" (p. 15). Olsen further points out regarding Foxe that "the relationship between Christian Humanism and Puritanism is most evident in his life and work, as is the tie between Puritanism and the medieval preaching friars" (ibid.).

The Prolegomena also deals to some degree with Foxe's eschatological outlook, and because of his adoption of the Augustinian amillennial position (in a somewhat revised form), Foxe is placed within the context of the magisterial reformers rather than within that of the radical reformation. In this respect, Olsen provides an important corrective to the views of William Haller (see pp. 36, 37).

In his chapter on "The Church in History" Olsen gives a detailed analysis of Foxe's view of ecclesiastical history as given in *Christus Triumphans* as well as in *Acts and Monuments.* Attention is called in this chapter to Foxe's periodization in which an initial suffering time of the church is followed by a thousand years of relative peace, after which there is again an outbreak of persecution. Foxe changed his opinion as to the precise times for beginning and ending the periods; but in the latest stages of development of his thought, the early period went from the NT era to A.D. 324 and the millennium lasted from 324 to 1324—a scheme which, says Olsen, was original with Foxe. Obviously, Constantine ushered in the period of relative peace in A.D. 324, and Wycliffe is a key figure at the time when persecution was resumed. Olsen goes on to compare and contrast the views of such other expositors as John Bale, John Napier, and Thomas Brightman with those of Foxe; and he also notices the 19th-century discussions by such men as S. R. Maitland and James H. Todd (see pp. 88-93). The concluding pages of this chapter provide an excellent summary of Foxe's philosophy of history and concept

of the church as revealed in his commentary on the Apocalypse.

In the chapter on "The Nature of the Church," Olsen treats Foxe's view of the visible and invisible church; and in the chapter on "The Marks of the Church," the author deals with statements by Foxe on the two *notae ecclesiae* of the Continental reformers: preaching of the pure word of God, and correct administration of the sacraments. In this latter chapter, Olsen further points out that two additional *notae* sometimes mentioned by English reformers—ecclesiastical discipline and brotherly love—are certainly in evidence as important Christian concerns for Foxe too, even though Foxe does not specifically refer to them as signs or marks of the true church.

The chapters on "The Church and Its Ministry" and "Church and State" furnish a careful analysis of Foxe's stand on episcopacy and on the concept of "Establishment." The evidence provided in these chapters fully justifies Olsen's earlier-quoted observation that Foxe may be called an "Anglican Puritan."

The final rather short chapter on "The Church and Toleration" is particularly interesting, for it reveals that Foxe was indeed a pioneer in the concept of religious toleration. Whereas the 16th-century Reformers in general tended to desire toleration for themselves but were not equally ready to grant it to others, Foxe indicated a genuine attitude of "liberty of conscience." He did this in his life, preaching, and writing. Illustrative of his attitude was his defense of both Anabaptists and Catholics against the death penalty. Olsen points out that Foxe's particular views in this respect derived both from the "Christian humanism" of Erasmus and from Foxe's own understanding of the forgiving grace of Christ, with the greatest impact being from the latter.

All in all, Olsen's book is an extremely well written and well documented volume. Even the "Prolegomena" would by itself have been a valuable contribution. But Olsen gives us much more than this by his careful analysis of the writings of Foxe on various matters pertaining to ecclesiastical history and ecclesiology. Olsen's additional discussion of views of Foxe's contemporaries, plus his careful evaluation of various modern treatments of Foxe, provides a further bonus.

The book is remarkably free from typographical errors, although in the third from last line on p. vii "rea dthe" should obviously be "read the," and on lines 22 to 23 of p. 204 "Würtemberg" should be "Württemberg." One may also prefer the spellings "Alcazar" and "Preterist" to the "Alcazor" and "Praeterist" which appear in lines 4 and 5 on page 88. Perhaps the most striking and serious typographical error is to be found in the very first line of the "Prolegomena," where "1577" is given as the year for the death of Foxe. The date should be 1587, as becomes clear within the next few pages. Also in that first line, should not the date of birth be 1516 rather than "1517"?

The bibliography is extensive and useful, but typesetting seems to have been inconsistent and the "block style" used on the first five pages is somewhat disconcerting. One wonders, too, whether a different arrangement or classification of sources might not have been more helpful (e.g., in a book on Foxe why should the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* be included under the same heading of "Primary Sources" as the *Acts and Monuments?*).

John Foxe and the Elizabethan Church is indeed a comprehensive volume, and flaws such as those mentioned above are minor in comparison to the

wealth of illuminating detail and well-reasoned analysis that Olsen provides. The book is a distinct and important contribution to the literature in the fields of ecclesiology, ecclesiastical history, and development of prophetic interpretation.

Andrews University KENNETH A. STRAND

Schatz, Werner. *Genesis 14. Eine Untersuchung.* Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXIII, Theologie, Bd. 2. Bern: Herbert Lang; Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang, 1972. 384 pp. Paperback, sFr 48.00.

This dissertation attempts to be "a comprehensive investigation of all problems" (p. 7) connected with this famous chapter which has been considered by some as fictitious without any real historical value (Wellhausen and others), by some as a historicizing legend (Jeremias, Dhorme, de Liagre-Böhl, Eissfeldt, Rowley), and by others as a historical document (Franz Delitzsch, Jirku, Deimel, Haag, Schedl, etc.). That there is still no consensus of opinion on the matter of the historicity of Gen 14 is illustrated by the position of W. F. Albright who declared in 1918 that Gn 14 has no historical basis. Fifty years later he states that the chapter "has an historical foundation" *(Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* [1968], p. 69; see now also his posthumously published article in *BA*, 36 [1973], 5-33, esp. 15). On the other side is the position of the eminent R. de Vaux who maintained until 1965 that Gn 14 has a historical basis, whereas he now designates this chapter as a midrash (*RB*, 72 [1965], 5-28).

This monograph opens with a detailed history of research (pp. 13-61), which is followed by a new translation of Gn 14 based upon text-critical observations (pp. 63-80). After a brief discussion dealing with the composition (pp. 81-84) there comes next an historical investigation of the individuals and nations (pp. 85-167) and a treatment of the geography (pp. 169-206), upon which Schatz brings to bear the available comparative data from the ancient Near East. Then the author turns to a philological and religio-historical study of the names for deity (pp. 207-240). This is followed by an investigation of the vocabulary that notices in which so-called pentateuchal sources a particular term or phrase appears (pp. 241-262). The section entitled "History of Tradition" (pp. 263-289) seeks to throw light on the relationship between Abraham and Lot, Abraham and the Amorites, and Abraham and Melchizedek, as well as on the war narrative. A short chapter treats the subject of the style of Gn 14 (pp. 291-307). The summary (pp. 309-324) is concerned with the complicated story of the handing down of Gn 14. A comprehensive and very valuable bibliography is provided (pp. 335-384), but indexes of Scripture references, names, and Hebrew terms are unfortunately missing.

In a short review it is difficult to summarize the various conclusions reached by Schatz. The following are typical and representative of the entire work: Gn 14 is assumed to be made up of three separate traditions, i.e., the war of the kings of the East, Abraham meeting the king of Sodom, and Abraham's relation to Melchizedek. The author of the supposed J source combined these three traditions into a literary document which was expanded and enlarged by the alleged Dtr (Deuteronomist) at about 550 B.C., and later

the author of the supposed P document worked this over. Still later other elements were added to the text. Thus while Schatz rejects the late midrash hypothesis (de Vaux) and the theory of an adaptation of a non-Hebrew document (E. A. Speiser), he develops an extremely complex and unconvincing hypothesis. His interpretations and evaluations of the pertinent questions reflect a strong bias against the abundant archaeological evidences which favor the position that Gn 14 is a historically reliable document. Despite this serious defect, which calls his conclusions into question, the author has provided the student of Gn 14 with a very rich collection of pertinent materials in terms of historical reports, sources and literature, as well as attempted solutions and hypotheses. On this account, this study is of great value although it is certainly not the last word on Gn 14.

Andrews University GERHARD F. HASEL

Schwarz, Hans. *On the Way to the Future*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972. 254 pp. $6.95.

In recent years much has been written about eschatology from various points of view. NT eschatology itself has been interpreted differently by scholars (consistent, existential, ethical, transcendental, fulfillment and promise). And then there have been the theology of hope, secular eschatology such as Marxism, and scientific eschatology in such varied forms as Chardin's evolutionary approach, Heim's dimensional approach, and ecological eschatology. One of the values of this book is its bringing all of these together systematically, with careful analysis and critique. Because of the wide range of his coverage, the author's discussions of the different views are necessarily short. However, they are quite clearly and lucidly set forth.

He first treats the eschatology of the OT and the NT, then discusses and criticizes various views of eschatology including the scientific types. His third part includes his own views on eschatology. He rejects four "blind alleys of eschatology—setting a date, purgatory, universal homecoming, and millennialism" (p. 136). He opposes what he calls "travelog eschatology," a detailed description of heaven and hell, with respect to what lies beyond death. He considers occultism as anti-Godly and immortality of the soul as non-biblical and believes in the resurrection of the whole being. He says that there is not much one can say about the state between death and resurrection, but he looks with favor on Luther's description of it as a "deep sleep without dreams."

His "new world to come" is not the secular and materialist utopia of Marx and Bloch. But in saying this he is aware of the charge of otherworldliness, with its accompanying weakness of neglecting the present world. His rejoinder to this charge is that "this process of active anticipation strives for a better man, a more just society, and a more worldly world to live in. But since it is only anticipation, Christian faith is realistic enough to take into account the intrinsic self-alienation of man. Thus we must reject the illusion that we could even create a good man, a just society, or a new world" (p. 225). It is still not convincingly shown how the Christian takes part in the betterment of a world in which he sees no future.

All men are resurrected for the final judgment. The judgment of the wicked he refuses to see as annihilation. He replies with this somewhat enigmatic question: "But how can there be an annihilation of anybody, if there is no escape from God, since God is everywhere, even in death and beyond death?" (p. 219). Although he opposes universal homecoming, this problem of the wicked seems to lead him at least to open the door slightly in that direction. "Even in our most sincere concern for them we have to acknowledge the ultimate hiddenness of God, a God who is beyond justice and love, and we can only hope that his never-ending grace will ultimately prevail" (p. 220).

He struggles with the concept of hell. It is not a place, but a relationship. It is the "anguish of knowing what one has missed without the possibility of ever reaching it" (p. 223). It is not a local, but a dimensional, separation. "Yet God and the destiny of the accepted will be somehow present, present as a curse" (p. 223).

He describes three basic attitudes of man toward the future: melancholic resignation, futurist activism, and proleptic anticipation. The first is, he considers, least viable and the second too optimistic in man. The most viable option, he affirms, is the Christian view of the future as proleptic anticipation.

There is much of value in this book with its call back to Biblical hope and eschatology. However, the author seems to waver on some solutions. While the parousia is mentioned, the dominant word is resurrection. It is somehow surprising that the second coming of Christ is not discussed more fully.

Andrews University SAKAE KUBO

Stauffer, Richard. *The Humanness of John Calvin.* Translated by George Shriver. Nashville, Tenn.: The Abingdon Press, 1971. 96 pp. Paperback, $1.95.

This book is a translation of Stauffer's *L'humanité de Calvin,* published in Neuchâtel and Paris in 1964. As the author points out in his Introduction, Calvin has received more than his share of abuse from both Catholic and Protestant writers. The book under review has been written to answer one of the most derogatory charges against the Reformer; namely, that he was "anti-human" or "inhuman." Three facets of Calvin's career have been selected for analysis in answer to this kind of charge, and they form the text for the book's three chapters: "Husband and Father" (pp. 32-46), "Friend" (pp. 47-71), and "Pastor" (pp. 72-93).

The material has been competently handled. The book, in spite of its small size, provides a remarkable amount of interesting information on aspects of Calvin's life and ministry which all too frequently do not come to the attention of the average reader. The translator and publisher are to be commended for the real service they have rendered in making this important piece of Calvin literature available to an English-reading audience.

Andrews University KENNETH A. STRAND

Taylor, Vincent. *New Testament Essays*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972. vii + 146 pp. Paperback, $2.95.

The contents of this posthumous publication of some of Vincent Taylor's *Kleine Schriften* are representative of his interests in NT theology and literary criticism. Taylor was a careful, thorough, cautious, and scrutinizing scholar who did not follow every new whim in NT studies. He is not known for making spectacular break-throughs or setting forth novel ideas.

The ten articles provided in this volume and dating from 1926 to 1962 are characteristic of his approach. His forte is his ability to set forth traditional positions in new and substantial ways. This is characteristic of his defense of the following: Jesus' creativity ("The Creative Element in the Thought of Jesus"), showing especially how Jesus taught that the Son of Man must suffer; the eschatological and soteriological elements of the Eucharist ("The New Testament Origins of Holy Communion") and the Markan passion sayings going back to Jesus ("The Origin of the Markan Passion-sayings"); the final Lukan authorship of the Gospel against Loisy's contention that it was a second-century expansion of a genuine writing of Luke ("The Alleged Neglect of M. Alfred Loisy"); the existence of Q as a literary document ("The Order of Q" and "The Original Order of Q"); and the traditional view of Rom 3: 25, 26 ("A Great Text Reconsidered").

Somewhat unexpected is Taylor's view that the NT shows restraint in calling Jesus "God" ("Does the New Testament Call Jesus 'God'"). This does not mean a denial of Christ's divinity, but the author feels that "to describe Christ as God is to neglect the sense in which He is both less and more, man as well as God within the glory and limitations of His incarnation" (p. 87). More original and provocative is Taylor's view that the sayings relating to the Parousia are early and do not refer to the Second Coming but to the coming of the Kingdom.

The articles are introduced by an interesting intellectual autobiography entitled "Milestones in Books." They are prefaced by a short tribute by A. Raymond George given at Taylor's funeral service and by a helpful assessment of Taylor's contributions by C. L. Mitton. Included also at the end of the book is a compilation of Taylor's publications by Owen E. Evans.

Andrews University SAKAE KUBO

Wells, David F., and Pinnock, Clark H., eds. *Toward a Theology for the Future*. Carol Stream, Ill.: Creation House, 1971. 329 pp. $4.95.

The purpose of this symposium dealing with many aspects of theology is to set forth evangelical alternatives to the central issues of the day with the bold hope that evangelical scholarship might recapture leadership in theological research. The editors feel that the time is propitious for such a program since the available theological options have become bankrupt. The aim of each essay is to focus on a central problem in a specific field and "to indicate where the decisive action is taking place and to move toward a constructive, evangelical proposal" (p. 10).

R. K. Harrison ("Perspectives on Old Testament Study") feels that OT studies have been saddled too long with inadequate methodology, especially that which is controlled by a priori philosophical considerations (evolution). He appeals for the objective, inductive method.

Everett F. Harrison ("Tradition of the Sayings of Jesus: A Crux Interpretum") seeks to demonstrate that we have evidence in the NT which shows concern for, as well as the actual, preservation of the sayings of Jesus. He presents some good arguments for his position, especially for the Gospels.

Palmer Robertson ("The Outlook for Biblical Theology") distinguishes Biblical Theology from Systematic Theology primarily in the fact that the former has a historical dimension. His suggestions for future evangelical contributions, especially for NT theology, are insightful but show how far behind evangelicals are in comparison with the "liberals."

Clark Pinnock ("Prospects for Systematic Theology") plays a tune similar to R. K. Harrison's in making the central issue the question of whether a positivistic scientific approach is valid. He distinguishes between this and genuine science. The former controls and pervades liberal theology and, in effect, destroys the very basis of Christian faith with its belief in the saving events.

Geoffrey W. Bromiley ("Promise of Patristic Studies") appeals to evangelicals to show more interest and concern in patristic studies, and not by default to surrender this area to others, especially to the Roman Catholics. He shows that proper study of the Bible demands knowledge of patristic exegesis and that careful examination will show that all later developments in the Catholic Church cannot find their support here.

David F. Wells ("The Future of the Church") calls for a return to Reformation insights in understanding God as *Deus absconditus* and *Deus revelatus* in opposition to modern secular theology which sees God in man and in life. God is in a sense hidden and we can come to know Him only as He reveals Himself in Christ or Scripture.

Bernard Ramm ("Ethics in the Theologies of Hope") presents a good analysis and critique of Moltmann's theology, particularly dealing with his emphasis on "deprivatization" of Christian ethics.

Harold J. Ockenga's chapter ("Proclamation for a New Age") should not have been included. It has little to do with the title of the essay itself and with the theme of the book.

H. D. McDonald ("Theology and Culture") deals with the Christ-and-Culture theme (favors the leavenist view). He describes the secular and humanist spirit of modern culture and calls for the Christian to communicate Christ as a norm and touchstone of culture and to prepare men for the Kingdom of God.

Stanley Obitts ("Religious Certainty and Infallibility: A Discussion with Hans Küng") criticizes Küng for actually making the believer's interpretation of his encounter experience infallible but presents no constructive proposals of his own.

Arthur Glasser ("Mission and Cultural Environment") opposes the trend to make mission service rather than evangelism. Because he is somewhat apologetic, what he wants to say does not come out as loudly and clearly as one would expect.

There are some helpful things in this volume, but the short chapters cannot begin to deal adequately with the central issues nor provide constructive proposals. Much more elaboration and expansion are need.

Andrews University SAKAE KUBO

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
SEMINARY STUDIES

VOLUME XII
1974

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY PRESS
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN 49104, USA

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

PAGE

A TRIBUTE TO SIEGFRIED H. HORN. The *AUSS* Staff 81

GANE, ERWIN R. The Intellect-Will Problem in the Thought of Some Northern Renaissance Humanists: Nicholas of Cusa 83

JOHNSTON, ROBERT M. Patriarchs, Rabbis, and Sabbath 94

MEYER, JOHN R. Luther's Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms .. 1

NITOWSKI, EUGENIA L. Inscribed and Radiated-Type Byzantine Lamps 18

RICHARDS, W. L. Textual Criticism on the Greek Text of the Catholic Epistles: A Bibliography 103

TERIAN, ABRAHAM. Coins from the 1971 Excavations at Heshbon 35

TULAND, CARL G. Ezra-Nehemiah or Nehemiah-Ezra? 47

UHLIG, SIEGBERT. Die Typologische Bedeutung des Begriffs Babylon 112

WORSCHECH, UDO F. CH. The Problem of Isaiah 6:13 126

BOOK REVIEWS

ALLEGRO, JOHN M. *The Chosen People* (Zev Garber) 63

ARON, ROBERT. *The Jewish Jesus* (Zev Garber) 64

BORNKAMM, GÜNTHER. *Paul* (D. Malcolm Maxwell) 139

BROWN, RAYMOND E.; DONFRIED, KARL, P.; and REUMANN, JOHN., eds. *Peter in the New Testament: A Collaborative Assessment by Protestant and Roman Catholic Scholars* (Raoul Dederen) 140

BRUNNER, PETER. *The Ministry and the Ministry of Women* (Sakae Kubo) 141

COBB, JOHN B., JR. *God and the World* (Edward W. H. Vick) 143

DE VAUX, ROLAND. *Histoire ancienne d'Israël: des origines à l'installation en Canaan* (Siegfried H. Horn) 66

FURNISH, VICTOR PAUL. *The Love Command in the New Testament* (Sakae Kubo) 67

GILKEY, LANGDON B. *Religion and the Scientific Future* (Edward W. H. Vick) 68

GOEDICKE, HANS, ed. *Near Eastern Studies: In Honour of William Foxwell Albright* (Zev Garber) 69

HAMMERSHAIMB, ERLING. *The Book of Amos* (Zev Garber) .. 71

HOEHNER, HAROLD W. *Herod Antipas* (Siegfried H. Horn) 73

HYMA, ALBERT. *The Life of Desiderius Erasmus* (Kenneth A. Strand) 144

JENSON, ROBERT W. *The Knowledge of Things Hoped For: The Sense of Theological Discourse* (Edward W. H. Vick) 74

KAUFMAN, GORDON D. *God the Problem* (Edward W. H. Vick) 145

LYONNET, STANISLAS, S. J., and LEOPOLD SABOURIN, S. J. *Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study* (Sakae Kubo) 75

MARTIN, MALACHI. *Three Popes and the Cardinal* (Raoul Dederen) 77

MELAND, BERNARD E., ed. *The Future of Empirical Theology* (Edward W. H. Vick) 146

MILLER, DONALD G. *The Authority of the Bible* (Sakae Kubo) 147

MONTGOMERY, JOHN WARWICK. *The Quest for Noah's Ark: A Treasury of Documented Accounts from Ancient Times to the Present Day* (Siegfried H. Horn) 148

MORRIS LEON. *Apocalyptic* (Kenneth A. Strand) 150

MORRIS LEON. *The Revelation of St. John: An Introduction and Commentary* (Kenneth A. Strand) 150

MUELLER, DAVID L. *An Introduction to the Theology of Albrecht Ritschl* (Edward W. H. Vick) 152

OLSEN, V. NORSKOV. *John Foxe and the Elizabethan Church* (Kenneth A. Strand) 153

PREUS, JACOB A. O. *It Is Written* (Sakae Kubo) 141

ROSENBLOOM, JOSEPH R. *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll: A Literary Analysis* (Zev Garber) 78

SCAER, DAVID P. *The Apostolic Scriptures* (Sakae Kubo) ... 141

SCHARLEMANN, MARTIN H. *The Ethics of Revolution* (Sakae Kubo) 141

SCHATZ, WERNER. *Genesis 14. Eine Untersuchung* (Gerhard F. Hasel) 155

SCHWARZ, HANS. *On the Way to the Future* (Sakae Kubo) 156

STAUFFER, RICHARD. *The Humanness of John Calvin* (Kenneth A. Strand) 157

TAYLOR, VINCENT. *New Testament Essays* (Sakae Kubo) ... 158

WELLS, DAVID F., and PINNOCK, CLARK H., eds. *Toward a Theology for the Future* (Sakae Kubo) 158

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW

CONSONANTS

א = ʾ	ד = *d̲*	י = *y*	ס = *s*	ר = *r*
ב = *b*	ה = *h*	כ = *k*	ע = ʿ	שׁ = *ś*
בּ = *b̲*	ו = *w*	כּ = *k̲*	פ = *p*	שׂ = *s̱*
ג = *g*	ז = *z*	ל = *l*	פּ = *p̲*	ת = *t*
גּ = *g̲*	ח = *ḥ*	מ = *m*	צ = *ṣ*	תּ = *t̲*
ד = *d*	ט = *ṭ*	נ = *n*	ק = *q*	

MASORETIC VOWEL POINTINGS

◌ַ = *a*	◌ְ, ◌ֱ (vocal shewa) = *e*	◌ֹ = *ō*
◌ָ = *ā*	◌ֵ, ◌ֶי = *ê*	◌וֹ = *o*
◌ֲ = *a*	◌ִ = *i*	◌ׇ = *ô*
◌ֶ = *e*	◌ִי = *î*	◌ֻ = *u*
◌ֵ = *ē*	◌ָ = *o*	◌ׄ = *û*

ABBREVIATIONS OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

AASOR	*Annual, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res.*
ADAJ	*Annual, Dep. of Ant. of Jordan*
AER	*American Ecclesiastical Review*
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung*
AfP	*Archiv für Papyrusforschung*
AHW	Von Soden, *Akkad. Handwörterb.*
AJA	*Am. Journal of Archaeology*
AJBA	*Austr. Journ. of Bibl. Arch.*
AJSL	*Am. Jrl., Sem. Lang. and Lit.*
ANEP	*Anc. Near East in Pictures,* Pritchard, ed.
ANEST	*Anc. Near East: Suppl. Texts and Pictures,* Prichard, ed.
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts,* Pritchard, ed., 2d ed., 1955
ANF	The Ante-Nicene Fathers
AcO	Acta Orientalia
AnOr	Analecta Orientalia
ArO	*Archiv Orientální*
ARG	*Archiv für Reformationsgesch.*
ARW	*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*
ATR	*Anglican Theological Review*
AUM	Andrews Univ. Monographs
AusBR	*Australian Biblical Review*
AUSS	*Andrews Univ. Sem. Studies*
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BASOR	*Bulletin, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res.*
Bib	*Biblica*
BibB	Biblische Beiträge
BiOr	*Bibliotheca Orientalis*
BJRL	*Bulletin, John Rylands Library*
BQR	*Baptist Quarterly Review*
BR	*Biblical Research*
BRG	Biblioth. Rerum Germanicarum
BS	*Bibliotheca Sacra*
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	Beihefte zur *ZAW*
BZNW	Beihefte zur *ZNW*
CAD	*Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CC	*Christian Century*
CdE	*Chronique d'Égypte*
CH	*Church History*
CIJ	Corp. Inscript. Judaicarum
CIL	Corp. Inscript. Latinarum
CIS	Corp. Inscript. Semiticarum
CJT	*Canadian Journal of Theology*
CT	*Christianity Today*
EQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
ER	*Ecumenical Review*
EvT	*Evangelische Theologie*
HJ	*Hibbert Journal*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
IG	Inscriptiones Graecae
Int	*Interpretation*

JAAR	*Journ., Amer. Acad. of Rel.*
JAC	*Jahrb. für Ant. und Christentum*
JAOS	*Journ. of the Amer. Or. Soc.*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBR	*Journal of Bible and Religion*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JEA	*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*
JEOL	*Jaarbericht, Ex Oriente Lux*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JPOS	*Journ., Palest. Or. Soc.*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JR	*Journal of Religion*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JSSR	*Journ., Scient. St. of Rel.*
JTS	*Journal of Theol. Studies*
Jud	*Judaica*
KJV	King James Version
LQ	*Lutheran Quarterly*
MGH	Mon. Germ. Historica
MPG	Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*
MPL	Migne, *Patrologia Latina*
MQR	*Mennonite Quarterly Review*
NEB	New English Bible
NKZ	*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*
NPNF	Nicene and Post. Nic. Fathers
NRT	*Nouvelle Revue Theologique*
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NTA	*New Testament Abstracts*
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
Num	*Numen*
OC	*Oriens Christianus*
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*
Or	*Orientalia*
OTS	*Oudtestamentische Studiën*
PEFQS	*Pal. Expl. Fund, Quart. Statem.*
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly*
PJB	*Palästina-Jahrbuch*
PRE	*Realencyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*
QDAP	*Quarterly, Dep. of Ant. in Pal.*
RA	*Revue d'Assyr. et d'Arch. Or.*
RAC	*Revista di Archaeologia Christiana*
RAr	*Revue Archéologique*
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RdE	*Revue d'Égyptologie*
RechB	*Recherches Bibliques*
RE	*Review and Expositor*
RelS	*Religious Studies*
RHE	*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*
RHPR	*Revue d'Hist. et de Philos. Rel.*
RHR	*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*
RL	*Religion in Life*
RLA	*Reallexikon der Assyriologie*
RQ	*Revue de Qumrân*
RS	*Revue Sémitique*
RSR	*Revue, Sciences Religieuses*
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SANT	*St. z. Alt. u. Neuen Test.*
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SOr	Studia Orientalia
SPB	Studia Postbiblica
ST	*Studia Theologica*
TD	*Theology Digest*
TEH	*Theologische Existenz Heute*
TG	*Theologie und Glaube*
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
TP	*Theologie und Philosophie*
TQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift*
TR	*Theologische Revue*
TRu	*Theologische Rundschau*
Trad	*Traditio*
TS	*Theological Studies*
TT	*Theology Today*
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
UF	*Ugaritische Forschungen*
VCh	*Vigiliae Christianae*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTS	*VT*, Supplements
WO	*Die Welt des Orients*
WTJ	*Westminster Theol. Journal*
WZKM	*Wiener Zeitsch. f. d. Kunde d. Mor.*
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
ZÄS	*Zeitsch. für Ägyptische Sprache*
ZAW	*Zeitsch. für die Alttes. Wiss.*
ZDMG	*Zeitsch. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft*
ZDPV	*Zeitsch. des Deutsch. Pal. Ver.*
ZHT	*Zeitsch. für Hist. Theologie*
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*
ZKT	*Zeitsch. für Kath. Theologie*
ZNW	*Zeitsch. für die Neutes. Wiss.*
ZRGG	*Zeitsch. für Rel. u. Geistesgesch.*
ZST	*Zeitschrift für Syst. Theologie*
ZTK	*Zeitsch. für Theol. und Kirche*

Printed by University Printers, Berrien Springs, Mich.