ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

SEMINARY STUDIES

VOLUME V JANUARY 1967 NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
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 or as a double issue in July. Annual subscription rates of $2.50 are payable to Andrews University, 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 Journal is indexed in the
Index to Religious Periodical Literature.

EMIL BRUNNER'S THEOLOGY OF PREACHING

HERBERT E. DOUGLASS
Atlantic Union College, South Lancaster, Massachusetts

Perhaps at no other time in the history of the Christian church have the function and purposes of Christian proclamation in general, and preaching in particular, been so scrutinized as in the last twenty years. In the judgment of many, the crisis of the Christian church today—its apathy and enervation in the face of modern problems, its unreality and shopworn moralism—at its heart, is the crisis of preaching.[1]

Careful scholarship has shown that the Christian church arose as the response to kerygmatic preaching,[2] a fact which Paul attests out of experience when he notes that faith comes from preaching (Rom 10:17). If preaching was the principle vehicle which accounts for the authentic, dynamic fellowship of faith in the first century, then it seems most probable that the recovery of authority and relevance by Christianity would depend on solving the crisis of preaching.

It is not the purpose of this study to review the rising tide of scholarly contributions being made on the subject of the

[1] *E.g.* Emil Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of the Church, Faith, and the Consummation* (hereafter cited as *Dogmatics*, III), trans. David Cairns and T. H. L. Parker (Philadelphia, 1962), p. 99: "Since the Reformation the sermon, that is, the exposition of the words of Scripture of a theological specialist who is called the minister of the divine Word (*verbi divini minister*), has been without doubt the centre, the authentic heart of the Church. This was for centuries uncontested and apparently constituted no problem. But it is precisely here that today the crisis of the Church is most evident—as a crisis of preaching." For an excellent analysis from the Roman Catholic viewpoint see Domenico Grasso, *Proclaiming God's Message* (South Bend, Ind., 1965), chap. I: "The Theological Problem of Preaching."

[2] C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development* (New York, 1962). See also Brunner, *Revelation and Reason*, trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia, 1946), pp. 122-164.

crisis in preaching, for minimum annotations alone would create a small book.[3] Neither is it our objective to analyze the alleged causes which have contributed to the modern plight of the Christian church which no longer can divide the world between the Christian nation and the unsaved heathen. Nor can we attempt here to answer thoroughly our own questions which necessarily precede a statement on the theology of preaching.

Yet, questions must be asked, especially by those most sympathetically concerned with the crisis, in order that the cause of the sickness may be more quickly isolated and defined. Although the shell remains, something vital has been well-nigh lost. What is there about preaching which, when well, brings forth hardy, responsible offspring but when sick, only a token of its former glory? What should one expect of a sermon? What is its purpose? What is the nature of that New Testament faith which is evoked by authentic preaching? How should the preacher understand his own relationship to the sermon? What is the "truth" which is to be proclaimed?

These are questions which can be answered only by careful theological thinking as it reflects on authentic faith and the Biblical Word. Many theological thinkers in the twentieth century have addressed themselves to the plight of the modern church, but perhaps no one has spoken more directly to the dilemma than Emil Brunner. He has been regarded as "the

[3] A significant list would include Merrill R. Abbey, *Preaching to the Contemporary Mind* (New York, 1963); Karl Barth, *The Preaching of the Gospel* (Philadelphia, 1963), and *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (New York, 1957); Herbert Farmer, *God and Men* (Nashville, Tenn., 1947), and *The Servant of the Word* (New York, 1942); P. T. Forsyth, *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind* (New York, 1907); John Knox, *The Integrity of Preaching* (New York, 1957); Michel Philibert, *Christ's Preaching—and Ours* (Richmond, Va., 1964); Dietrich Ritschl, *A Theology of Proclamation* (Richmond, Va., 1960); Jean-Jacques von Allmen, *Preaching and Congregation* (Richmond, Va., 1962); Theodore Wedel, *The Pulpit Rediscovers Theology* (Greenwich, Conn., 1956); Gustaf Wingren, *The Living Word* (Philadelphia, 1960).

most representative of those theologians who shaped the thought of the last generation of Protestants." [4]

However, what may not be as well known as his general theological impact is the soil and concern out of which his theological contribution grew: Brunner's theology was born out of his own actual need as a parish preacher and nurtured by confronting the perennial task of making God's Word meaningful to modern man. His work has been marked by a conscious effort to clarify and to correct the crisis of preaching.[5]

Early in his pastoral concern for Christian proclamation, along with Karl Barth, he saw the discrepancies between the principles of liberalism, in which he had been academically trained, and the world of the Bible. At the same time he did not return entirely to the position of traditional orthodox Protestantism.[6] On the one hand, liberalism had reduced the distance between God and man by emphasizing the human potential and the reliability of man's common reasoned experience as the standard of ultimate truth. On the other hand, traditional orthodoxy too often had distorted the God-man relationship by allowing faith to slip from the personal dimension into a purely noetic one and by reducing the responsibility of man in the faith-event. Liberalism accused orthodoxy of irrelevancy and pre-critical acceptance of authority; orthodoxy returned the compliment by accusing liberalism of inauthenticity and relativism.

[4] Wilhelm Pauck, "The Church-Historical Setting of Brunner's Theology," in *The Theology of Emil Brunner*, ed. Charles W. Kegley (New York, 1962), p. 34.

[5] Brunner, "Intellectual Autobiography," Kegley, *op. cit.*, p. 9. For an explication of Brunner's theological system as a theology of preaching see the present writer's "Encounter with Brunner—An Analysis of Emil Brunner's Proposed Transcendence of the Subjectivism-Objectivism Dichotomy in its Relation to Christian Proclamation" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pacific School of Religion, 1964).

[6] Brunner, *The Theology of Crisis* (New York, 1930), pp. 2, 21, 22. Cf. Barth's experience in his *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, pp. 100, 101.

Brunner saw that this division was only the modern unfolding of the perennial tension within Christianity between subjectivism and objectivism. This dichotomy has rent the church since those days when theologians falsified the New Testament understanding of truth by allowing it to slip into the traditional subject-object antithesis of Greek philosophy, which in itself had been a legitimate tool for natural-rational thought.[7] However, Brunner pointed out, when Christian truth is thus to be sought within these categories, the inevitable result is a disproportionate emphasis on either the subject (*e.g.*, the subjectivism of liberalism) or on the object (*e.g.*, the objectivism of traditional orthodoxy).

This tension within the Christian church has directly affected the proclamation of the gospel. Within traditional orthodoxy, the Bible and/or ecclesiastical dogma, rather than God himself, too often emerged as the primary object of faith. Thus faith tended to be more of a mental process, an impersonal response involving only an attempted correction of external habits rather than a self-authenticating, personal encounter between God and man.[8] For some, preaching was merely a processing of information rather than an address to responsible men who had the right to expect relevancy and personal meaning before decision; for others, pulpit entreaty was simply to urge people to conform their lives to objective standards which would validate their faith.

With the Hellenization of New Testament kerygmatic preaching into subject-object categories, objectivism was strengthened whenever preaching became defined as the presentation of theological propositions about God, and when the faith it was to awaken was conceived of as evoked primarily on the level of the intellect rather than on that of ex-

[7] Brunner, *The Divine-Human Encounter*, trans. Amandus W. Loos (Philadelphia, 1943), pp. 7, 21 *et passim*.

[8] Brunner, *Revelation and Reason*, pp. 36-40. See also Brunner, *Truth as Encounter* (a new and enlarged edition of *The Divine-Human Encounter*; Philadelphia, 1964), pp. 76-78, 174-181.

perience. Too often the preacher is then encouraged to think that his success depends on logic, comprehensiveness and/or ability to excite certain human emotions.

Brunner emphasized that through the centuries whenever preaching has tended to reduce Christian proclamation to mere didactic exposition of the Bible or to hortatory moralisms, the church has instinctively reacted with the rise of subjectivistic movements which attempted to interiorize disproportionately the religious experience. Faith, to these groups, was conceived more as a personal experience, to be understood in ways most meaningful to the individual. Too often, however, this reactionary emphasis on personal meaning in Christian faith reduced the importance of the given Word. The Word of God would thus tend to become more of an expression of man's religious self-consciousness rather than a Word from the outside of man and spoken to man.[9]

Brunner saw that this historical oscillation and tension between preaching as didactic exposition in the attempt to find authority, and preaching as personal experience in the attempt to find relevance, lays bare the basic sickness of the Christian church. Whenever the church has lost sight of the purpose and function of preaching (that is, whenever its theology misunderstands what was happening between God and man during apostolic preaching), there arise within and without the church the symptoms of the crisis of preaching—on the surface, for all practical purposes, the lack of either authority or relevance, and fundamentally the absence of both.

At the end of the second decade of the twentieth century, Brunner, together with a number of other theologians, pointed to a third way between the traditional alternatives of subjectivism and objectivism. Their attack faced two fronts: with

[9] Referring to Schleiermacher, Brunner said, "His subjective interpretation of the faith of the church, when closely examined, tends to empty it of content completely. The Word is no longer the divine, revealed authority and the foundation of faith, but only the means of expressing that faith." *Truth as Encounter*, p. 80.

their emphasis on the radical qualitative discontinuity between God and man, and on the personal God as the initiator of revelation, they hit the heart of liberalism; and with their emphasis on God as Absolute Subject who can be neither adequately objectified in human words nor heard outside the commitment of faith, they sought to avoid the objectivisitic tendencies of traditional orthodoxy.[10]

In later years, however, Brunner believed that the early promise of this movement had faded with the development of a new subjectivism-objectivism dichotomy, not outside but within its very ranks. In Barth's developing theology, he saw the unfolding of objectivism and in Bultmann's reaction to Barth, a new form of subjectivism.[11] With this Brunner's own conviction was strengthened that the only solution to the perennial impasse between subjectivism and objectivism in Christian proclamation is to develop the theme of "truth as encounter" as the basic principle of the Christian message.[12]

Brunner's understanding of the Biblical presentation of truth as encounter suggests an ellipse moving about two foci: the self-communicating God and the responsivity of man.[13] He insisted that to misunderstand or to stress disproportionately either focus would be to allow Christian preaching to fall into the errors of subjectivism or objectivism. Those who stress a transcendent God, One Who must reveal Himself if He is to be known, without proper emphasis on the

[10] *The Theology of Crisis* constituted Brunner's early lectures as he endeavored to transcend the increasing theological relativity within subjectivistic liberalism and the hardening categories of objectivistic orthodoxy.

[11] *Dogmatics*, III, 212-224; *Truth as Encounter*, pp. 41-49.

[12] Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption* (hereafter cited as *Dogmatics*, II), trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia, 1952), p. v; *Dogmatics*, III, pp. ix, x. It is interesting to note that the fourth chapter of the six added in the second edition of *Wahrheit als Begegnung* (Zurich, 1963) was entitled, "Die Theologie jenseits von Barth und Bultmann."

[13] This concept of a theological ellipse depicting the personal nature of divine communication is developed in the author's above-mentioned dissertation (n. 5), pp. 121-267.

personal nature of revelation or on man's responsibility to receive and to respond intelligently, tend to commit the mistakes of objectivism; those who stress the responsibility of man and his freedom at the expense of the objective reality of God's self-disclosure tend to fall into the errors of subjectivism.

"Self-communication" emphasizes the personal character of the divine disclosure, that it is a Person who is being revealed. "Self-communication" makes clear that the purpose of revelation is more than the transmission of information, even though it be information about a Personal God who desires personal response from His creation. Brunner thus understood divine Revelation as a transitive event between two subjects.[14]

The concept of responsivity emphasizes that God speaks to and apprehends what He has put into Man in creation—God does not by-pass what was made to be used.[15] Man was created by the Word, in the Word, and for the Word. That is, he was created by God in such a way that he may freely respond to his Lord who desires to fellowship with him. This ability to relate and to respond in fellowship with God is the formal image of God which remains as man's essential nature whether he rightly responds to God or not.[16]

But, Man as a self-determining person misused his freedom and became *ir*responsible in his rebellion, not *un*responsible. This rebellion, or sin, is the act of the whole man; it is the

[14] Brunner, *Revelation and Reason*, pp. 32, 33; Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of God* (hereafter cited as *Dogmatics*, I), trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia, 1950), p. 19.

[15] "Das Evangelium wendet sich nicht an einen Menschen, der von Gott überhaupt nichts weiss und hat" ("The gospel does not present itself to a person who knows and has nothing at all of God"), "Die andere Aufgabe der Theologie," *Zwischen den Zeiten*, VII (1929), 262. For Brunner's development of this idea of responsibility, see *Man in Revolt*, trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia, 1947), pp. 70-203; *Revelation and Reason*, pp. 48-80; *The Divine Imperative*, trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia, 1948), pp. 152-162; *Dogmatics*, II, 46-131.

[16] *Dogmatics*, II, 55-61.

turning away from the will of God—the failure to respond—and not mere weakness or ignorance. Yet, man is still responsible (that is, able to respond) in his rebellion and in some degree continues to sense his misused responsibility. Because in sin man lives in contradiction to his created nature, the consequences of the contradiction set up a condition wherein the gospel of Christianity can find a "point of contact" (*Anknüpfungspunkt*).[17] In fact, Brunner held that the revelation in creation, that is, something about God's will and man's original destiny as it now can be discerned apart from the Scriptures, becomes the presupposition for the saving revelation in Jesus Christ. The forms of revelation as directed to sinful man are determined by his human capacity to receive it. The missionary point of contact is in the sphere of responsibility which all men share to some degree of awareness.[18]

Faith, then, as Brunner understood the New Testament, is the right relationship of the hitherto irresponsible man to the Lordship of the self-communicating God. The nature of New Testament faith, he contended, is determined by God's intention in His self-communication. The personal act of faith is the correlate to the personal act of God's self-communication.[19] Faith, the personal act of decision, is simultaneously perception and obedience: 1) God in Christ is recognized as the Lord of life, and man's sense of distance and anxiety is perceived as the result of his rebellion (a knowledge experienced first hand); 2) in this awareness, there is the response of obedient love to the Lord God who not only makes clear man's state as sinner, but who also declares man forgiven and reinstated as his son.

This new life of authentic faith leads to a transformed existence wherein man wills to do the will of a holy and loving God—that is, to relate to all persons as God related Himself

[17] *Man in Revolt*, pp. 527-541.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 63; See *Dogmatics*, II, 46.
[19] *Truth as Encounter*, pp. 102-108.

to man.[20] The life of faith becomes a reflection of God's love, thus making possible the emergence of genuine community wherever men with genuine faith exist. Faith thus becomes the basis for the existence of the Christian church.[21]

Brunner held authentic faith to be the result of kerygmatic preaching (Rom 10:17), and saw it as arising when the historic Word (the objective witness) and the interior Word (the subjective witness) converge and address man as the contemporary Word of God. The preaching church is the bridge which carries over the years the authority and relevancy of the historically grounded Christ-event and, joining this proclamation, the Holy Spirit makes the historic Christ-event present and self-validating to men today. Thus the man of faith responds, not simply to historical records, but to the living Lord who speaks in a self-authenticating manner. Faith proves preaching relevant and authoritative by bringing unity and meaning to the thinking person and community to the estranged.[22]

In this understanding of revelation as a transitive event between two subjects, Brunner believed that he had provided theological support for transcending the subjectivism-objectivism dichotomy in Christian proclamation. Proclamation is seen as the contemporary extension of revelation as a transitive event. Implicit within this theological structure in addition to correct content are the methodological principles for authentic proclamation. Man's methods of proclamation are to be the same as God's; that is, the preacher should adapt the faith-awakening address to every man's condition so that he can readily understand it. The problems of "communication of" and "communication between" [23] are resolved in understanding both revelation and proclamation as involving personal

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 162-167.
[21] *Dogmatics*, III, 290-305; see also pp. 134-139.
[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 5, 134; see also *Revelation and Reason*, pp. 136-164.
[23] Hendrick Kraemer, *The Communication of the Christian Faith* (Philadephia, 1956), pp. 11 ff.

encounter between the self-communicating Absolute Person and the man who was created to respond to his Lord. Although man's freedom and prerogative to understand that to which he must commit himself are respected, the gospel, if rightly conveyed, speaks to his actual condition in such a way that its rejection would be understood as a turn from reality. For man to turn from Jesus as his Lord is to reject the "truth"—about himself and the world in general.[24]

For Brunner the sermon should not be an exposition of the preacher's religious self-consciousness, nor an attempt at a sociological program, nor an endeavor to prove the existence of God, nor merely a conveyance for the transmission of information; it should rather be a faithful exposition of the historic Word so that the human situation once spoken to by the Spirit can be identified with the human situation today and through this reconstruction, the Spirit can again address man in his need. The preacher is thus both the personal witness to the self-communicating God, and the living channel whereby the historic faith-awakening message is made relevant to the individual who already is listening to the faith-evoking call of the Spirit.[25]

Authentic proclamation does not resort to mere announcement or command, because man remains a subject and not an object in the transitive event of revelation. Neither does God implant within man His own activity which does man's responding for him, nor is there any kind of objective-causal influence at work wherein the Word merely has to be spoken without particular regard for the human situation.

Brunner diagnosed the modern sickness of the church as ailing exactly where its life of faith is generated—in its preaching. Whenever New Testament faith is misunderstood or perverted, the appeal to authority without meaningful relevancy fails to move thinking men; likewise does the disproportional emphasis on relevancy and accommodation fail

[24] *Dogmatics*, III, 150, 151; *Revelation and Reason*, p. 182.
[25] *Revelation and Reason*, pp. 157, 158; *Dogmatics*, I, 19; III, 50.

to satisfy men who soon sense the lack of a genuine authority.[26] The world sees little evidence of authority or relevancy when Christian proclamation does not create the transformed existence it talks so much about. When revelation and proclamation are not understood as transitive events, when faith is not understood as the total response of trusting obedience which proves itself effective in love, when the church thus comes to misunderstand itself as simply a conveyor and keeper of doctrine, or as a religious institution which may dispense salvation, the ability of the Christian voice to speak to self-determining, responsible men is desperately handicapped.

But when Christian proclamation is understood as the articulated witness of the faith-fellowship, by men who, in understanding God's *"Gabe und Aufgabe,"* his gift which is also his commission, move out toward their fellowmen with the same love by which God encountered them (that is, without coercion or threat, without ignoring each man's need to understand what is being proclaimed), there will be a great many more who will take time to listen. Authentic proclamation, as validated by authentic faith, witnesses to the union of *logos* and *dunamis* and by so doing unites the legitimate emphasis of both objectivism and subjectivism while transcending their distortions.

Brunner contended that a correct theology of preaching is the church's primary concern, that the "care of the proclamation of the Word is therefore the first and most immediate care, the institution of preaching is the task laid upon us by God; the office of preaching is therefore the foundation which bears Christianity, the basis of the Church."[27]

[26] *Dogmatics*, III, 102, 108, 111, 114, 115, 135.
[27] Brunner, *God and Man*, trans. David Cairns (London, 1936), p. 126.

THE BABYLONIAN CHRONICLE AND THE ANCIENT CALENDAR OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH

SIEGFRIED H. HORN
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

Of the official ancient records those known as the Babylonian Chronicles are among the most reliable. Fragments of such chronicles covering a number of years from about 700 B.C. to the end of the Babylonian empire, in 539, have come to light in recent decades from time to time. Of the period of the Neo-Babylonian empire the available chronicles cover the following years: 626-623, 616-594, 556-555, and 554-539.[1] All of these important historical texts have received the widest possible discussion from historians and chronologists, especially during the years following the publication of each document. It may therefore seem to be superfluous to reopen the subject here. However, it is a fact that scholars have reached differing conclusions from their study of these texts with regard to certain events in which the Kingdom of Judah is involved. The present article, therefore, is written to present certain observations which either have not been made in previous discussions, or need strengthening and clarification.

Since this article deals with the problem of the nature of the calendar in use during the last decades of the existence of the Kingdom of Judah, only the three following texts are pertinent for our study: (1) B.M. 21901, published by C. J. Gadd in 1923, covering the years 616-609,[2] and (2) B.M. 22047

[1] Translations of the Babylonian Chronicles as far as they were known before 1956, when Wiseman published four more texts, have been provided by A. Leo Oppenheim in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ed. James B. Pritchard (2d ed.; Princeton, 1955), pp. 301-307.

[2] C. J. Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh* (London, 1923). It is republished by Wiseman in his publication listed in the next note.

and B.M. 21946, published in 1956 by D. J. Wiseman, covering the years 608-594.[3]

These three texts are of the utmost value for the history and chronology of the last years of the Kingdom of Judah, since they have provided accurate information with regard to a number of events recorded in the Bible, such as (1) the Battle of Megiddo between Josiah of Judah and Neco of Egypt, in which the former was mortally wounded, (2) the Battle of Carchemish, mentioned by Jeremiah, as the result of which Nebuchadnezzar occupied all of Syria and Palestine, and (3) the surrender of Jerusalem to Nebuchadnezzar by King Jehoiachin. The publication of the two tablets B.M. 22047 and B.M. 21946 by Wiseman put an end to the strange silence which the contemporary records of Nebuchadnezzar seemed to have observed in regard to historical data. Before 1956 hardly any historical records of the 43-year reign of this famous king of Babylon had come to light. On the other hand it was known from Biblical records that he carried out several military campaigns against Judah, which culminated in the final destruction of Jerusalem, that he achieved a victory over Pharaoh Neco at Carchemish, conducted a long siege of Tyre, and invaded Egypt. However, not one historical contemporary text was known that contained a clear record of any of these events. The wealth of texts from Nebuchadnezzar's reign, coming in part from the excavations of Babylon by R. Koldewey and in part from other sources, including inscriptions found in the Lebanon, were records either of building or of other non-military activities of the king.[4] This strange absence of clear records dealing with specific political activities of Nebuchadnezzar had the result that some scholars questioned whether

[3] D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings* (626-556 *B.C.*) *in the British Museum* (London, 1956); henceforth abbreviated: *CCK*.

[4] A convenient translation of most of these texts is given by Stephen Langdon, *Die neubabylonischen Königsinschriften* (Leipzig, 1912), pp. 70-209.

that king ever had possessed the political importance which the Bible seems to give him.[5]

The first break in this absence of historical information with regard to Nebuchadnezzar came when King Jehoiachin's captivity in Babylon became attested by the "ration" tablets from Nebuchadnezzar's palace, which Weidner published in 1939.[6] Also some light was shed on the siege of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar by six economic tablets,[7] and an invasion of Egypt in Nebuchadnezzar's 37th year is recorded in a tantalizingly fragmentary tablet in the British Museum.[8]

But these texts rank in importance far behind those of the Babylonian Chronicles, which for the first time have provided brief but clear records of Nebuchadnezzar's political and military activities during the first ten years of his reign. They have revealed that during these ten years he conducted one military campaign after another, defeated the Egyptian army at Carchemish, and also took Jerusalem.

Wiseman, publishing the chronicles dealing with Nebuchadnezzar's reign, has ably discussed their historical implications and bearing on the history of the last years of the Kingdom of Judah. His work has been reviewed by several scholars,[9] and a comparatively large number of articles have

[5] See W. F. Albright's remarks with regard to the views of S. A. Cook and C. C. Torrey, who strongly doubted the accuracy of the Biblical description of the devastation of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar, in *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (2d ed.; Baltimore, 1946), pp. 246-248.

[6] E. F. Weidner, "Jojachin, König von Juda, in babylonischen Keilschrifttexten," *Mélanges syriens offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud*, II (Paris, 1939), 923-935.

[7] Eckhard Unger, "Nebukadnezar II. und sein Šandabakku (Oberkommissar) in Tyrus," *ZAW*, XLIV (1926), 314-317; Albright, *JBL*, LI (1932), 95, n. 51.

[8] Oppenheim, *ANET*, p. 308.

[9] Weidner, *AfO*, XVII (1954-1956), 499-500; M. Noth, *JSS*, II (1957), 271-273; E. Dhorme, *RA*, LI (1957), 209-210; W. von Soden, *WZKM*, LIII (1957), 316-321; J. Friedrich, *AfO*, XVIII (1957-1958), 61; F. R. Kraus, *VT*, VIII (1958), 109-111; A. Pohl, *Orientalia*, XXVII (1958), 292-294; E. Cavignac, *OLZ*, LV (1960), 141-143.

appeared dealing with the last kings of Judah in the light of these texts.[10] All reviewers have accepted without question the data as presented in the texts, but have reached different conclusions (1) in regard to the date of the final destruction of Jerusalem and the end of Zedekiah's reign, and (2) in regard to the methods employed by the books of Jeremiah and Kings in dating Nebuchadnezzar's regnal years. Although there are other differences in the approach of the scholars who have published their views, the chief difference consists in the application of different ancient calendars. Most of them assume that the calendar used in Judah was identical with the Babylonian calendar and that the year began in Judah, as well as in Babylonia, with the month Nisan in the spring.[11] They have reached the conclusion that Jerusalem was destroyed in the summer of 587 B.C.,[12] and that Jeremiah reckoned Nebuchadnezzar's regnal years one year too early. Some, however, believe that the Jews used a Palestinian civil calendar, according to which the year began with Tishri in the autumn. They have come to the conclusion that the destruction of Jerusalem occurred in the summer of 586 B.C.[13]

[10] Albright, "The Nebuchadnezzar and Neriglissar Chronicle," *BASOR*, No. 143 (Oct., 1956), 28-33; D. N. Freedman, "The Babylonian Chronicle," *BA*, XIX (1956), 50-60; J. P. Hyatt, "New Light on Nebuchadrezzar and Judean History," *JBL*, LXXV (1956), 277-284; A. Malamat, "A New Record of Nebuchadrezzar's Palestinian Campaign," *IEJ*, VI (1956), 246-256; F. Nötscher, " 'Neue' babylonische Chroniken und Altes Testament," *BZ*, I (1957), 110-114 (not seen); M. Noth, "Die Einnahme von Jerusalem in Jahre 597 v. Chr.," *ZDPV*, LXXIV (1958), 133-157; H. Tadmor, "Chronology of the Last Kings of Judah," *JNES*, XV (1956), 226-230; E. R. Thiele, "New Evidence on the Chronology of the Last Kings of Judah," *BASOR*, No. 143 (Oct., 1956), 22-27; E. Vogt, "Chronologia exeuntis regni Iuda et exsilii," *Biblica*, XXXVIII (1957), 389-399; Vogt, "Die neubabylonische Chronik über die Schlacht bei Karkemisch und die Einnahme von Jerusalem," *Supplement to VT*, IV (1957), 67-96.

[11] The following scholars, whose articles are mentioned in Footnote 10, apply the Spring year: Albright, Freedman, Hyatt, Noth, Tadmor and Vogt.

[12] Vogt, however, dates the fall of Jerusalem in 586.

[13] Malamat and Thiele. See for their articles Footnote 10.

It is, therefore, obvious that the date of the fall of Jerusalem depends on what type of calendar is employed. While no definite and unassailable conclusions can be reached until a historical record dealing with that event is found, it is the present writer's conviction that the authors and/or compilers of the books of Kings, Chronicles, and Jeremiah used a calendar year that began in the autumn with the month of Tishri.

In an earlier study I have shown that such a civil calendar seems to have existed in the times of Solomon, of Josiah, and of Nehemiah.[14] Furthermore, a complete harmony of the chronological data of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah during the two centuries when the two kingdoms existed side by side can be obtained only if it is assumed that Judah followed an autumn-to-autumn calendar and Israel a spring-to-spring calendar.[15] Moreover, the Jews who lived in Egypt during the post-exilic period seem to have applied a civil calendar that began in the autumn, as revealed by their dated, and in many instances double-dated, documents.[16]

Any consideration of the evidence must start with events of which the dates have been securely established:

The Battle of Megiddo. Before Wiseman published the last part of the Nabopolassar Chronicles there was uncertainty with regard to the date of the Battle of Megiddo and the death of Josiah. Some dated these events in 609[17] and others in

[14] S. H. Horn and L. H. Wood, *The Chronology of Ezra* 7 (Washington, D.C., 1953), pp. 60-65, 70-71. See also Thiele, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids, 1965), pp. 28-30; henceforth abbreviated: *MNHK*.

[15] Thiele, *MNHK*, p. 30: "Perhaps the strongest argument for the use of a Tishri-to-Tishri regnal year in Judah is that this method works, giving us a harmonious pattern of the regnal years and synchronisms, while with a Nisan-to-Nisan regnal year the old discrepancies would be retained."

[16] Horn and Wood, "The Fifth-Century Jewish Calendar at Elephantine," *JNES*, XIII (1954), 1-20; but see the objections of R. A. Parker, "Some Considerations on the Nature of the Fifth-Century Jewish Calendar at Elephantine," *JNES*, XIV (1955), 271-274.

[17] For example J. Lewy, "Forschungen zur alten Geschichte

608.[18] Gadd, who published the text of that part of Nabopolassar's Chronicles which ended in 609, was convinced that the Battle of Megiddo took place in connection with an Egyptian campaign in 608. For 609 the Chronicles record an unsuccessful advance of Assyrian and Egyptian armies on Haran. Since the city of Carchemish is mentioned in 2 Chr 35:20 as the site of a military encounter in which Neco was apparently involved after the Battle of Meggiddo, Gadd thought that this encounter was not the one dealt with in the Babylonian Chronicles for 609, in which Carchemish is not mentioned. He and those who followed him found support for their views in the "catch-line" of Gadd's Chronicles, which reads: "In the [18th]year, [in the month of Elu]l, the king of Akkad called out his army." They assumed that the campaign of Nabopolassar to which this "catch-line" refers was directed against Egypt.

The publication of Wiseman's Chronicles has proved this assumption to be incorrect. Although the opening words of the new text correspond to the "catch-line" of the preceding tablet, the text shows that the campaign of the Babylonian army of 608 was directed against Urartu in the north. The Egyptians do not seem to have been considered a threat to Babylonia during that year or the following year, for they are not mentioned again until we reach the records of the year 606. We have, therefore, no alternative but to relate the Egyptian campaign, of which the Battle of Megiddo was an incident, to the events recorded in Gadd's Chronicles for the summer of 609. This conclusion must be considered final, and it has been accepted by all scholars who have written on the subject in recent years.

However, the exact date of the Battle of Megiddo cannot be ascertained with certainty. The campaign against Haran by the Assyrians and Egyptians began with the crossing of

Vorderasiens," *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft*, XXIX (1925), 20-23.

[18] Gadd, *op. cit.*, pp. 15, 24.

the Euphrates in Tammuz (June 25 to July 23) and ended with their retreat in Elul (Aug. 23 to Sept. 20). This means that the campaign could have begun as early as the end of June or as late as the second half of July. The distance from Megiddo to Carchemish is approximately 340 miles and must have taken the Egyptian army nearly a month to cover. This leads to the conclusion that the Battle of Megiddo could hardly have ended later than the middle of June, if the advance toward Haran started in the latter part of Tammuz. It could have been earlier, if the crossing of the Euphrates took place in the early part of Tammuz.

After the unsuccessful attack on Haran had forced him to retreat, Neco seems to have set up his headquarters at Riblah, south of Hamath in Syria. It was to Riblah that he summoned Jehoahaz and there he deposed him (2 Ki 23:33). This action must have taken place either in Elul or in Tishri, the following month.

If we now apply this evidence to the chronology of the kings of Judah from Josiah to Jehoiakim, we reach the following conclusions: During the Battle of Megiddo Josiah was mortally wounded and died in Megiddo (2 Ki 23:30). Neco, who was in a hurry to reach the headquarters of his army at Carchemish on the Euphrates (2 Chr 35:20, 21), continued his march north as soon as the forces of Josiah had been defeated. He felt that Judah with a beaten and demoralized army no longer posed a threat to him, and that he could postpone the political arrangements in Judah until after the encounter with the Babylonians had taken place. However, the lack of exact data makes it impossible to be definitive with regard to the dates of the reigns of the kings involved. It is certain that Josiah died in May or June 609 in the 31st year of his reign (2 Ki 22:1). He was succeeded by Jehoahaz, who in turn was deposed by Neco after a reign of three months (2 Ki 23:31, 33). He may therefore have reigned from May to August or from June to September, 609.

For those who hold the view that the regnal years of the

kings of Judah were counted according to a calendar which began the year in the spring, the date of the death of Josiah is immaterial, as long as it occurred after March 28 (= Nisan 1). In that case, the year that began in the spring of 609 and ended in the spring of 608, was then (1) the 31st year of Josiah, (2) the year in which Jehoahaz reigned for three months, and (3) the accession year of Jehoiakim.

Those, however, who believe that a civil year beginning in autumn was used in Judah to reckon the regnal years of the kings, are forced to assume that Jehoahaz was not deposed until after Tishri 1 (Sept. 21), because data contained in the Babylonian Chronicles, not yet discussed, make it certain that Jehoiakim, the successor of Jehoahaz, began his first regnal year in 608, either in the spring or in the autumn, and that his first year cannot have started in the autumn of 609.[19] According to this reasoning the Battle of Megiddo cannot have taken place earlier than in Tammuz, the same month in which the Assyrian and Egyptian armies crossed the Euphrates. In no other way could Jehoahaz have reigned for three months and still be deposed after Tishri 1.

Before leaving this subject we should point out that it is possible that Neco and his armed forces, held up by the Battle of Megiddo, were not able to join those Egyptian army contingents which were permanently stationed at Carchemish when the campaign against Haran began. It is known that Egyptian forces had supported the Assyrians before 609, for the Babylonian Chronicles attest their military participation in Assyrian campaigns for the years 616 and 610. The excavations of Carchemish have also provided evidence that this city was under a strong Egyptian influence under Psamtik I and Neco II before it was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in

[19] Thiele, *MNHK*, pp. 163-165, dates the Battle of Megiddo in Tammuz 609, and the accession of Jehoiakim in Tishri of the same year. Malamat, *op. cit.*, p. 256, presents a Synchronistic Table which shows the end of Jehoahaz' three months of reign coinciding with the change of year in the autumn. He considers the next full year as the accession year of Jehoiakim.

605.[20] It was probably an Egyptian garrison city during those years. Furthermore, the name of Neco is not mentioned in the Babylonian Chronicles. The Egyptian forces stationed at Carchemish may therefore have joined the Assyrians according to an agreement worked out between the heads of state sometime earlier or through diplomatic channels. In fact it is possible that the late arrival of Neco and his army was the reason for the failure of the campaign against Haran.

The Battle of Carchemish. The Babylonian Chronicles published by Wiseman have put an end to the uncertainty with regard to the date of the Battle of Carchemish mentioned both in the Bible (Jer 46:2) and by Josephus (*Ant.* x.6.1), but nowhere else in ancient records prior to the discovery of the Babylonian Chronicles. Unfortunately no exact date is given for this battle in the Chronicles. We merely learn that it took place in the 21st year of Nabopolassar before he died on Ab 8 (= Aug. 15, 605). Since the Babylonian year had begun April 12 in 605, and Nebuchadnezzar before the end of August (when word of his father's death reached him) had defeated the Egyptians not only at Carchemish, but also at Hamath in Syria, and had "conquered the whole area of the Ḫatti-country," it cannot be far amiss to assume that the Battle of Carchemish took place early in the Babylonian year, perhaps before the end of April—most probably not later than in May.

The Capture of Jerusalem. The most exact information ever obtained from cuneiform records for any event recorded in the Bible is that of the Babylonian Chronicles pertaining to the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar during the reign of Jehoiachin. It is stated that Nebuchadnezzar left for Palestine (Ḫatti-land) in Kislev of his 7th regnal year (= Dec. 18, 598 to Jan 15, 597), and that he seized "the city of Judah"

[20] C. L. Wooley, *Carchemish*, II (London, 1921), 123-129.

(= Jerusalem) on Adar 2 (= March 16, 597). Moreover, it is stated that on that day he "captured the king" and "appointed there a king of his own choice." This provides an exact date for the end of Jehoiachin's reign and the accession of Zedekiah. In fact, even a virtually exact date for the end of Jehoiakim's reign is obtained by means of this information, because the length of Jehoiachin's reign is known—three months and 10 days (2 Chr 36:9). This leads back to Marcheshwan 22 (= Dec. 10, 598) for Jehoiachin's accession and the death of his father Jehoiakim.[21]

Jehoiakim died in his 11th regnal year (2 Ki 23:36) which had begun either in the autumn of 598 or in the spring of the same year, depending on the type of calendar then used. This leads to the year 608/607 as his first year, as has already been pointed out in the discussion of the Battle of Megiddo. If an autumn-to-autumn calendar was used Jehoiakim must have come to the throne after Tishri 1, 609, since the beginning of his 1st regnal year did not occur until Tishri 1, 608. However, if a spring-to-spring calendar was used, he could have come to the throne before Tishri 609, because his first regnal year would have begun Nisan 1, 608.

Jehoiachin's total three-month reign falling entirely between Tishri and Nisan poses no problems as far as the chronology is concerned, nor do the available data provide any evidence in regard to the type of calendar used during his time.

[21] This date is arrived at from the calendar tables of R.A. Parker and W. H. Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology* 626 *B.C.-A.D.* 75 (Providence, 1956) by reckoning back 10 days from Kislev 2 inclusively, assuming that Marcheshwan had 29 days and that the dating used by the Hebrew chronicler coincided with the Babylonian. Thiele, *MNHK*, p. 168, gives Marcheshwan 21 (Dec. 9, 598) as the date of Jehoiachin's accession, evidently preferring this date to Marcheshwan 22, which he had defended in his *BASOR*, No. 143, article (p. 22, where the equation with Dec. 8 is incorrect). Vogt, *Suppl. to VT*, IV, p. 94, also takes Marcheshwan 22 as the date for Jehoiakim's death and equates it with Dec. 9, evidently using the tables of the 2d edition of Parker and Dubberstein, *Babylonian Chronology* 626 *B.C.-A.D.* 45 (Chicago, 1946), as the basis of his computation.

For Zedekiah's reign, however, a difference of an entire year is involved, depending on the type of calendar applied to his recorded length of reign of 11 years (2 Chr 36:11). The date of his predecessor's capture, and presumably of his own accession is given by the Babylonian Chronicles as Adar 2 (= March 16, 597). If an autumn-to-autumn calendar is applied to his reign his first regnal year would have begun Tishri 1, 597, and his eleventh year, in which Jerusalem was destroyed (2 Ki 25:2), would have been the year 587/586, autumn-to-autumn. In that case Jerusalem's capture would have taken place Tammuz 9 (2 Ki 25:3) and its final destruction Ab 7 (2 Ki 25:8), or July 18 and August 14, 586, respectively.

On the other hand, if a spring-to-spring calendar was applied, Zedekiah's first year would have begun Nisan 1 in 597, and his 11th year would have begun Nisan 1, 587. In that case Jerusalem would have been captured July 29, 587, and destroyed August 25, 587. Both sets of dates have found defenders among Biblical historians, as has already been pointed out. Fortunately some information is available which can, according to the present author's views, decide which set of dates is correct. This information is given in 2 Ki 25:8 and in Jer 52:12, where the capture and destruction of Jerusalem is dated in the 19th year of Nebuchadnezzar. Whether the date is reckoned by the Babylonian calendar, according to which Nebuchadnezzar's 19th year began Nisan 1, 586, or by an autumn-to-autumn calendar, according to which Nebuchadnezzar's 19th year would have begun Tishri 1, 587,[22] the result is the same: The capture and destruction of Jerusalem took place in the summer of 586, because only during that summer both months fell in the 19th year of Nebuchadnezzar.

Scholars who have defended the use of the spring-to-spring calendar by the writers of the records of the last kings of Judah have generally followed W. F. Albright, who holds

[22] See below for a demonstration of the evidence for this view.

that in the west Nebuchadnezzar's official accession year (605/604) was considered his first regnal year, and that all data pertaining to Nebuchadnezzar given in Biblical records (with the exception of a passage in Jer 52:28-30) were one year higher than the Babylonian numbering, and thus differed by one year from the official Babylonian reckoning.[23] This theory can hardly be correct, because it would seem strange indeed that the Jewish annalists should have used for Nebuchadnezzar the antedating (or non-accession-year) system, while they used the postdating (accession-year) system for their own kings. That the Babylonians used the postdating system is well known and needs no demonstration, and all scholars agree that this system was also used by the Jewish writers with regard to the regnal years of their own kings. Should it therefore not be more plausible to assume that the Jewish historians used the postdating system consistently in their records for the kings of Babylonia as well as for their own kings?

Moreover, many scholars have failed to take into consideration the fact that the Hebrew chroniclers counted the regnal years of a foreign king according to the calendar of the chroniclers' own country, even if it differed from the calendar of the country over which the foreign king ruled. Only if this principle is recognized and consistently applied can a chronology of the kings of Judah and Israel be obtained, based on the synchronisms and other chronological data found in Kings and Chronicles.[24]

It is also well known that Ptolemy, the 2nd century astronomer of Alexandria, applied the ancient Egyptian calendar with its wandering year to the Babylonian, Seleucid, Macedonian and Roman rulers whom he lists in his famous Canon.[25]

[23] Albright, *BASOR*, No. 143, p. 32; Freedman, *op. cit.*, pp. 56, 57; Noth, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[24] Thiele, *MNHK*, pp. 19-21, 54 ff.; Horn, "The Chronology of Hezekiah," *AUSS*, II (1964), 43.

[25] F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1906), I, 138-143.

That his practice was common in Egypt has been demonstrated by certain double-dated documents, such as the Elephantine papyri of the 5th century B.C.[26] The following date shows this clearly: "Kislev 3, year 8 = Toth 12, year 9 of Darius [II]."[27] In this case a certain date according to the Egyptian calendar was considered to have fallen in the 9th year of Darius, while the same day according to the Babylonian or Jewish calendar was considered to have fallen in the 8th year.

The clearest example of this practice in Biblical literature is Nehemiah's record of his appointment as governor of Judah in Nisan of the 20th year of Artaxerxes I (Neh. 2:1 ff.) after he had received a report of the unfavorable conditions in Judah in the month Kislev of that same 20th year of Artaxerxes (Neh 1:1 ff.). Unless an error is involved in one or both of these texts, as some scholars think,[28] we have here evidence of a calendar year in which Kislev preceded Nisan, and of the fact that a Jew applied this type of calendar to the 20th year of Artaxerxes, king of Persia.[29] If this were an isolated case one might be tempted to dismiss the evidence as an error, but the cumulative evidence from many sources points in the same direction: The kingdom of Judah in the pre-exilic period used an autumn-to-autumn civil year, and applied it to the reckoning of the regnal years not only of their own kings but also of foreign kings as well, and this practice remained in force among many post-exilic Jews.

If this evidence is applied to Nebuchadnezzar's reign the following conclusions can be reached. The Babylonian Chronicles have revealed that Nabopolassar died on Ab 8 in his 21st regnal year (= Aug. 15, 605), and that Nebuchadnezzar reached Babylon on Elul 1 (= Sept. 7, 605) of the same year

[26] Horn and Wood, *JNES*, XIII (1954), 4, 5.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 17, No. *AP* 25.

[28] For example W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia* (Tübingen, 1949), p. 102; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (London, 1962), p. 192.

[29] J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (7th ed.; Berlin, 1914), p. 161; Thiele, *MNHK*, p. 30.

and "sat on the royal throne." Both of these dates fell between Nisan and Tishri. Therefore, the chroniclers of Judah, applying the autumn-to-autumn year to Nebuchadnezzar's reign, began to count his first regnal year with Tishri 1 in 605 (= Oct. 7, 605). Hence his accession year, according to Jewish reckoning, had a length of less than two months, while according to the Babylonian reckoning it lasted until the spring of 604.

This double reckoning of Nebuchadnezzar's regnal years by the Babylonian and Jewish annalists accounts for the apparent discrepancy between the data with regard to the date of Jehoiachin's capture; for the Babylonian Chronicles place this event in the 7th year of Nebuchadnezzar, while 2 Ki 24:12 puts it in the 8th year. The 7th year of Nebuchadnezzar according to the Babylonian spring calendar lasted from March 27, 598 to April 12, 597, but according to the Jewish autumn calendar it had already ended in the autumn of 598, when Nebuchadnezzar's 8th year had begun.[30] Hence, both documents, the Babylonian Chronicles as well as 2 Ki 24:12, contain accurate information in spite of their apparent contradictions.

If this simple explanation is accepted, there is no need for the rather strange assumption that the Jewish annalists used the antedating system for Nebuchadnezzar's reign,[31] or if not, that Jehoiachin after his surrender was not immediately transported to Babylonia, so that the Babylonian Chronicles record his arrest, and 2 Ki 24:12 his deportation.[32]

Also all other Biblical passages mentioning regnal years of Nebudchadnezzar, with the possible exception of one,[33]

[30] This has already been suggested by Thiele, *BASOR*, No. 143, p. 26.

[31] See supra under note 23.

[32] Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 34; Malamat, *op. cit.*, p. 254. For another, equally improbable theory see Thiele, *MNHK*, pp. 167, 168.

[33] The only problem text seems to be Jer 46:2, which states that the Battle of Carchemish took place in the 4th year of Jehoiakim, which according to the Jewish calendar was the year 605/604, autumn-

then fall in line. In Jer 25:1, the 4th year of Jehoiakim of Judah is equated with the 1st year of Nebuchadnezzar. This was the autumn-to-autumn year 605/604. The fall and final destruction of Jerusalem is dated in 2 Ki 25:8 and in Jer 52:12 in the 19th year of Nebuchadnezzar, which coincided with the 11th year of Zedekiah of Judah (2 Ki 25:2; Jer 39:2; 52:5). That year was the autumn-to-autumn year 587/586, as has already been pointed out.

The two deportations of Jews recorded in Jer 52:28-30 which took place in the 7th and 18th years of Nebuchadnezzar must have been secondary and minor deportations, and cannot refer to deportations which took place after Jehoiachin's capture in 597 and after the fall and destruction of Jerusalem

to-autumn. But we know now that the Battle of Carchemish took place in the spring of 605, before Nabopolassar's death. This difficulty can be explained only in one of two ways: (1) Either the passage of Jer 46:2 contains a scribal error made by the author, compiler or a copyist, or (2) the date refers not to the battle itself but rather to the time when the prophecy was issued. I therefore, venture to suggest that Jer 46:1, 2 be read in the following way: "The word of Yahweh which came to Jeremiah the prophet, against the nations; about Egypt: against the army of Pharaoh Neco, king of Egypt (which had been at the river Euphrates at Carchemish and which Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon had defeated) in the 4th year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah." If the portion of the verse referring to the Battle of Carchemisch is considered a parenthetical clause, all chronological difficulties are removed, and this passage falls in line with the rest of the dated historical statements of Jeremiah mentioning Nebuchadnezzar.

In this case one has to assume that the parenthetical clause was inserted in the introduction to Jeremiah's message to point out that the prophetic oracle was pronounced over the Egyptian army which had been badly mauled several months before, perhaps as long ago as a year. It is true that in this way the passage shows an artificial and unnatural grammatical construction, for which reason this interpretation may not appeal to many scholars, but one should at least admit the possibility that the text can be interpreted in such a way that the chronological difficulties, which otherwise exist, can be removed. That translators from the LXX to our time have applied the date as referring to the battle is no proof that the traditional reading is correct. Since numerous parallels of similar parenthetical clauses have been recognized in many other Biblical passages, this one need not be rejected as an isolated case.

in 586, because of the small number of deportees. For the deportation of 597 our sources in 2 Ki 24:14 and 16 mention 10,000 and 8,000 deportees respectively. Therefore, the deportation of 3,023 according to Jer 52:28 in the preceding year (the 7th year of Nebuchadnezzar, 599/598, autumn-to-autumn) must have been in connection with the harassment of Jehoiakim by "bands of the Chaldeans" to which 2 Ki 24:2 refers, in which Nebuchadnezzar was not personally involved, although these military activities against Judah were carried out under his direction and with his sanction (cf. 2 Chr 36:6). They were probably led by one of his generals. In the course of these military encounters Jehoiakim must have met his death.

The number of citizens of Judah deported to Babylonia after the fall of Jerusalem is not recorded, but it seems incredible that the number should not have been larger than 832, as those scholars believe who apply Jer 52:29 to this deportation. Undoubtedly the few deportees referred to in this verse were Jews captured during the siege of Jerusalem, perhaps after the fall of such cities as Azekah or Lachish, to which Jer 34:7 refers and on which the Lachish letters have shed some welcome light.

JOHN FOXE'S CONCEPT OF TOLERATION

V. NORSKOV OLSEN

Newbold College, Bracknell, Berkshire, England

The concept of religious toleration was revived during the 16th century by the fact that the Reformers in the early period of the Reformation advocated freedom of conscience as well as obedience to God as man's primary duty. The doctrine of the Bible as the sole authority in matters of faith, the truth of justification by faith, and the priesthood of all believers as well as participation of Christian laity in church government, together with the Protestant concept of Christ as the sole head of the Church, created a climate in which the cause of religious toleration could be furthered. On the other hand, the Reformers' alliance with the state and the doctrine of the sovereignty of God led to intolerance. The Reformers required freedom of conscience and religious liberty for themselves, but were not ready to grant this to others.

In marked constrast to this paradoxical attitude stand the life, preaching, and writings of John Foxe, the Martyrologist, 1517-1587. Accordingly, a study of his life and writings to ascertain his conception of toleration should be of interest. This is the more so since one standard work on toleration in England [1] refers only briefly to one of Foxe's pleas for toleration, and a more recent work does not mention his attitude at all.[2] The influence of Foxe and the high esteem in which he was held not only in the reign of Queen Elizabeth but also

[1] W. K. Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England* (London, 1932).

[2] Joseph Lecler, *Toleration and the Reformation* (London, 1960).

during the following centuries would also justify such an examination.[3]

Foxe felt himself called to be a promoter of peace and concord, and his own personality not only inclined but also fitted him to take on such a role. He wrote a small Latin tract against the death penalty for adultery. This tract, printed in 1548, was his first publication. In the opening paragraph he tells the reader:

> I have always by nature been most averse to controversy, preferring rather even to concede than to enter into contention with others. So I cannot at all desert the cause of sinners, for whom so willingly Christ died. Rather, with the Samaritan I would help the wounded and half-dead (traveller) with oil and necessities. However, I know there will not be lacking those who will criticize my view as too favourable or lenient. There are many who think we all should be more ready to condemn than to pardon.[4]

Foxe no doubt had a sensitive nature. In his plea to Queen Elizabeth on behalf of some Anabaptists condemned to death by burning, he said: "I befriend the lives of men since I myself am a man. And I speak for them, not that they may continue in error, but that they may be recovered. I would like to help animals as well as men." He further states that the slaughtering of animals in the marketplace brought him feelings of pain. He also expresses his admiration and veneration for "the clemency of God himself in ordaining that those brute and lowly creatures which were formerly made ready for sacrifice should not be committed to the flames before their blood was

[3] Foxe's monumental work, *The Acts and Monuments*, commonly referred to as "the Book of Martyrs," was considered second only to the Bible. The last (ninth) ancient edition appeared in 1684. Four modern editions were printed during the 19th century, and many abridged editions through the centuries, the latest of these in 1954. This was nearly 400 years after the first English edition in 1563, not to speak of the two Latin editions in 1554 and 1559.

[4] Foxe, *De non plectendis morte adulteris* (Singleton, 1548). This tract is hereafter referred to as *Adulteris*. It is printed as a part of Appendix I of Pratt's 1870 edition of *The Acts and Monuments*; see Vol. I: 1, pp. 4-11. This edition of *The Acts and Monuments* is hereafter referred to as *A.M.* For this quotation see *A.M.*, p. 4.

poured out at the foot of the altar." From this example Foxe draws the conclusion that "in exacting punishments, no matter how just, rigour should not bear sole sway, but the harshness of rigour be tempered with clemency." [5]

John Foxe's youngest son, Simeon, who died in London in 1641 after a most distinguished career as a physician—for seven years he was the president of the Royal College of Physicians—wrote a biography of his father about the year 1611.[6] Simeon testifies to the charitable nature of his father when he writes: "Master Foxe was by nature so ignorant in requiting injuries, that he would many times with much adoe confesse himself wronged, even then, when he had in his hands ability to revenge." He further writes that his father was "famous, not only as a man learned, but as one for his friendliness, usefull, and no lesse by art, than a natural inclination made to be helpfull to others." Foxe's house was often "thronged" with people who sought his help, "and almost all (came) for the same cause: To seek some salve for a wounded conscience." [7]

Foxe's sensitive nature made him well-disposed to toleration and ready to flee from any kind of discord. It is somewhat significant that his own gentle nature makes him write about the gentleness of others. Speaking about Constantine, whom Foxe greatly praises, he mentions "the singular gentle nature of this meek and religious Emperor. Furthermore, all princes should learn from him 'how gently to govern.'" [8] Christ is referred to as "the meek King of glory" and readers are warned how "dangerous a thing it is to refuse the gospel of God, when it is so gently offered." [9] During the Marian perse-

[5] Foxe, "To the Queen in Behalf of Two Dutch People to be Burnt for Their Opinion." Printed in *A.M.*, I:1, 28 (Harleian Manuscripts, No. 416, Art. 95, pp. 151, 155. Appears as Appendix No. X in *A.M.*, I:1, 27-28.

[6] Simeon's *Memoir* of his father is printed in Latin and English in the second volume of the 1641 edition of the *Acts and Monuments*.

[7] *Memoir*, pp. A 5, B 2.

[8] *A.M.*, I:2, 298.

[9] *A.M.*, I:2, 89.

cution he wrote to the nobility of England and asked them the question: "Where is the Pauline clemency; where is your toleration?" Foxe also admonished them to act in a "gentle way, worthy of theology." [10] In another connection he urges: "Be controlled by the Spirit of gentleness," [11] and "make use of the gentleness of the Gospel." [12]

Foxe's kind and gentle nature made him well-disposed to toleration. However, his concept of toleration did not have its roots simply in his own character, but resulted from gospel teaching. In this connection it must be acknowledged that the factors which make for religious toleration are many,[13] and some of these influenced Foxe. Thus a number of statements in his writings as well as his many references to the Greek and Roman classics suggest the importance of humanistic influence on his thinking. During the Marian persecution Foxe wrote to Queen Mary and the nobility a long and moving appeal for toleration; the concluding words express this humanistic sentiment: "... among all human affections nothing is so fitting to men as clemency, which we all trace back to the image of the Divine nature." [14] Yet his concept of toleration can only be fully understood if seen in the light of the Reformer's message of God's forgiving grace and of justification by faith. This is the basic motivation of Foxe's concept of religious toleration. From Foxe's appeal in 1548

[10] Foxe, *Ad inclytos ac praepotentes angliae proceres, ordines, et status, totamque eius gentis nobilitatem, pro afflictis fratribus supplicatio* (Basel, 1557). This tract is printed in *A.M.*, I:1, 38-55, as Appendix No. XVII; hereafter referred to as *Nobilitatem.* For quotation see *A.M.*, I:1, 40, 50.

[11] *Adulteris, A.M.*, I:1, 9.

[12] Foxe, "Dynastae cum primis splendidissimo, ac spectatissimo, D. Thesaurario caeterisque ejusdem senatus Reginae consiliariis, viris lectissimis, dominis colendissimis, prudentis ac gravitate suspiciendis in Christo Domino, εὐφρονεῖν καὶ εὐφραίνεσθαι." Harleian M.S. No. 417, Art. 50, p. 110. Appears as App. XIII in *A.M.*, I:1, 31-32.

[13] Jordan, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-34.

[14] *Nobilitatem, A.M.*, I:1, 55.

against the death sentence for adultery the following lines are taken:

> Scarcely anyone could be found, as things now exist, who, in tracing the offences of others, would care for his own probity to be questioned. . . . Nor does God himself display severity towards us: he has freely pardoned all things for us, and daily pardons those who fall. How much more should mortals judge leniently, then, their fellows . . .
>
> I do not see how this hatred, this bitter antagonism of private persons, not only against the sins but even against individual people, can be a part of men, certainly, it does not in the least harmonize with the profession of Christians, whose every endeavour should be to show charity and toleration to sinners, especially to those who are not wilfully evil . . . We freely embrace those whom we see to be good. On the other hand, if anyone confesses to a lapse through weakness of nature, how superciliously we spurn him.[15]

Gentleness, meekness and consideration are virtues ultimately connected with true Christian living; thus the gospel rightly preached and accepted leads to a manifestation of tolerance and consideration. This point is richly illustrated throughout his writings.

During the Marian persecutions Foxe was on the Continent as an exile. He spent some time in Frankfurt and took part in the liturgical discussions among the English refugees. One group wanted to follow the liturgy established during the reign of Edward VI, but others insisted upon a Genevan form of worship. Foxe wrote a letter to Peter Martyr, 1555, in which he expressed his desire to be the peacemaker. He writes:

> So far as I am concerned, I shall everywhere be a promotor of concord. And I might succeed in that, if men would listen to me. If the aggrieved parties will be content to deal more friendly and charitably with one another, this fire will subside and peace will return.[16]

The struggle regarding liturgy, ceremonies and discipline within the English church continued when the exiles returned

[15] *Adulteris*, *A.M.*, I:1, 4.
[16] Strype, *Memorials*, III (ii), 310.

to England at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. In its first phase the controversy centered to a large degree in the question whether or not clergy should continue to use the cap and the surplice. Foxe was among those who felt that the use of them should be discontinued. Those who refused were branded with the name of Puritans. In this connection it should be noticed that Fuller describes two types of Puritans. "Some milde and moderate, contended only to enjoy their own conscience. Others fierce and fiery, to the disturbance of Church and State." He classifies Foxe among the former.[17]

On March 20, 1564 a group of advanced Protestants made a petition to Archbishop Parker requesting forbearance and respect for their conscientious refusal to wear the vestments. Among the twenty who signed this petition was John Foxe.[18] One who has studied the original document in its historical setting makes the following comment:

> The most remarkable feature of this supplication was its conciliatory tone. The subscribers begged to be excused from conforming in the use of the vestments, but their appeal was to fraternal loyalities, and they implied that their resistance would be short-lived if the bishops should prove so ungracious as to refuse their moderate requests.[19]

This evaluation of the subscribers appeared to be true also in the case of Foxe.

[17] Thomas Fuller, *The Church-History of Britain* (London, 1655), Book IX, sec. 68.

[18] Strype has printed the supplication, but only signed by Thomas Sampson and Laurence Humphrey. See Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, I, 322-326; III, 95-97. The original petition was part of St. Paul's Cathedral MS. Add. I., "Epistolae virorum doctorum de rebus ecclesiasticis tempore Elizabethae Reginae." These manuscripts were bought by the Lambeth Palace Library. However, the petition to Parker was in the hands of an American collector and not obtainable. Patrick Collinson had opportunity to examine this manuscript and found twenty signatures: see his *The Puritan Classical Movement in the Reign of Elizabeth I*, (Ph. D. thesis; University of London, 1958), pp. 32, 33.

[19] Collinson, "The 'not conformytye' of the young John Whitgift," *JEH*, XV (1964), 33.

In the debate between John Whitgift and Thomas Cartwright concerning the question of superiority among the clergy, after the publication of *The Admonition to the Parliament* in 1572, both men quote Foxe in order to substantiate their views. They also express great personal regard for him.[20] In view of the fact that Foxe was in agreement with Whitgift [21] and disliked the extreme Puritans,[22] his attitude to the two parties is remarkable. He most sincerely sought to reconcile the two parties by appealing to moderation and toleration. This is made evident in a newly discovered letter from Foxe to John Whitgift after the latter had become archbishop.[23] In the letter Foxe takes upon himself the role of mediator when he writes: "As far as I am able, I would strive to make peace, as is right, with both sides." [24] From his own middle-of-the-road position he points out the two extremes:

> One part hold to authority and tradition and its right, like grim death; the other side oppose them claiming that conscience alone should be obeyed, and they are determined to yield to no one. I greatly fear the outcome of this most unseemly squabble, and what catastrophe it may issue in.[25]

Foxe hopes the Lord will intervene, "Otherwise, the outlook is that it will lead to ultimate disaster, and this is threat-

[20] For the whole discission see *The Works of John Whitgift* (Parker Society Edition; Cambridge, 1851-54), II, 333-361.

[21] See *A.M.*, I:2, 50.

[22] J. F. Mozley, *John Foxe and His Book* (London, 1940), pp. 111, 112.

[23] *Jn. Foxe to Archbishop Jn. Whitgift.* Lambeth Palace Library MS "Epistles of learned Men," No. 75, fol. 117-121, n.d. Hereafter referred to as *F. to W.* For the story and content of this collection of manuscripts see E. G. W. Bill, "Records of the Church of England Recovered by Lambeth Palace Library," *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, III:1 (April, 1965), 24-26. The letter is written in Latin in Foxe's own handwriting, and has not previously been analyzed. It expresses the high regard and esteem which Foxe had for Whitgift as well as for the chair he occupied, and was no doubt written shortly after the latter became archbishop.

[24] *F. to W.*, fol. 120.

[25] *Ibid.*, fol. 117.

ened by both sides." [26] Accordingly he makes this appeal: "We each should ardently strive for peace, and together aim for the glory of Christ and loving concord in Him. Not zealous for the victory of our party, but consulting the common good of the public church." [27]

The punishments and compulsions exercised by the High Commission against the extreme Puritans were opposed by Foxe. He asks the question: "Should the situation be made harder for them, at the present time, by asserting authority after the Roman manner?" [28] He suggests: "Overcome evil with good, lest there be a worse outcome in the future." [29] The following statement by Foxe should also be noticed:

> If without prejudice our weakness can pass any judgment in these matters, whether it would seem to please some that this evil can be cured by force and austerity,—but this would appear to me to come too late. And this extreme method needs to be guarded against, lest greater excess should break out. But my judgment is, that the matter be dealt with, in regard to those who would contravene fit and proper religious teachings, by persuasion rather than by rigid austerity. It is far better to deal with honest opposition by an appeal to conscience than to try to forcibly constrain it.[30]

Foxe sincerely hoped that moderation would be manifested by both sides. On the one hand he hoped that the extreme Puritans would "contain themselves within modest lines, and consider, in the first place, that if the common vessel, in which they are sailing, be wrecked, they themselves may also perish." He also agrees, "that perchance some things have crept into the customs and ceremonies of men which call for the refinement of reformation." Yet it should be remembered: "What species of reformation has there ever been in the church in which there was no spot or wrinkle? What, indeed, in human affairs is so absolutely perfect, or has there ever been

[26] *Loc. cit.*
[27] *Loc. cit.*
[28] *Ibid.*, fol. 120.
[29] *Ibid.*, fol. 119.
[30] *Ibid.*, fol. 118.

a time so felicitous that there has been nothing to condone?" To the other group Foxe has this advice: "If some fault happen to break out in men, they should imitate the practice of capable physicians who remove the disease without detriment to the patient, especially if the evils are not harmful to piety." However, "if the evil cannot be tolerated without adversely affecting morals," then the suggestion is that "the discipline be put in the hands of fit persons, without making it a public affair, or reported, without tumult or clamor. Let it be settled among those directly concerned. Let the peace of the church be considered, and the state of the times." Foxe further reminds them that "the concord of the church, is when weaknesses are tolerated, when the people take counsel about irregularities in doctrine and practice, when the Bishops condone certain weaknesses of the people." [31]

When it came to the death penalty for religious reasons Foxe expressed strong disapproval and, where he had opportunity, he did all that he possibly could to intervene in behalf of the accused. During the reign of Edward VI only two persons were put to death on account of their religion. One seems to have been an Anabaptist and the other an Arian. The name of the first was Joan Boucher or Joan of Kent, and that of the other, George. a Dutchman. It appears that Foxe spoke in their behalf.[32] There is good reason to believe that Foxe disapproved of the burning of Servetus in 1553 and may even openly have condemned it.[33]

In the year 1575 the fire of persecution was kindled anew in Smithfield as two Dutch Anabaptists were burned for their religious views.[34] An earnest plea had been made in their behalf by the Dutch Reformed congregation in London. They were part of the Strangers' Churches which had been organized

[31] *Ibid.*, fol. 119.

[32] See *A.M.* (ed. 1559), pp. 202, 203; *A.M.*, pp. 699, 704, 860; Mozley, *op. cit.*, pp. 35, 36.

[33] Mozley, *op. cit.* p. 48.

[34] Strype, *Annals*, II:1, 564.

by Archbishop Cranmer during the reign of Edward VI. It has been pointed out that it was planned and hoped that these churches, composed of foreigners, would become models of a reformed church. The reign of Mary and the conservatism of Elizabeth made their influence insignificant.[35] However, the Dutch church, which greatly opposed the teaching of the Anabaptists, showed itself a model church in regard to religious toleration as it tried in every way it could to save the Anabaptists from being burned.[36] Jacques de Samere, a Reformed layman, made a supplication to Queen Elizabeth, and Thomas Bodley, the endower of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, conferred with the bishop of London.[37] John Foxe, too, exerted all his influence in trying to avert the burning of the Anabaptists. Reference has already been made to his plea to the Queen, and in his letter to Chief Justice Monson he appealed for clemency by pointing out that "the nearer each approach to the sweet spirit of the Gospel by so much farther he is from the hard decision of burning and torturing." Foxe says that he has little doubt of the clemency of the Chief Justice because of his "extreme prudence" and "sincere religion." [38]

In connection with his plea for mercy for the Anabaptists, Foxe lays down the principle that toleration is needed in order that the Gospel may have opportunity to make its influence felt. To the Chief Justice he writes:

> I ask that you consider their souls, lest they perish eternally. Often there occur sicknesses in which piety accomplishes more than asperity and time more than the hand of the physician. I speak of

[35] Frederick A. Norwood, "The Strangers' 'Model Churches' in Sixteenth-Century England," in *Reformation Studies, Sixteen Essays in Honor of Roland H. Bainton*, ed. Franklin H. Littell (Richmond, Va., 1962), pp. 181-196.

[36] *Ecclesiae Londino-Batavae Archivum*, J. H. Hessels, ed., (Cambridge, 1887-97), 3 vols.; see especially II, 700-708, Letter No. 191.

[37] Thielman J. van Braght, *The Bloody Theater or Martyrs' Mirror*, translated from the original Dutch edition of 1660 by Joseph F. Solm (Scottsdale, Pa., 1961), pp. 1008-1024.

[38] *A.M.*, I:1, 28, App. XI.

> those sicknesses, now, where spiritual medicine avails more than corporeal; when faith errs, it can be constrained by no one. It can be taught, and many die as orthodox, who lived as heretics. Even these wretched Anabaptists may be in a manner converted and give you thanks. Nor do I think it should be considered what kind of men they are but what kind of men they are capable of becoming.[39]

Foxe also writes to the Lord Treasurer concerning the same condemned Anabaptists and mentions that the bishop of London "has filled the office of pastor as he was able to and as there was need for. He had neglected nothing in his endeavour to turn them back to correct standing and to (spiritual) health." In this appeal Foxe states further that rather than "employ the remedy of coercion," they should "heal wounds." By killing they would "consign men to Gehenna"; therefore they should rather make use of "the gentleness of the Gospel." [40] On still another occasion Foxe writes: "It is tyrannical to constrain to faggots. Consciences love to be taught, and religion wants to teach. The most effective master of teaching is love. Where this is absent, there is never anyone who can teach aright, nor can anyone learn properly." [41]

Foxe's concept of toleration as related to the Gospel must be measured against the growth of Protestant orthodoxy and scholasticism. Doctrinal controversies among the Protestant bodies themselves, as well as their common defence against Catholic doctrines, especially after these were defined at the Council of Trent, accentuated the need for definite statements of faith. Confessions of faith were formulated, but the faith these were meant to safeguard often took second place. Orthodoxy of the letter became the chief concern, and in comparison piety of heart was put into the background. The result was a spirit of intolerance between the various groups into which the Reformation movement divided itself. No wonder that a man like Castellio in his plea for toleration has as his theme that "the essence of Christianity is to live as

[39] *A.M.*, I:1, 28, App. XI.
[40] *A.M.*, I:1, 31, App. XIII.
[41] *Nobilitatem*, *A.M.*, I:1, 50.

Christians, in mutual charity, without turning doctrinal differences into a pretext for hatred and persecution." [42] With this Foxe would fully agree. It is important to establish that Foxe was not in sympathy with the theological climate created by Protestant orthodoxy and scholasticism, and that he considered himself a Gospeller. His preaching was that proclamation of the Gospel which characterized the early creative and dynamic period of the Reformation, and which was so vital to John Foxe as the theological basis for a practical toleration. It is interesting to notice that one of Foxe's sermons, *Christ Crucified*, preached in 1570, was later republished with a recommendatory preface by another great preacher, George Whitefield.[43]

As a proclaimer of the Gospel and its bearing upon toleration the question of the right relationship between the Mosaic law and grace was of great importance to Foxe. In this connection it will be profitable to turn briefly to Calvin.

According to Calvin, in the Law of God or the Decalogue are found God's precepts for right ethical living. All Levitical laws are but interpretations of its meanings. It is an error to think Christ a "second Moses," to supplement the limitations of the Mosaic law.[44] Calvin believed that the ceremonial requirements of the laws of Moses have been abolished by the Gospel, but not their moral and judicial injunctions. Much, therefore, of Calvin's justification for the execution of heretics is based on Deuteronomy 13.[45] In his sermon on Deuteronomy 22, dealing with the stoning of those taken in adultery, Calvin strongly suggests that adultery ought to be punished by death.[46]

The significance of John Foxe's appeal to Thomas Picton

[42] Quoted by Lecler, *op. cit.*, I, 341.
[43] Foxe, *A Sermon of Christ Crucified* (reprinted London, 1838), p. 3.
[44] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1957), II. viii. 7.
[45] *Joannis Calvini opera*, Deut., chap. 13.
[46] *Ibid.*, Deut., chap. 22.

against death sentences on adultery can only be fully appreciated when it is seen in the light of Calvin's theology. Here he states: "If I might declare my opinion freely, in a free church, for my part, I would say that it is neither practicable nor necessary to sentence the adulterer to death." [47] Thus Foxe goes against the philosophy which lay behind the harsh Mosaic character of the theocratic administration at Geneva. He even derogates Moses, supporting himself on the contention that the Gospel had annulled the law.[48]

The question of the death sentence becomes then for Foxe a question of whether or not we are under grace or law. The Gospel itself is at stake. In his appeal against the death sentence on adultery his closing paragraph reads:

> I am only appealing to evangelical liberty against certain who appear to want to bring us back to the constraint of the Mosaic Law. I am anxious that you use this Christian privilege, not as an occasion of the flesh, but as means of grace and recovery to respectability.[49]

In *Christ Jesus Triumphant,* Foxe speaks of the "sovereign grace of the Gospel," and "that mild trumpet of the Gospel." He further writes:

> In my opinion, they who are admitted to the ministry and function of the word of God ought to hold and follow that way of teaching whereby Christ, rather than Moses, may be imprinted in the people's hearts: and whereby the riches of God's mercy may be so laid open before their eyes, out of the wonderful treasures of Christ Jesus, as that, like true Christians, they may at last begin to know and acknowledge their good gifts and blessings.[50]

The Protestant Confessions of the 16th and 17th centuries point out that one of the marks of the true church is that "the Gospel is rightly preached." [51] Since in the opinion of Foxe

[47] *Adulteris, A.M.,* I:1, 4.
[48] See *ibid.,* pp. 6-10.
[49] *Ibid.,* pp. 10, 11.
[50] Foxe, *Christ Jesus Triumphant* (Latin, 1556; Eng., London, 1828), p. 66.
[51] See Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York, 1877), III, 11, 210, 218, 376, 419, 499.

the concept of toleration is rooted in the Gospel and toleration is needed for the Gospel to make its influence felt, then it is only logical that for Foxe toleration became a mark of the true church, and persecution a sign of an apostate church. The *Belgic Confession* of 1561 supported him, describing "the marks by which the true church is known," and asserting that "as for the false church, she . . . persecutes those who live holily according to the word of God." [52] *The First Scots Confession* of 1560 and *The Second Scots Confession* of 1581 make indirect references to the same.

Foxe's great work, *The Acts and Monuments*, especially the editions with the woodcuts, could not but impress its readers with the fact that a persecuting church could not be the true church. In its closing pages, Foxe refers to a number of persons who did persecute and how God's punishment came on them. He also points out as examples a number of persons who had shown toleration and consequently through the providence of God received due reward.[53] In the light of these examples it is not without significance that a marginal note reads: "The nature of the church is not to persecute with blood." [54]

Writing to "All the Professed Friends and Followers of the Pope's Proceedings," Foxe quotes the prophet Isaiah saying:

> They shall not kill nor hurt in all my holy hill, saith the Lord (ch. 11:9). . . . The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard with the kid; the calf, the lion, and the sheep shall feed together, and a young child shall rule them. The cow also and the bear shall abide together with their young ones, and the lion shall eat chaff and fodder like the ox (ch. 65:25).

According to Foxe, this peaceful picture of mount Zion "beareth in the Scripture an undoubted type of the spiritual church of Christ." [55] True, this peaceful condition was not the state of the church as Foxe knew it; therefore he

[52] Schaff, *ibid.*, pp. 419, 420.
[53] *A.M.*, VIII:2, 628-671.
[54] *Ibid.*, p. 671.
[55] *A.M.*, I:1, XXVII, XXVIII.

found it necessary "to write such a long story . . . of the suffering of so many martyrs." [56] It should be noticed that both in the introduction and in the conclusion of *The Acts and Monuments,* Foxe brings out the point that he hoped that his great work would restore that peaceful condition which should characterize the true church. This was his main objective in writing this monumental work.

Having noticed that Foxe believed in toleration as a mark of the true church, and that "the nature of the church is not to persecute with blood," we may then ask as to his attitude toward Roman Catholics. The interesting fact is that Foxe who through his work, *The Acts and Monuments,* created and nourished anti-Roman feelings, manifested the same toleration to Roman Catholics when they became objects of persecution as he did to others.[57] Though Foxe's references to Rome are as sharp as those of the other Reformers, in his tolerant attitude he is different. All this was not mere theory, for in 1581 Foxe pleaded in behalf of the Jesuit Edmund Campion. This is still more significant from the fact that Catholics were plotting against Elizabeth and his own name was on the blacklist in Rome.[58] He also fully realized the political difficulties of the Queen and his loyalty to her. His son Simeon, speaking about his father's attitude to the Catholics, writes:

> I will speak a word or two of his moderation towards them. I could produce letters of his, wherein he perswadeth the Lord, and others, who then held the places of chiefest authority, not to suffer Edmund Campion, and his fellow conspirators to be put to death, nor to let that custome continue longer in the Kingdome, that death than some other punishment should be inflicted on the Papist offenders.[59]

[56] *Ibid.*, p. XXVIII.

[57] Reference to this article, as yet unpublished, has been made by A. G. Dickens. He especially noticed this point. See Dickens, *The English Reformation* (London, 1964), p. 323.

[58] See Anthony Monday, *The English Romayne Lyfe* (London, 1532), p. 6; Strype, *Annals,* II:2, 355.

[59] *Memoir,* p. B 4.

Foxe's concept of toleration did not in the least lead to a spineless compromise of basic evangelical truths and moral standards. This is emphasized in a book written in 1551.[60] It deals with the right use of censure or ecclesiastical excommunication, and was addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the other bishops and the pastors of the Church of England. The subject of the book is church discipline, and it is significant to notice that no stronger means than excommunication was advocated in dealing with heretics and sinners. It should also be noticed that Foxe allowed the state to punish, but not execute the one who had been excommunicated.[61] Though he was against executing the Anabaptists, he would freely agree to let them be exiled: "Many have been exiled, which I think is just treatment." [62] In this connection it should be noticed that the question of the death penalty and its bearing on religious toleration was brought up at the time of the passing of the Act of Supremacy. On this occasion one member of parliament, Robert Atkinson, referred to Protestant preachers, saying that "the greatest punishment taught by the Apostles was that of excommunication." [63]

Reference should also be made to the work, *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*, edited and prefaced by Foxe in 1571.[64] This revision of the ecclesiastical laws, drawn up during the reign of Edward VI, contained regulations regarding heretics and adulterers. The book does not provide for the punishment of heretics beyond that of excommunication. While the one excommunicated could be handed over to the state as previously noticed in Foxe's tract to the archbishop and bishops, yet the death penalty is not mentioned.

[60] Foxe, *De censura sive excommunicatione ecclesiastica* (London, 1551).

[61] *Op. cit.*, p. 58.

[62] *A.M.*, I:1, 27, App. X.

[63] See Strype, *Annals*, I:1, 446-455; J. E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments*, 1559-81 (London, 1953); Jordan, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

[64] *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum, ex authoria* (London, 1571; Edward Cardwell, ed., Oxford, 1850).

Some argue that by handing the person over the state, the *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum* still kept the door open for capital punishment,[65] while others affirm that the intention was to discontinue the old penal laws.[66] The latter seems to be the more reasonable conclusion. The *Reformatio legum* in its treatment of excommunication seems to be in full accord with Foxe's tract on excommunication written twenty years earlier. Even when allowance is made for the fact that Foxe may not have agreed with all the details in *Reformatio legum*, it would still seem very strange if he would have gone so far as to write the preface to a work containing laws and regulations which could lead to execution. In the opinion of Foxe the death penalty was not a minor matter.

Foxe was in advance of his times in advocating religious toleration, yet he was so much a son of his own time that religious toleration in a modern sense, not to mention complete liberty for the exercise of all kinds of religions, did not enter his mind. That, however, was probably also too much to expect. But the admonition Foxe gave to both church and state, as well as the Gospel principles on which his concept of toleration was built, created a platform from which religious toleration could be promoted yet further.

Writing to Queen Elizabeth at the close of *The Acts and Monuments*, Foxe modestly confesses: "I take not upon me the part here of the moral or of the divine philosopher, to judge of things done, but only keep me within the compass of an historiographer." [67] In *The Acts and Monuments* he appears to be mainly a historiographer, but his other writings reveal

[65] See J. Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (London, 1840), V, 479, 480; J. Lingard, *A History of England* (London, 1820), IV, 462, 463. Henry Hallam, commenting on Collier and Lingard, points out the bias of these two men. He himself is not ready to give a final answer. See Hallam, *The Constitutional History of England* (London, 1832), I, 109, 110.

[66] See G. Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (London, 1681), II, 198.

[67] *A.M.*, VIII:2, 673.

that he was also a "moral and divine philosopher." Past research on Foxe has been restricted mainly to the question of the historicity of *The Acts and Monuments*. Yet the study of Foxe's belief in toleration, not only in his minor works but also in *The Acts and Monuments*, indicates that he was a moral and theological philosopher. No doubt *The Acts and Monuments* will take on new meaning when it is realized that Foxe was basically a theologian and a preacher, and that his historiography was only to serve the purpose of theology and preaching.

The theology of the English Reformers has often been analyzed to see how far they were influenced by the men of Wittenberg, Zurich or Geneva; in other words, it is more or less an attempt to classify them within one of the groups of the continental Reformers. Foxe recognized his debt to the continental Reformation, but mainly to its principle of "justification by faith." The writings of Foxe also reveal that the English theologians of the 16th century were capable of thinking for themselves.

SYRIAC VARIANTS IN ISAIAH 26

LEONA G. RUNNING
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

Introduction

In a three-part article concluded in the previous issue of this journal, a report was given concerning an investigation of the Syriac version of Isaiah. In the present article one chapter of Isaiah is selected for study in greater detail of a limited area.[1] Ch. 26 has been chosen because, containing the Prayer of Isaiah in vss. 9-19, it involves 59 MSS, or 12 more than the 47 which are usually concerned in the rest of the study. Only the Song of Isaiah (a very small section, 42: 10-13 plus 45: 8, and hence not representative) involved more MSS—35 beyond the usual 47, out of the total of 94 Biblical MSS used in the investigation (six early, nine Massora, nine Lectionary, six fragmentary and rather old, 23 late, and 41 liturgical, containing the Psalter and Canticles or Biblical Odes). Ch. 26 is also exactly average in length among the chapters of the book, containing 21 verses.

From the original collection of variants in ch. 26, ten were discarded as obviously merely orthographic differences, and 12 as clearly scribal errors. This left 124 variant readings at 81 places in the text of the chapter, some being multiple. Whereas throughout the book the variants averaged two places to a verse, in ch. 26 they average four to a verse, though it must be conceded that some, which elsewhere would have been discarded for the above two reasons, were included

[1] For keys to abbreviations, symbols, sigla, and bibliographic references, see Part I in *AUSS*, III (1965), 138-157.

because of our special interest in this section that is found in the additional liturgical MSS.

All the variant readings of ch. 26 are exhibited below, each followed by a brief comment as to its type and sometimes an evaluation. The seven variants occurring only in patristic quotations are listed afterward, with brief comments. No variant from the Prayer of Isaiah is involved in NT quotations from this book. The concluding section draws some comparisons and expresses conclusions.

The Variants in Is 26 in Biblical MSS

vs. 1a ܐܬܬܚ] ܐܬܐ L1 M1 P1/ (T G S) (change of verb from passive to active; scribal error?)

1b ܒܢܝܗ] ܒܢܝܗ F1/ H T (omission of suffix; scribal error?)

2a ܘܦܬܚܘ] pr ܘ O2 (completely non-significant addition of conjunction)

2b ܢܛܪܝܢ] (1) + sey. R2(t)/ (2) om ܕ P7-m/ (G) S (change to plural; omission of preposition)

3a ܠܗ ܢܛܪ] ܢܛܪ F1 P3 R2, 3, 5/ (H T) G (S) (addition of conjunction; omission of preposition and object)

3b ܢܬܒ] ܢܬܒ P3 R2, 3, 5 (change of verb from first plural to third person singular)

3c ܢܛܪ] ܢܨܪ M2 (substitution of synonym)

5 ܠܚܝܐ] (1) ܠܟܝܐ L9-m R6-1 R7, 8, 9-m/ (2) + ܡܢ P7-m R8, 9-m (substitution; addition of a word)

8a ܘܒܟ] om ܘ P6/ H T (G S) (completely non-significant omission of conjunction)

8b ܠܫܡܟ] (1) + ܐܢܐ P4/ (2) ܠܟ ܠܫܡܟ P3 R2, 3, 5 (addition; substitution)

9a ܒܥܝ] (1) om O2/ G S/ (2) pr ܠܠܟ L27-c P8-c R8-m R10, 11, 12, 13-c S6, 7, 8, 9, 10-c W2-c/ (3) pr ܐܢܐ

ܠ ܥܡ ܗܘܐ ܒܥܝ ܠܡ ܐܡܪ R10-c (omission; addition of word; addition of clause)

9b ܠܗ] om R4 (omission of preposition and object)

9c ܐܠܗܐ] om L27-c P8-c R8-m R10, 11, 12, 13-c S6, 7, 8, 9, 10-c W2-c (omission of word)

9d ܘܐ] pr ܘ F1 L4, 5 L13-1 M1 P3, 6 R2, 3, 5 R6-1 S7, 9, 10-c/ *Livre P* II, 38 (addition of conjunction)

9e ,ܐܝܟ] ܐܝܟ ܕ P8-c R11, 13-c W2-c (addition)

9f ܒܥܐ] ܫܡܝܐ R10-c S6, 8, 9-c (substitution)

9g ܐܝܬܘܗܝ] (1) pr ܘ P8-c R11, 13-c S6, 10-c/ (2) ܘܐܝܬܘܗܝ R8-m R10-c S8-c (om ܘ Eph *Op Om* II, 62) (addition of conjunction; addition of suffix and conjunction; Ephraim adds suffix only)

9h ܠܗ] ܠܗ S8-c (verb changed to singular)

9i ܫܡܝܐ] (1) ܐܪܥܐ L13-1/ (S) / (2) + ܐܝܬܘܗܝ ܐ[ܪ]ܥܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ P7-m (substitution; addition)

10a ܐܬܝܗܒ] ܢܬܝܗܒ P8-c R10-c S6, 7, 9-c (verb changed to plural)

10b ܐܡܪ] + sey. R13-c S7, 9-c/ (T) (change to plural, with Targum)

10c ܐܝܬܘܗܝ] (1) pr ܘ F1 L27-c P1, 3 P8-c R2, 3, 5 R10, 11, 13-c S6, 7, 8, 9, 10-c W2-c/ (2) + ܒܥܠ ܡܠ ܐܝܬ S6, 7, 10-c/ (3) + ܐܝܬ ܐܝܟ ܒܥܠ S8-c (addition of conjunction; two additions)

10d ܐܡܪ] (1) om ܘ W2-c/ (2) ܐܡܪ L27-c R10, 11, 13-c S6, 7, 8, 9, 10-c/ G S / (3) pr ܐܝܬ ܡܠ ܒܥܠ L27-c R10-c/ G S (conjunction omitted or substituted by preposition; addition)

10e ـــــ] ܐܝܬ L27-c R10-c S6, 7, 8, 9, 10-c/ G S (verb changed to singular)

10f ܡܐܡܪܐ] ܡܫܬܥܐ L27-c R10-c S6, 7, 8-c/ (T G) S (substitution)

11a ـــ ܘܐܫܬܘܕܥ] tr after ܕܚܕ P8-c (transposition, scribal)

11b ܫܠܚ] (1) ,ܫܬܩܠ R10-c S7, 9-c/ (2) ܫܠܚ S8-c/ S (verb changed to plural; suffix omitted)

11c ܕܚܕ] (1) ܕܚܕ S8-c W2-c/ (2) + ـــ ܘܐܫܬܘܕܥ P8-c (addition of suffix; addition)

11d ܗܝܢܘ] + ܗܝܢ O2 P8-c R11, 13-c S6, 7, 9-c W2-c (addition)

12a ܚܙܐ] (1) pr ܒܥܠܡܐ ܕܒܥܝ ܠܐ ܡܠܐ ܚܙܐ ܠܐ ܒܥܝ S6-c/ (S) / (2) + ܡܠܐ R11, 13-c W2-c (additions)

12b ܐܠ] ܐܠ R11, 13-c W2-c (change of verb to imperative; scribal error?)

12c ܠܝ] ـــ R2(mg) (different suffix pronoun; scribal error?)

12d ܠܐ] ܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܐ S6, 8, 10-c (addition of negative)

12e ـــ ܚܬܢܝ] ـــ ܚܬܢ R10-c S10-c (different suffix; scribal error?)

13a ـــ ܡܠܐ] (1) ܡܠܐ R10-c S7, 9-c/ (2) ـــ ܕܠܐ ܡܠܐ ـــ ܠܐ ܡܠ ܕܠܐ S6, 8, 10-c (omission of suffix pronoun; addition)

13b ܐܡܢ] (1) pr ܕ P8-c/ (2) ܡܢ S10-c/ (3) ܡܢ ܠܐ ܕ R10-c/ (4) pr ܕ ـــ ܠܐ ـــ L27-c P8-c W2-c/ (5) ـــ ـــ ܠܐ ـــ ܐܡܢ ܕ R11, 13-c (addition of a preposition; change to singular verb; sg. plus negative; additions)

13c ـــ ܠܐ] ـــ C1, 2, 3, 4, 5 F1 J1 L3, 4, 5, 6 L12-1 L27-c M1, 2 O1 P1, 2, 3, 5, 6 R1, 2, 3, 4, 5 R6-1 R10, 12-c S6, 7, 8, 9-c W2-c/ (T) / Eph *Op Om* II, 63 (substitution)

13d ـــ ـــ ـــ ـــ] ܐܠ ـــ W2-c (substitution)

13e ـــ ـــ] ـــ R10, 11, 13-c S6, 7, 8, 9-c (omission of suffix)

13f ܢܗܘܝ] ܢܗܘܝܢ R12-c (change of verb to first person or to perfect; scribal error?)

14a ܟܝܢܝܐ] (1) om ܐ R10-c/ (H T G S) / (2) om sey. R11-c (omission of conjunction; change to singular)

14b ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ] (1) om ܠܐ R4/ (2) ܠܐ ܡܫܟܚ W2-c (omission of negative; change of participle from Pa'el to Pe'al; scribal error?)

14c ܒܪܢܫܐ] (1) ܒܪܢܫ F1 P3 R5 S6, 7, 8, 9, 10-c/ (H T G S)/ Eph *Op Om* II, 63 / (2) ܒܪܢܫ W2-c (scribal errors, probably; the first is probably correct, an error being in the Urmia text)

14d ܚܠܡ] ܟܝܢ ܕܝ P8-c R10, 11, 13-c S6, 8, 10-c W2-c (substitution)

15a vs om R11, 13-c W2-c (scribal error, but not homoioteleuton)

15b ܟܬܒ ܠܗ ܟܝܢ] (1) ܟܬܒ ܠܗ ܟܝܢ P8-c S9-c/ (2) ܟܝܢ ܟܬܒ ܠܗ L27-c S6, 10-c/ (3) ܟܬܒ ܠܗ ܟܬܒ ܠܗ ܟܝܢ S8-c (suffix added; suffix added, and transposition; conflation)

15c ܟܬܒ ܠܗ ܒܫܡܝܐ] (1) pr ܐ P8-c/ (2) om ܠܗ R6-1; (3) ܟܬܒ ܠܗ ܒܫܡܝܐ R10-c S6, 8, 9-c (addition of conjunction; omission of preposition; addition of suffix pronoun)

15d ܟܝܢܐ . . . ܕܫܡܝܐ] om P8-c (omission by homoioteleuton)

15e ܕܫܡܝܐ] + ܒܪܟܐ O2 (addition in a MS full of scribal errors)

15f ܒܫܡܪܐ] ܒܫܡܝܐ P1 (scribal error, *r* instead of *d*)

15g ـــܐܠܗ] pr ܠ L27-c M1 P6 S6, 7, 8, 9, 10-c (preposition added)

15h ܫܡܥܢ] (1) ܟܬܒ C5/ H / (2) ܐܥܕܟ L27-c S6, 9, 10-c/ (T) (omission of suffix; substitution, similar to the Targum)

16a ܒܝܕ ܠܥܡܐ] ܒܝܕ ܥܡܐ ܕ R8-m (change of preposition)

16b ܘܥܒܕܘ] om ܘ P4/ (H T G S) (omission of conjunction, agreeing with all four texts, but non-significant)

16c ܠܡܥܒܕ] ܠܡ R10-c/ H (T) (change of verb to singular)

16d ܒܥܠܡܐ] (1) ܒܥܠܡ P1/ (2) ܒܥܠܡܐ S8-c (scribal misspelling; omission of suffix pronoun)

17a ܘܐ] pr ܘ R11, 13-c/ G S (non-significant addition of conjunction, agreeing with Greek and Syrohexapla)

17b ܒܗܠܟ] ܒܟ L27-c (scribal error)

17c ܠܐ] ,ܠܐ P8-c (addition of silent letter, a misspelling)

17d ܒܠܥܘ] ܒܥܘ L27-c P7-m R9-m (scribal error)

17e ܕܣܥܬܢ] (1) ܕܣܥܬ C5/ G (S) / (2) ܕܢܥܟ R10-c S7, 9-c change to singular; omission of suffix)

17f ܒܥܡ] ܕܡ S6, 7, 8, 9, 10-c (common variant spelling)

17g ـܘܡ] (1) ـܘܢ L3(2) L11-m/ (2) ـܝܡ C5 P8-c R10-c S6, 7, 8, 9, 10-c W2-c H T G S / (3) om R13-c (addition of suffix pronoun; addition of suffix and transposition of letters, making the first person plural verb form, which is doubtless the correct and original form, the first variant actually being a transposition from this; omission)

17h ܒܢ] om P8-c/ (G S) (omission)

18a ܒܣܘ ... ܠܟ] om L27-c (omission of probably one line, doubtless a homoioteleuton)

18b ܠܟ] (1) ܠܟܝ P3 R2, 3, 5/ (2) ܠܟ L6(2) L9(mg)-m P7-m R7, 9(t)-m R10, 11, 13—c S6, 7, 8, 9, 10-c/ (3) pr ܒܠܫܘܢ ܕܝ S6, 8, 10-c/ (G S) (scribal spelling variations; addition)

18c ܠܢܡ] (1) ـܠܟ L5 R9-m R10-c S6, 7, 9, 10-c W2-c/ (2) ـܠܟ S8-c/ (3) ـܢܡ P8-c (three substitutions)

18d ܕܝܢ] om sey. $S^{7, 9\text{-}c}$/ H (T) G S (change to singular)

18e ܕܝܢ] ܕܝܢ C^{5*} F^{1} $R^{10\text{-}c}$ $S^{7, 9\text{-}c}$ (addition of silent letter to first plural suffix, a misspelling)

18f ܕܟܝܢ] ܠܟ $W^{2\text{-}c}$ (substitution)

19a ܕܡܬܝ] (1) ܕܡܬ $L^{27\text{-}c}$ $S^{7\text{-}c}$/ (T) G S / (2) + ܕܟ $P^{8\text{-}c}$ $R^{11, 13\text{-}c}$ $W^{2\text{-}c}$/ Aph I, 381; (Eph *Op Om* III, 316) (omission of suffix; addition, agreeing with Aphrahat and substantially with Ephraim; perhaps an Old Syriac trace)

19b ܕܐܡܪ] ܐܡܪ O^{2} $R^{10, 13\text{-}c}$ $S^{6, 7, 8, 9, 10\text{-}c}$/ H G S (change of verb in plural to masculine)

19c ܘܐܬܝ] om ܘ $L^{27\text{-}c}$ $S^{8\text{-}c}$ (omission of conjunction)

19d ܘܐܬܝ] (1) + ܠ $P^{8\text{-}c}$/ (2) ܘܐܬܝ F^{1} P^{3} $R^{2, 3, 5}$ $S^{8\text{-}c}$/ (T) / (3) ܘܐܬܝ $S^{7\text{-}c}$/ (4) ܘܐܬܝ $S^{9\text{-}c}$ (addition of a preposition and object; additions of various suffix pronouns)

19e ܐܬ] (1) pr ܠ $R^{10\text{-}c}$ $S^{6, 7, 8, 9\text{-}c}$/ (T) / (2) ܠ ܐܬ $S^{10\text{-}c}$/ (3) ܐܬ $R^{11\text{-}c}$ (addition; addition with different form; different form without addition)

19f ܕܐܡܪܝܢ] + ܕܐܡܪ $R^{6\text{-}1}$ (addition)

19g ܕܐܡܪܬ] (1) ܕܐܡܪ $R^{10\text{-}c}$ $S^{6, 7, 9\text{-}c}$/ (T) G S / (2) ܕܐܡܪ $L^{27\text{-}c}$ (substitutions)

19h ܐܬܝܗܒ] ܐܬܝܗܒ C^{2} L^{5} M^{1} R^{5} $R^{10, 12\text{-}c}$ $S^{6, 7, 8, 9, 10\text{-}c}$/ (G S) / Eph *Op Om* II, 64 (change to passive form)

21a ܡܝܬܐ] + ܕܡܪ $S^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\text{-}1}$/ (T G) S (addition)

21b ܕܐܡܪܝܢ] + sey. $S^{1, 2, 4\text{-}1}$/ (G S) (change to plural)

21c ܕܟܬ] (1) om F^{1} $R^{2(t)}$ $S^{3\text{-}1}$/ (2) ܕܠܟ $S^{4\text{-}1}$ (omission; substitution)

The Variants in Is 26 *in Patristic Quotations*

vs. 8 ܢܦܫ] ܢܦܫ Eph *Op Om* II, 62 (change of first person suffix from plural to singular)

9(g) ܙܕܝܩܘܬܐ] ܙܕܝܩܘܬܟ Eph *Op Om* II, 62 (addition of suffix)

11(d) ܬܢܘܪܐ] ܢܘܪܐ Eph *Op Om* II, 62 / H T G S (change from "furnace" to "fire," with the four texts—probably a scribal error in the Urmia text)

13(f) ܢܬܕܟܪ] ܐܬܕܟܪܢ Eph *Op Om* II, 63 (change from imperfect to perfect verb, reflexive, first person plural)

18 ܕܬܒܠ] ܕܐܪܥܐ Eph *Op Om* II, 64 / G S (substitution of a synonym)

19(d) ܘܢܫܒܚܘܢ] om Eph *Op Om* II, 64 (omission by homoioteleuton)

21 ܬܘܒ] om Eph *Op Om* II, 64 / G S (omission)

Conclusion

It is interesting to note that while the 124 variants (+ five, because five pertained to two categories at the same time, making 129) of the MSS fell into 23 of the 35 categories of kinds of variation found in our study, the seven variants of the patristic quotations fell into five of the categories. While Ephraim, of the fourth century, alone is the source for the seven variants found only in patristic quotations, both he (five times) and Aphrahat, earlier in the fourth century (once) as well as the seventh-century *Livre de la Perfection* (once) give support to MS variants, but no other patristic sources do this in ch. 26.

The most common variant consisted of the addition of one or more words (27 of the 129; see above); next came substitutions (16), scribal errors such as those of spelling (12), and omission of one or more words (11). Such scribal errors as omission by homoioteleuton or transposition were classified under omissions and transpositions rather than as scribal errors; otherwise the majority of variants could be classified as scribal errors, and distinctions would be blurred.

The chapter gives a fair sampling of the variants found in our whole study. Only five of those in ch. 26 were included in those considered worth evaluating as possible traces of Old Syriac, since those to be evaluated were limited to substitutions, scribal errors, omissions, additions, instances of a different form of the same word, transpositions, and clauses worded entirely differently. The last-named did not occur in ch. 26; the others provided 75, or 58 per cent, of the variants of ch. 26, yet their number was further reduced before the evaluation by their lack of support from the Aramaic Targum and/or a patristic quotation. We consider it extremely hazardous to say that a variant represents the oldest text type unless it does have the support of the Targum and/or one of the most ancient patristic sources, and even then it may be a coincidence of scribal errors.[2] Only 47 of the screened

[2] The addition or dropping of the conjunction, which is involved in 15 of the 129 variants of this chapter, or 12 per cent, once with support of the *Livre de la Perfection*, is completely non-significant; a scribe somewhere will be found to have added or dropped it in the Syriac, and the same scribal tendency was at work in the four basic texts, the Hebrew, Targum, Greek, and Syrohexapla. M. H. Goshen-Gottstein correctly pointed this out in "Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Peshitta," in *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran* (Jerusalem, 1960), p. 174: "Especially vexing is the problem of the *Waw* copulative. One feels tempted to state that, provided a sufficiently large number of manuscripts is compared, there is hardly any case in which the addition (or omission) of a *Waw* would be syntactically or exegetically possible without at least one manuscript exhibiting such a deviation." In the note on that page he adds: ". . . by now I feel convinced more than ever that the systematic noting of *waws* in the apparatuses to MT would lead us nowhere. No foreseeable result would justify the amount of work and the trebling (at least) of the size of the apparatus, which would be flooded by *waw*-'readings.' "

Yet an analysis of the variants that Arthur Vööbus exhibits as genuine traces of Old Syriac in *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs* (Stockholm, 1958) shows that *12 per cent* of them consist of just this—addition or omission of the *waw* conjunction, with support of one or more Targum MSS.

Bruce M. Metzger discusses the problem of methodology in evaluating variants in connection with the "Caesarean text" of the Greek New Testament, coming to the same conclusion—that some variants are worthless: ". . . is it really legitimate to utilize all variants, large

101 variants evaluated were judged to be probably genuine traces of Old Syriac, 24 of these being Targum traces, as shown in the preceding three-part article.

Glancing through the variants that have been presented here, one receives an overwhelming impression of scribal fallibility at work. Some examples are 3^b; 9^h; 10^a and 10^b, which should go together, but the MSS for each are not the same ones except for two liturgical MSS from Sinai. In 10^c and 10^d, the fact that the same added words appear in two locations in the text adds further suspicion to them. 11^d is a patent dittography, made still easier by the good sense it made, "furnace of fire." The same long addition appears in 12^a and 9^a, widely separated, each time found in one (not the same) liturgical MS. The second occurrence shows its source—the Syrohexapla, for the first half of the addition minus pronominal suffix.

12^b is dropping of a letter; the change of pronominal suffix in 12^c is especially easily made if a scribe is writing a different script than his *Vorlage* contains, or if the MS has a break or

and small, to determine the relation between manuscripts? Manifestly a spectacular variant, such as the presence of the *pericope de adultera* after Luke 21.38 in the manuscripts of family 13, has real significance in disclosing the textual affinities of a given manuscript. But it seems to the present writer that the possibility of mere chance coincidence among manuscripts in agreeing in small variations (involving *inter alia*, word order, common synonyms, the presence or absence of the article, the aorist for the imperfect or historical present) has not been sufficiently taken into account. . . . If one hundred people today were to transcribe independently from a common text, how often would they agree fortuitously in their errors? The point is that in many instances it is exceedingly difficult to decide with finality whether a given variant present in four or five manuscripts is significant or insignificant in determining genealogy. The conclusion which one must draw is that some of the variants which are commonly utilized . . . are not really capable of turning the scales in either direction." *Chapters in the History of New Testament Criticism* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963), p. 72.

In the present article and the preceding three-part report of the investigation of the Syriac text of Isaiah we have laid bare our methodology at every step, and will welcome scholarly discussion of the problems involved.

a smudge at the spot. The variety of changes at 13^{b} evidences scribal corruption; 13^{f} and $14^{b, 1, 2}$ are doubtless scribal errors. In 14^{c}, the first variant, with agreement of all four basic texts and Ephraim, is probably the original, from which the Urmia text form occurred by a misreading, and the other variant by a different misreading. 15^{a}, a verse omission in three liturgical texts, is not due to similar forms but just to carelessness; 15^{d} is a homoioteleuton. 15^{b}'s transpositions and conflation are obviously to be credited to the scribes.

The singular reading at 15^{e} in the wretchedly copied O^{2} cannot command respect. 15^{f} is an example of one of the most common scribal errors in MSS involving Semitic languages. 16^{d}, $17^{b, c, d, e}$, and 18^{a} are all obviously scribal errors. 17^{g} is interesting; the correct form is the second variant, with agreement of all four basic texts, and probably the first variant and the Urmia form developed from it. 18^{b} shows misspellings in both directions and Greek influence through the Syrohexapla; the variety of pronouns in 18^{c} is interesting.

It is difficult to characterize 18^{d}; writing one dot over the *r* instead of two is the only change, yet the result is to make the word singular, agreeing with the four texts. One is tempted to say that the plural form was the Old Syriac, and the two Sinai MSS deviated from it by scribal error, rather than being influenced by one or more of the texts. 18^{e} is scribal; also the variety at 19^{d}.

To mention several that may be genuine Old Syriac, 13^{c}, 15^{h2}, 19^{e1}, 19^{e2}, and 19^{g1} were the 5 included in the evaluations of 101 out of 3339 readings in our investigation. 13^{c}'s variant reading is found in 34 MSS, in the Targum, and in Ephraim's quotation; it was probably the original, and the Urmia form together with 3 MSS, L^{1}, L^{2} and P^{8-c}, show a scribal error for it. The Hebrew, Greek, and Syrohexapla furnish no help here, reading differently.

15^{h2}'s substitution of "wicked ones of the earth" for "ends of the earth" agrees with the word "wicked ones" in the

Targum; it occurs only in the liturgical MSS and may well be a genuine trace of the older text type.

19$^{e1, e2}$ agree with the Targum in adding the word "all," which may be the original text form, but on the other hand it would be easy for a scribe to bring this in from many parallel passages, such as 18: 3. One dare not be dogmatic on these matters. The other variations here are obviously scribal.

19^{g1} is another instance of substitution of "wicked ones," this time with the agreement of the Greek and the Syrohexapla as well as the Targum. The second variant doubtless resulted from it; it may be the ancient form of the text.

Another, not included in the evaluations, is 19^{a}. The addition is supported by the two oldest Syrian authors, Aphrahat and Ephraim; it may be genuine. Also 19^{h}, where the passive verb form is supported by the Greek and the Syrohexapla as well as found in Ephraim's quotation, may be genuine—or it may be one of the instances of influence upon Ephraim from the Greek text. Dogmatic assertions are not in order.

Concerning the seven variants in the patristic quotations of ch. 26, all of which are found only in Ephraim's writings, 18 and 21 have the agreement of the Greek text and the Syrohexapla, with which Ephraim shows agreement as often as he does with Hebrew and the Targum. In 18, either word would, of course, translate the Greek word, but the Syrohexapla has the variant word, along with Ephraim—the Syrohexapla *following* Ephraim by about two and a half centuries, of course. All four basic texts support Ephraim's variant in 11$^{(d)}$; thus it seems all the clearer that the Old Syriac text-type had "furnace," to which the scribes of eight MSS (see above) added "of fire," the reading of the four texts and of Ephraim being just "fire." (The four references followed by a letter in parentheses also occur, with slight differences, among the variants from Biblical MSS.) 8 and 13^{f} may be adaptations Ephraim made in fitting the quotations into his own sentences or in quoting from memory; 19$^{(d)}$ is a

scribal error made by Ephraim, or by the scribe of his *Vorlage*, or by a later scribe copying Ephraim's MS.

It is apparent that the great mass of variant readings is worth very little for the recovery of the archaic text (as is true in all text-critical work, of course); it is equally apparent that great caution must be used in pronouncing certain readings Old Syriac. So little evidence is coercive; so many times one can only conclude, "It could be a genuine trace—or, a scribal error!"

TA HAGIA IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

A. P. SALOM
Walla Walla College, College Place, Washington

Τὰ ἅγια (and its variants) occurs a total of ten times in the NT, all of them in the Epistle to the Hebrews.[1] A casual examination of translations and commentaries makes it evident that there is considerable confusion of expression (if not of thought) among translators and commentators in their handling of this word. Table 1 illustrates the variety offered by translations ranging from the *KJV* to Phillips. An attempt was made to choose a representative group, including the committee translation, the modern speech translation, and the paraphrase. Of the ten translations chosen there is complete agreement only at one point (9: 1). In six of the verses under consideration (9: 2, 8, 12, 25; 10: 19; 13: 11) there is disagreement whether τὰ ἅγια refers to the sanctuary in general or to a specific part of it. Of the 100 translations represented in Table 1, 65-69 are in terms of the sanctuary in general, 11-13 are in terms of the outer compartment of the sanctuary, and 20-22 are in terms of the inner compartment.[2]

[1] Heb 8: 2; 9:1, 2, 3, 8, 12, 24, 25; 10: 19; 13:11.

[2] The variation occurs because, at some places, the intention of the translator is not clear. In order to avoid the confusion introduced by such terms as "Holy Place," "Holy place," "holy Place," "holy place," "holy places," *etc.*, the following terminology is hereinafter used as far as possible: "sanctuary" is used to refer to the Tabernacle or Temple in general; "outer compartment" and "inner compartment" are used of the Holy Place and Holy of Holies respectively. The summary given above in the text can be broken down as follows: 8: 2 sanctuary 10 x; 9: 1 sanctuary 10 x; 9: 2 sanctuary 3 x (?), outer compartment 7 x; 9: 3 inner compartment 10 x; 9: 8 sanctuary 6 x, inner compartment 4 x; 9: 12 sanctuary 5 x, outer compartment 3 x, inner compartment 2 x; 9: 24 sanctuary 10 x; 9: 25 sanctuary 7 x, outer compartment 2 x; inner compartment 1 x; 10: 19 sanctuary 6 x, inner compartment 4 x; 13: 11 sanctuary 8 x, outer compartment 1 x, inner compartment 1 x.

The same division of opinion has been discovered among the commentators [3] where it has been found necessary to explain that "Holy place" in some instances does not refer to the Holy Place, but to the Holy of Holies!

In view of the fact that the *auctor ad Hebraeos* leaned so heavily upon the LXX,[4] it would seem that this is the logical place to look for evidence of his meaning in the use of τὰ ἅγια. A study of the LXX revealed the results summarized in Table 2. Of the 170 uses of this word which had reference to the Tabernacle or Temple,[5] the overwhelming majority (142) referred to the sanctuary in general. When used in this way τὰ ἅγια seemed to appear indiscriminately in the singular or plural, although more than twice as frequently in the plural.[6] At the same time it should be pointed out that when it was used of either the outer or inner compartments it was more usually singular. With only four exceptions this use was found to be articular. This same general pattern seems to be

[3] See *infra*, pp. 66 ff.

[4] For a recent discussion of the use of the LXX by Hebrews, see Kenneth J. Thomas, "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews," *NTS*, XI (1965), 303-325. See also B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1903), pp. 469-480; J. van der Ploeg, "L'exégèse de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Épître aux Hébreux," *RB*, LIV (1947), 187 ff.; R. A. Stewart, *The Old Testament Usage in Philo, Rabbinic Writings, and Hebrews* (unpublished M. Litt. Thesis, University of Cambridge, 1947); C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (Paris, 1952), I, 330 ff.; F. C. Synge, *Hebrews and the Scriptures* (London, 1959); M. Barth, "The Old Testament in Hebrews," *Current Issues in NT Interpretation*, ed. W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder (New York, 1962), pp. 53 ff.

[5] In addition there were 16 uses in which it was constructed with τόπος, and 13 in which τὸ ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων (and variants) occurred. These were treated separately.

[6] The possible reasons why the plural was used so commonly were not pursued in this study. See F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (translated and revised by Robert W. Funk, Cambridge, 1961), p. 78; Nigel Turner in James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh, 1963), III, 25-28; J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch* (Basel, 1926), I, 97 ff.

followed (on a much smaller scale) in Hebrews.[7] It is significant

Table I

Translation of τὰ ἅγια *in the Epistle to the Hebrews* [a]

Reference	Greek	Goodspeed	Knox	*NEB*	*ERV*	*ASV*	*RSV*	*KJV*	Moffatt	Wuest	Phillips
8:2	τῶν ἁγίων	1[b]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1
9:1	Τό τε ἅγιον	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9:2	Ἅγια	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2A
9:3	Ἅγια Ἁγίων	1A	1A	3	4	4	4	5	4	4	4
9:8	τῶν ἁγίων	1	1	1	9	9	1	5	6	7	4
9:12	τὰ ἅγια	1	1	1	9	9	2	9	2	4	4
9:24	ἅγια	1	1	1	9	9	1	10	9	10	10
9:25	τὰ ἅγια	1	1	1	9	9	2	9	9	10	4
10:19	τῶν ἁγίων	1	1	1	9	9	1	7	8	4	4
13:11	τὰ ἅγια	1	1	1	9	9	1	1	2	4	1

[a] The translations are arranged (reading from the left) in order of consistency of translation. Although it is recognized that this is not a *sine qua non* of translation, it is, nonetheless, one factor of evaluation and for the present purpose a convenient standard of comparison. A study of this Table reveals some expected results, *e.g.*, the close connection between the *ERV* and the *ASV*; and the degree of inconsistency of translation in the "expanded" translation of Wuest and the paraphrase of Phillips. It also reveals some surprises, *e.g.*, the consistency of translation of the *NEB*; and the similarity of Knox to Goodspeed.

[b] 1 = "sanctuary"; 1A = "inner sanctuary"
2 = "Holy Place," "Holy place," "holy Place"; 2A = "outer compartment"
3 = "Most Holy Place"
4 = "Holy of Holies," "Holy of holies," "holy of holies"
5 = "Holiest of all," "holiest of all"
6 = "Holiest Presence"
7 = "Holiest," "holiest"
8 = "holy Presence"
9 = "holy place"
10 = "holy places"

[7] Of the nine uses in Hebrews which correspond to τὰ ἅγια (the construction at 9:3 is Ἅγια ἁγίων), eight were in the plural and seven were articular.

Table II

The Use of τὰ ἅγια in the LXX [a]

	sanctuary	outer compartment	inner compartment
Total number of uses	142	19	9
Singular	45	13	8
Plural	97	6	1
Articular	138	19	9
Anarthrous	4	—	—

[a] The accuracy of these figures is, of course, subject to such factors as variant readings, doubtful uses, and the human factor.

that of the 98 places where this LXX expression is a translation of the Hebrew, 36 translate מִקְדָּשׁ which designates a sanctuary in general.[8] All of this would suggest that this word had the idea of the sanctuary as a whole for its basic meaning in Hebrews as in the LXX.

It could be argued that, inasmuch as all the uses of τὰ ἅγια from Heb. 9: 8 on are found in a Day of Atonement setting, a connection must be made between these six uses (at least) and the seven uses of this same word in Lev 16.[9] It is true that these latter references are to the inner compartment of the sanctuary.[10] However, it should be pointed out that each of the uses in Leviticus is singular, while in Hebrews (with one exception) they are plural. If the author of Hebrews was making a conscious borrowing from Lev 16 undoubtedly he would have used the singular. Furthermore, it seems far more likely that he was influenced by the general tendency of the LXX (which indicates that τὰ ἅγια refers primarily to the sanctuary as a whole), than by a specific part of it.

In addition to the uses of τὰ ἅγια already considered, there

[8] The remaining 62 were translations of קֹדֶשׁ which parallels ἅγιος.

[9] Lev 16: 2, 3, 16, 17, 20, 23, 27.

[10] See especially Lev 16: 2 where "within the veil, before the mercy seat" specifies which part of the sanctuary is referred to.

are two other constructions in which it appears in the LXX. τὸ ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων (and variants) occurs eleven times referring to the inner compartment of the sanctuary.[11] Seven of these are of the order cited above (i.e. singular/plural) and four are plural/plural. All of them are translations of קֹדֶשׁ הַקֳּדָשִׁים. Ἅγια ἁγίων in Heb 9: 3 is an example of this use and refers to the inner compartment. Although it appears in the LXX more frequently in the articular form (eight such uses), this is not sufficient reason to eliminate the anarthrous example in Hebrews from this category. It appears that the author of Hebrews had a specific reason for omitting the article.[12]

The construction with τόπος is found 16 times in the LXX, all of which are singular.[13] It does not appear in Hebrews but is found in the NT at Mt 24: 15; Acts 16:13; 21:28. In all of its LXX appearances it refers to the sanctuary in general. All three of the NT uses could also be understood in this same way. Acts 21: 28 is particularly significant in that τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον is parallel to ἱερόν. The use of this construction in both the LXX and the NT supports the thesis that τὰ ἅγια primarily refers to the sanctuary in general.

The use of ἅγιος in non-biblical sources reveals that the meaning "sanctuary" or "temple" was quite widespread. In the Ptolemaic period τὸ ἅγιον was used for "temple" in the Canopus inscription of Ptolemy III (239 B.C.).[14] Both Philo [15] and Josephus [16] also used it in this sense. Schlatter points out

[11] Ex 26: 34; 1 Ki 6: 16; 7: 36; 8: 6; 1 Chr 6: 49; 2 Chr 3: 8, 10; 4: 22; 5: 7; Eze 41: 4; Dan 9: 24. In addition there are two uses, the meanings of which are debatable: Lev 16: 33; Num 18: 10.

[12] See *infra*, p. 64.

[13] Ex 29: 31; Lev 6: 9 (MT 6: 16), 19 (MT 26); 8: 31; 10: 13, 17, 18; 14: 13; 16: 24; 24: 9; Ps 23: 3 (MT 24: 3); 67: 6 (MT 68: 5); Ec 8: 10; Is 60: 13; 2 Mac 2: 18; 8: 17.

[14] W. Dittenberger, ed., *Orientes Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* (Leipzig, 1903-1905), No. 56, line 59. See also U. Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, I (Berlin, 1922), No. 119, line 12 (156 B.C.).

[15] *Legum Allegoriae*, iii. 125.

[16] Josephus used it both of the Jerusalem temple (*Ant.*, iii. 6.4), of the inner compartment (*Bell.*, i. 7.6), and of the sanctuary with the forecourt and walls of the temple (*Bell.*, iv. 3.10; vi. 2.1; *Ant.*, xii. 10.6).

that Josephus used it sparingly in this sense probably because it would have sounded strange in the ears of Greeks who were used to hearing ἱερόν.[17] Procksch [18] agrees with Flasher [19] that τὸ ἅγιον and τὰ ἅγια were introduced into the LXX to avoid using ἱερόν which had heathen connotations.

Only three of the uses of τὰ ἅγια in Hebrews are anarthrous. Of these, Heb 9: 24 is qualified by the accompanying χειροποίητα so that it has the value of being definite, even though not articular. The remaining 9: 2 (Ἅγια) and 9: 3 (Ἅγια Ἁγίων) both refer to specific parts of the sanctuary (the outer and inner compartments respectively), as is clearly indicated by the context. Was the author trying to make a distinction between these two (by leaving them anarthrous) and the other uses in Hebrews thus indicating that these two alone referred to specific parts of the sanctuary? Was this a device employed deliberately, to show a difference between the two groups? [20] If this is the case, it constitutes further evidence

[17] A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus* (Stuttgart, 1929), p. 12.

[18] Otto Procksch in Gerhard Kittel (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids, 1964), I, 95.

[19] M. Flasher in *ZAW*, XXXII (1929), 245, n. 2.

[20] Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 245 noted that "the anarthrous form [Ἅγια in 9: 2] in this sense appears to be unique." He also connected it with Ἅγια Ἁγίων in 9: 3. However, he felt that it fixed attention on the character of the sanctuary. Helmut Koester's puzzlement concerning the use of Ἅγια here (" 'Outside the Camp': Hebrews 13: 9-14," *HThR*, LV (1962), 309, n. 34) is solved by the above suggestion. His statement that "in all other places the simple Ἅγια is the technical term for the 'inner tent' " does not take into consideration the peculiarly anarthrous nature of the expression at 9: 2, nor does it account for the use of this word at 9: 1, 24. His explanation of 9: 2, in terms of dependence upon a "*Vorlage*" in the description of the tabernacle, is quite unsatisfactory. Koester himself seems to prefer the suggestion of J. Moffatt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (New York, 1924), p. 113, that the words ἥτις λέγεται Ἅγια of 9: 2 would have been in a better position immediately after ἡ πρώτη. From this, Koester takes the next step to suggest that the words are a marginal gloss "which later came into the text, that is at a wrong place." It is true that there is some textual confusion at this point, but none of the readings suggests a different position for this clause. It

that τὰ ἅγια in Hebrews (apart from 9: 2, 3) should be regarded as referring to the sanctuary as a whole.

The general conclusion reached from the study of the LXX use of τὰ ἅγια and the comparison with the use in Hebrews is that this expression refers basically to the sanctuary in general. The question remaining to be answered is the question of translation. How should it be translated in Hebrews? Should it be left in translation with the emphasis on the basic meaning and thus be translated "sanctuary" each time (as by Goodspeed and Knox)? Or should it be interpreted in the light of its context and the theology of the passage, and translated according to that specific part of the sanctuary which seems to be in the mind of the writer? It is the contention of the present writer that the basic meaning of the word should be uppermost in the mind of the translator and, provided it makes sense in the context, should be used for the translation.[21] Thus "sanctuary" would be the translation throughout Hebrews except at 9: 2, 3. It is then the work of the commentator, on the basis of his study of the context and the theology of the passage, to decide what specific part (if any) of the sanctuary was in the mind of the writer.

8: 2 τῶν ἁγίων here refers to the heavenly sanctuary as a whole. This is supported by the epexegetical statement that follows, καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς.[22] σκηνή is used quite

should also be pointed out that, while there are readings for articles before both Ἅγια of 9: 2 and Ἅγια Ἁγίων of 9: 3, the evidence is not strong for either.

[21] The general principle as applied to the question of ambiguity in translation is discussed by the following: Robert G. Bratcher and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Mark* (Leiden, 1961), pp. 63, 69; Theophile J. Meek, "Old Testament Translation Principles," *JBL*, LXXXI (1962), 143-145; F. F. Bruce, *The English Bible: A History of Translations* (London, 1961), p. 222.

[22] Spicq, *op. cit.*, II, 234, "Mais il désigne nettement le temple dans ix, 8, 12; x, 19; xiii, 11, et il est fréquemment l'équivalent de ἱερόν dans les LXX (cf. Lév. v, 15; 1 Mac. iv, 36; xiv, 15). De fait, il est parallèle ici à τῆς σκηνῆς." It is worth noting that Philo uses the exact phrase (*Leg. Alleg.* iii. 46), λειτουργὸς τῶν ἁγίων, of Aaron. He uses it, however, in the sense of "holy things."

regularly in the LXX for both אֹהֶל and מִשְׁכָּן representing the tabernacle as a whole. While it is argued by Koester [23] and Hewitt [24] that the author is speaking here of two separate things, their position is not strongly supported. In view of the evidence already presented from the LXX of the use of τὰ ἅγια, it would appear that the primary meaning here is the sanctuary as a whole, not the inner compartment (the basis of the arguments of Koester and Hewitt). Moffatt strongly supports this conclusion.[25]

In the larger context of the author's argument the emphasis is here being placed on the *existence* of the heavenly sanctuary. Just as Israel had its place of worship and high priest, so (says the *auctor*) Christianity, on a grander scale, has the same. In the words of Moule, "sanctuary and sacrifice are ours."[26] Now it is true, both that the reference in the context is to the high priestly function (8: 1, 3), and that the unique function of the high priest was concerned with the inner compartment of the sanctuary. Thus, while "sanctuary" must rightly be regarded as the translation of τῶν ἁγίων, on a secondary level, at least, the author may be considered to have had a specific part of the sanctuary in view.

9: 1 Coming as it does, at the beginning of a detailed description of the parts and functions of the earthly sanctuary, τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν obviously is a reference to the sanctuary in general and should be translated accordingly. As Bruce points

[23] Koester, *loc. cit.*, "This is not a hendiadys, but expresses that Christ's office includes both the service in the sanctuary of heaven itself (τὰ ἅγια) *and* the entering by passing through the heavenly regions (ἡ σκηνή) = the ascension!"

[24] Thomas Hewitt, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, 1960), p. 135.

[25] Moffatt, *op. cit.*, p. 104, "But the writer uses τὰ ἅγια elsewhere (9^{8f} 10^{19} 13^{11}) of 'the sanctuary', a rendering favoured by the context. By τὰ ἅγια he means, as often in the LXX, the sanctuary in general, without any reference to the distinction (cp. 9^{2f}) between the outer and the inner shrine."

[26] C. F. D. Moule, "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament," *JThS*, N. S., I (1950), 37.

out, the author bases his description on "the wilderness tent described in the book of Exodus . . . the sanctuary of the old covenant."[27] Westcott emphasizes that it gives naturally "the general notion of the sanctuary without regard to its different parts."[28] The singular τὸ ἅγιον is not found elsewhere in Hebrews; however, it is found quite frequently in the LXX.[29]

9: 2 Provided the reading Ἅγια is correct (τὰ Ἅγια B sa), this use is unique. The significance of this has already been discussed.[30] Montefiore notes that the anarthrous form is unparalleled in Hebrews but fails to see any significance in it.[31] Unaccountably (unless there is a printing error, or he is following the *Textus Receptus*), he identifies the word as ἁγία and then discusses whether it is neuter plural or feminine singular. He decides in favour of feminine and considers that it is an adjectival use qualifying σκηνὴ. However, it would appear rather to be a neuter form and a substantival use referring to the outer compartment (ἡ πρώτη σκηνὴ) of the sanctuary. The contents of the room as described in the verse support this.

9: 3 This is the most straightforward of the uses of τὰ ἅγια in Hebrews. The form Ἅγια Ἁγίων (both neuter plural) is equivalent to the Hebrew superlative קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים ("Holiest") and thus refers to the inner compartment of the sanctuary.[32] Like 9: 2, the expression in this verse is anarthrous,[33] and like

[27] F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1964), p. 182.

[28] Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 244. See also Moffatt, *op. cit.*, p. 112; Spicq, *op. cit.*, p. 248 ("il désigne ici l'ensemble de ce lieu saint sans distinction de l'une ou l'autre de ses parties").

[29] *E.g.*, Ex. 36: 3; Lev 4: 6; 10: 18; Num 3: 47; Ps 62: 3 (MT 63: 2); Eze 45: 18; Dan 8: 11, *etc.*

[30] *Supra*, p. 64.

[31] Hugh Montefiore, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (New York, 1964), p. 146.

[32] P^{46} has ἅγια here and ἅγια ἁγίων in 9: 2. This appears to be the result of some primitive disturbance of the text.

[33] $א^{c}$ B D^{c} K L read τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων. This could be an assimilation to the LXX use of this phrase which is always articular.

9: 2, it refers to a specific part of the sanctuary. This, of course, is confirmed by the context (9: 4) which describes the contents of this compartment.

9: 8 Again, the basic meaning of τὰ ἅγια must be considered foremost in translating, so that "sanctuary," as given by Goodspeed, Knox, *RSV*, and *NEB*, is correct. The comprehensive meaning which includes both the outer and inner compartments of the sanctuary explains the use of ἡ πρώτη σκηνὴ.[34] The sanctuary here described is the heavenly sanctuary of which the inner compartment of the earthly sanctuary is symbolic.[35]

The means of access to the heavenly sanctuary was historically not available as long as the outer compartment had standing or retained its status.[36] This outer compartment represents the customary limit of access to God in the experience of Israel. Westcott's comment is pertinent, "the outer sanctuary [*i.e.*, compartment] was the representative symbol of the whole Tabernacle as the place of service."[37] When the earthly sanctuary fulfilled its purpose at the death of Christ, the means of access was historically provided into the heavenly sanctuary.

9: 12 The translations of the *KJV*, *ERV*, and *ASV* ("the holy place") and of Moffatt ("the Holy place") and the *RSV* ("the Holy Place") are definitely misleading. The characteristic service of the Day of Atonement here referred to (cf. vs. 7), was located in the inner compartment of the earthly sanctuary. However, inasmuch as the high priest had to pass through the outer compartment, it could be said that he "employed" (cf.

[34] ἡ πρώτη σκηνὴ (as in 9: 2, 6) refers to the outer compartment. See Moffatt, *op. cit.*, p. 118; Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 252.

[35] Spicq, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

[36] Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 192, n. 48, "It is not necessarily implied that the earthly sanctuary, as a material structure, no longer existed; what is implied is that, with Christ's passing 'through the heavens' (Ch. 4: 14) into the presence of God, the earthly structure has lost its sanctuary status."

[37] Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 252.

vs. 11 διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς) the whole sanctuary in this service. "Whereas Aaron and his successors went into the earthly holy of holies on the Day of Atonement . . . Christ has entered the heavenly sanctuary."[38] It is suggested, then, that τὰ ἅγια once more be rendered "sanctuary," referring to the heavenly sanctuary.

9: 24 If in 9: 12 τὰ ἅγια is to be translated "sanctuary," clearly it should be the same in 9: 24, for the same locale is described. It is not a specific part of the heavenly sanctuary that is in the mind of the author, as is evident from his adversative phrase ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν. Commentators are almost unanimous in considering this use of ἅγια a reference to the heavenly sanctuary in general.[39]

9: 25 As in 9: 12, the translation "Holy Place" (and variants) is misleading. The reference in the context of the Day of Atonement service of the earthly high priest is not to the outer compartment of the sanctuary. His characteristic service on that day was carried on in the inner compartment. However, once more, because the whole sanctuary is involved in these services, "sanctuary" is to be preferred as the translation, thus emphasizing the basic meaning of the expression. This leaves with the commentator the task of pointing out that the inner compartment was the place where the significance of that day resided.[40]

10: 19 Unquestionably, the context (vs. 20) indicates that the author here is referring to the Christian's privilege of free access into the very presence of God, access which was denied both the worshipper and the ordinary priest in the earthly

[38] Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 200. See also Montefiore, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

[39] See Montefiore, *op. cit.*, p. 160; Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 220; Spicq, *op. cit.*, p. 267; Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 271; F. W. Farrar, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Cambridge Greek Testament (Cambridge, 1888), p. 123.

[40] F. D. Nichol (ed.), *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* (Washington, 1957), VII, 456, "*Ta hagia* may, in this context, be regarded as referring particularly to the most holy place, or in a general sense to the sanctuary as a whole, as in ch. 8: 2."

sanctuary. But again it is recommended that the translation of τῶν ἁγίων be left as "sanctuary," allowing the reader or commentator, on the basis of the literary and theological context, to draw his conclusions as to what part of the sanctuary is particularly in the mind of the author.

13: 11 Although Westcott allows that this verse may apply to other than the Day of Atonement ritual,[41] it is likely in view of Chapter 9 particularly, that the author has this day in mind. From Lev 16: 27 (cf. vs. 2) it is possible to discover that on the Day of Atonement the blood of the sacrificial animal was carried into the inner compartment of the sanctuary. Thus this part of the sanctuary was in the mind of the author. But the LXX use of τὰ ἅγια and the manner in which it has been used in Hebrews would lead us to render it once more in the neutral sense, "sanctuary."

[41] Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 440.

THE FOUNDING OF METHODIST MISSIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA [1]

BERNARD E. SETON
St. Albans, Herts., England

Into the dismal religious arena of early eighteenth century England there stepped the brothers John and Charles Wesley with their companion, George Whitefield. The formation, under their leadership, of the Holy Club at Oxford in 1729 set in motion a train of spiritual events that stirred England to unsuspected depths and profoundly affected countries that were then little known to Europe. Ten years later came the move that is generally held to mark the foundation of Methodism—the opening of the Foundry, near Moorfields in London, as the Methodists' own meeting place. From then until his death in 1791 John Wesley gave the society that came to bear his name a dynamic, methodical, almost tireless leadership; while Charles, through his more than 6,000 hymns, inspired a unity among a diverse and continually growing membership.[2]

At no time did the brothers intend to found a new denomination. They were both ordained clergymen of the Church of England, and claimed only to be revitalizing the body to whose service they had dedicated their lives. But they themselves were swept along in the stream their ministry had released, and were carried beyond the point where they could return to the bosom of the church in which they had been reared. In 1784 John took the decisive step of ordaining his

[1] A condensation of a doctoral dissertation, "Wesleyan Missions and the Sixth Frontier War," presented to the University of Cape Town in 1962.

[2] Standard histories of the Methodist Church give abundant detail of the movement's development. Recommended is W.J. Townsend, H. B. Workman, G. Eayrs (eds.), *A New History of Methodism* (London, 1909), 2 vols.

own ministers, while the autonomy of American Methodism in the same year marked yet another stride away from the Establishment toward complete independence.

It was hardly possible for such a movement to be confined within the limits of one small island. Wesley himself paid frequent visits to Ireland and saw a strong work spring up there from 1752 onwards. But the first distinct missionary move came in 1759 (*annus mirabilis*!) when a layman returned to his property in the West Indies and began working for the conversion of his plantation Negroes. In the following year, Methodism entered Italy, and the pace then quickened. Work for Indians began in Canada (1765); in the Thirteen Colonies meetings for Europeans opened in New York in 1766, the first church was dedicated in 1768, and by 1784 the work was strong enough to be given independent status under its own bishops.

It was not until 1790 that the Society gained a foothold in France, while Germany was only reached from the United States in 1789. Entrance into Africa came through Negro Methodists from Nova Scotia who settled in Sierra Leone in 1792. Between 1812 and 1816 Ceylon, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa were supplied with missionaries. In 1813 the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society [3] was formed, with local branches throughout Britain; and in 1815 the Society became an integral part of the Church's organization.

Methodism Reaches South Africa

The first steps in South African Methodism were propitious in that they were taken by a layman, and were not due to any artificial efforts to enlarge the bounds of the growing church. A fervent Wesleyan soldier arrived at the Cape of Good Hope in 1806 and shared his convictions with fellow soldiers and

[3] Hereinafter abbreviated as W.M.M.S. A reliable history of the Society is written by G. C. Findlay and W. H. Holdsworth, *The History of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society* (London, 1921-1924), 5 vols.

citizens. His place was later taken by a Sergeant Kenrick who, in 1812, appealed to London for a minister to care for the growing interest, and received his answer with the arrival of the Rev. J. McKenny at the Cape in 1814. The recruit, however, fell foul of the autocratic Governor, Lord Charles Somerset, and finding no legal outlet for his energies, went to Ceylon. Two years later a party of Wesleyans reached the Cape and explored possible avenues of service, but discovering that monopoly by the English and Dutch established churches restricted their activities, they turned northwards and, under the leadership of Barnabas Shaw, founded their first mission, Leliefontein, at Kamiesberg in Little Namaqualand toward the end of 1816.[4]

For ten years Shaw nurtured the slender threads of interest shown by the Namaqua, but converts came slowly and in small numbers. By 1821 two further stations were opened, both in Great Namaqualand, but the nomadic nature of the people was unfavorable to the development of mission stations and the work, compared with that in other parts of Southern Africa, proved unproductive.[5]

In 1821 Bechuanaland was entered by the Wesleyan Stephen Kay, and within two years Broadbent among the Barolong was giving evidence of vision and courage that rivalled those of the better-known Robert Moffatt. And while these men were preaching far beyond the boundaries of civilization, the climate of opinion in Cape Town was gradually becoming more favorable to their Society. The Colonial Office in England, under pressure from interests sympathetic to Methodism, and possibly influenced by the movement's increasing respectability, had conceded the right of its ministers to practise their profession in the Cape. A humble church was opened in the capital city in 1822, with Dr. John Philip

[4] Barnabas Shaw, *Memorials of Southern Africa* (London, 1841).

[5] The annual membership figure for the whole area north of Cape Town remained at 67 for the years 1820-1824.

of the London Missionary Society [6] performing the ceremony, and a little later an Anglican bishop consecrated a second church at nearby Simonstown.

The foregoing, however, represented no more than modest growth. Much greater activity was needed if Methodism was to enjoy its share in the expansion that was coming to Christian endeavor in Southern Africa. The required impetus came with the 1820 Settlement which was an emigrant movement from Britain serving the double purpose of easing population and economic pressures at home and providing the vulnerable eastern frontier of the Cape Colony with a stiffening of British settlers. The 4,000 immigrants doubled the number of English inhabitants in the Cape at one stroke and set a firm British mold on the area for more than a century.[7]

The articles governing the Settlement provided for the payment of salary to any minister of religion elected to serve a group of not less than one hundred emigrating families. Only one group, the Sephton party of 344 individuals, took advantage of this provision. Although they were by no means all Wesleyans they took with them a 21-year old Methodist minister, William Shaw (no relative of the above-mentioned Barnabas) who had volunteered for mission work and was appointed by the W.M.M.S. "as one of their duly accredited Missionaries, but in the special capacity of Chaplain" to the party of settlers.[8] Methodism, the emigrants, and South Africa were fortunate in the choice of such a man. From the day in early February 1820 when he boarded the emigrant ship *Aurora* at Deptford and refused the distinctive treatment that would have been willingly afforded his cloth, until his death in 1872 there was a crescendo of praise concerning his character and achievements. Colleagues, acquaintances, and

[6] Hereinafter abbreviated as L.M.S.

[7] Isabel E. Edwards, *The 1820 Settlers in South Africa* (London, 1934).

[8] W. Shaw, *The Story of My Mission in South Eastern Africa* (London, 1860; hereinafter abbreviated as SMM), p. 5.

even those who differed from him painted similar pictures of his many excellencies: and a record of his work confirms their judgments.

The Sephton party landed near the site of present-day Port Elizabeth and traveled to their assigned allotments of land in the newly-named District of Albany. Shaw shared the inevitable hardships of pioneer life, but quickly turned to his spiritual duties, ministering to the needs of the widely-scattered settlers. Those needs were many, for at that time there was no organized religion for Europeans east of Uitenhage and Graaff Reinet. Even the troops at Grahamstown had no chaplain, and it was generally understood that the practice of Christianity stood at a low ebb throughout the frontier region. Shaw, with a catholicity that marked much of his subsequent ministry, undertook the spiritual care of the whole settlement and thereby laid the foundations for Methodist predominance in the area. He soon passed beyond the immediate circle of British settlers and served Dutch and Hottentot groups. His parish, bounded by the Bushman and Fish Rivers, came to embrace 20,000 souls—15,000 immigrants of all ages, and 5,000 soldiers, Dutch farmers and Hottentot laborers. No one man could carry such a load. Within a few months of his arrival in Albany he was writing to his Missionary Committee, explaining,

> It is utterly impossible for me to supply this scattered multitude with the Bread of Life. Beloved Fathers, believe me, I am ready to ride over hill and dale, through wood and water; and to preach wherever I come, and in every place, the unsearchable riches of Christ. I declare to you I have no wish to ask for help that I may sit down and eat the bread of idleness; but unless you send, at least another missionary to the station, many *important* places must be neglected; many Englishmen will become *heathen*—many thousands of children will grow up in ignorance, and your unworthy servant of the gospel must kill himself with labour and fatigue.[9]

[9] Undated letter in *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* (London; hereinafter abbreviated as WMM, with appropriate year of issue), 1821, p. 150.

While awaiting a favorable response to his appeal, William Shaw partially solved his own problem by organizing a group of ten local preachers to serve the 115 declared members of the Wesleyan Methodist Society. Three Sunday schools with 136 pupils were already operating, the minister himself was administering the sacraments to 80 persons, and his congregations were constantly growing.

Recruits from England slowly reached Albany, the days of single-handed struggle gradually passed, the pioneer could stand back and see a pattern of growth that augured well for the future. But he could not stand still: he organized orderly expansion to cover as large a frontier area as possible and had the satisfaction of seeing most sizable communities cared for by Wesleyan workers, either clerical or lay.[10]

Into Kaffraria

Although Shaw had accepted appointment as official chaplain to settlers, he had no intention of always limiting his ministry to white congregations, but hoped that work among the Europeans in Albany would open the way for missions among the native tribes beyond the frontier. This was in harmony with Methodist policy which regarded all sections of the Society's work as parts of one whole. His plans therefore embraced the spiritual care of all races within his reach, and he soon was preaching to European, Hottentot, and Xhosa [11] groups; and when he visited Dutch farms he drew the owners' slaves into the circle of his compassionate ministry.[12] In this way he prepared himself for mission work beyond the eastern frontier.

In this outreach Shaw exemplified Methodist mission

[10] Shaw's accounts of his early work in Albany are given in *WMM*, 1821, pp. 150, 151, 534, 634, 788; *WMM*, 1822, pp. 127, 264, 671; *WMM*, 1823, pp. 619, 620; *SMM*, pp. 88-107.

[11] "Xhosa" is the generic name for the large group of Bantu tribes that inhabited the southeast section of South Africa, an area lying roughly between the Gt. Fish and Mbhashe Rivers.

[12] *WMM*, 1821, pp. 150, 634, 788.

philosophy in contradiction to that of other societies. The Dutch Reformed and Anglican churches, for instance, directed their efforts almost exclusively to the white population, while the London and Glasgow Societies concentrated on the Hottentot and other African peoples. The Wesleyan agreed with neither school of thought, but declared:

> Wherever there is a British Colony in juxtaposition with heathen tribes or natives, it will be our wisdom to provide for the spiritual wants of the Colonists, while at the same time we ought not to neglect taking earnest measures for the conversion of the heathen.[13]

The missionary made no unpremeditated attack on heathenism, however. In spite of his ardent desire to work among African tribes, he paused to gain the affection and confidence of the settlers, and through them, the approval of the authorities. His reputation was made, and when he came to apply for permission to cross the frontier he was looked upon with favor instead of suspicion. Yet he was never servile, and did not truckle to bigoted authority if it discriminated against his exercise of ministerial prerogatives.

> As I had long before received and put faith in the dictum of an eminent English lawyer, that 'the Toleration Act travels with the British flag,' I resolved to regard the matter in this point of view; and hence I never applied for any licence or permission from any functionary whatever, but at once proceeded to discharge all public duties wherever I met with any class of people willing to receive me in the capacity of a Minister.[14]

Methodism was fortunate in the man appointed to accompany the Albany settlers. Had he been of any smaller stature than time proved him to be, the story of the Church's growth would have been different, for there must have been many more than the few failures that were eventually recorded. As it was, Shaw's character firmly molded the Society's history east of Algoa Bay, it largely determined the direction of its missionary effort, and it gave Methodism its primacy in the development of missions in Southern Africa.

[13] *SMM*, p. 95.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

The scope of Shaw's vision is disclosed in an early letter from Albany to his Missionary Committee in London:

> I hope the Committee will never forget that, with the exception of Latakoo, which is far in the interior north of Kuruman [L.M.S.], there is not a single missionary station between the *place of my residence* [Albany] and the *Northern extremity of the Red Sea*; nor any people, professedly Christian, with the exception of those in Abyssinia. Here then is a wide field—*the whole eastern coast of the Continent of Africa.*[15]

In a later letter (1822) he spoke of "a chain of stations" which could be established between Albany and Latakoo, *via* Natal. The vision of this "chain" came to dominate his thinking: it directed his appeals and his planning for all the forty and more years he spent in Africa. It led him to set up a connected line of missions, each of which was within convenient distance of the other so that none was dangerously isolated. Enthusiasm never ran away with him: he kept his feet firmly on the ground while pushing mission advance ever forward. The success of his projects demonstrated the wisdom of his policy.

The first specific move to forge the first link in the proposed chain was recorded August 3, 1822, when he wrote:

> I obtained permission from the Landdrost [civil officer] and Commandant [military officer] to proceed on a short visit to Caffreland beyond the colonial frontier.[16]

Armed with that permit the missionary and two colleagues visited the most powerful of the nearby Xhosa chiefs, Ngqika and, after some delay secured his permission to begin work among the Gqunukwebi, a tribe of mixed origin living east of the Gt. Fish River in a 60-mile strip of coastal territory about 30 miles deep. By December 5, 1823, Shaw with William Shepstone, a builder who was also a local preacher, had arrived at the kraal of the Gqunukwebi chief, Phatho, and

[15] *WMM*, 1821, p. 151 (author's italics; n.d.).

[16] *WMM*, 1823, p. 186. Pages 187-190 describe the route and reception of the party.

began to lay the foundations for his first Kaffrarian mission, Wesleyville.[17]

From the beginning, the Methodists endeavored to promote several objectives. They instructed the Gqunukwebi in the elements of Christianity, they shared with them the basic benefits of European civilization, and they promoted good relations between the Africans and the colonists. In the latter sphere there was plenty to do for the Xhosa propensity for cattle-rustling caused constant friction between whites and blacks, and led to *commandos*, retaliatory and punitive expeditions by colonists. Xhosa failure to mend their cattle-raiding ways, and colonial desire for territorial expansion were the root causes of an intermittent series of so-called "Kaffir Wars," the sixth of which, in 1834/5, was destined to cause serious interruption to Methodist mission growth. But in 1823 open war was some twelve years away and there was much to do in introducing the gospel throughout vast tracts of country.

The pioneer said little about the initial hardships involved in setting up house in a primitive community, partly because he was never one to stress difficulties, and partly because his previous experience in Albany made the Wesleyville operation relatively simple. When the primary domestic needs had been satisfied he left the remaining material tasks to his assistant, Shepstone, and turned to develop the spiritual opportunities that lay around him. In so doing, he settled to his own satisfaction the oft-repeated question: To civilize or Christianize?—and unequivocally decided in favor of priority for Christianity. "The only possible means of civilizing rude and barbarous people," he declared before the Aborigines Com-

[17] Shaw in a letter, Dec. 26, 1823, *WMM*, 1824, pp. 487, 488. In *SMM*, pp. 376, 377, Shaw states his reasons for giving English names to Kaffrarian missions: the local inhabitants rarely had specific names for exact localities, and if the mission had succeeded in naming a district, the Xhosa word would have been unpronounceable by a European.

mittee,[18] "is through the influence of Christianity." [19] But this did not lead him to neglect the civilizing of his parishioners: by personal example and by diligent practical instruction he introduced them to the simpler benefits of a European way of life. At no time did the missionaries find their task easy.

> They [Africans] disputed every inch of ground with us; they were willing to go into inquiry, but we found them very different in that respect to [*sic.*] the Hottentots in the colony, who always receive with implicit credit what is stated to them by their teachers. The Caffres exhibited considerable powers of mind, and were not willing to receive any dogma until it was proved to their satisfaction.[20]

In addition, there were unremitting struggles against licentiousness, witchcraft, revolting cruelty, and polygamy, which explains slowness of growth. After the first year's work, Shaw reported that there were about 150 people attached to the mission, of whom 100 were adults, while 60 or so children came to the day school. Attendance at religious services varied between 150 and 200, among whom were numbered the chiefs who were "themselves rarely absent from divine worship," and who ever "afforded all necessary countenance and protection." [21] On March 22, 1825 the first Methodist class meeting in Kaffraria was formed when six people gathered for instruction in the Christian faith. After five months, the first public baptism took place, three of the six class members accepting the rite. A further ten months

[18] The Aborigines Committee, appointed by the British Government, arose from an inquiry into the Slave Trade. Its proceedings were officially recorded and embodied in government publications, *Imperial Blue Books* (*British Parliamentary Papers*), *Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines*, 2 Parts (London, 1836). Part I, serial number VII. 538; Part II, serial number VII.425. The two parts are hereinafter abbreviated as *IBB VII.538* and *IBB VII.425* respectively.

[19] *IBB VII.538*, p. 124.

[20] *IBB VII.538*, p.60.

[21] *Imperial Blue Book* (*British Parliamentary Papers*), *Papers Relative to the Condition and Treatment of the Native Inhabitants of Southern Africa, Within the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope* (London, 1835), p. 189.

passed before the second baptism when three more joined the church; but by December, 1826, the number of communicants had risen to sixteen.[22] The missionaries hoped to win Phatho to the faith, but he never confessed Christianity. His brother, Kama, however, was a genuine convert who, after long preparation, was baptized in 1830. By that time Shaw was transferred to Grahamstown as director of the Albany-Kaffraria-Bechuanaland district, but Wesleyville continued to grow, and in 1834 could report a membership of 66 baptized believers.[23]

Continued Advance

While establishing Wesleyville, Shaw was not forgetful of his plan to create a chain of stations toward Natal. In March, 1825, fourteen months after opening the first mission, he undertook an exploratory trip which led to the inauguration of a second station, Mount Coke, among the Ndlambe tribe some twenty miles north of Wesleyville. Work there proved less productive: the tribal situation was different, none of the chief's family became Christians, and results were consistently meager. After five years of witness, membership stood only at 13, and by 1833 it had risen to 18, but the following year saw it drop to a mere seven.[24] In addition to local hindrances, this small growth may be partly attributed to frequent changes in leadership, a rather uncommon weakness among the Wesleyans. Between 1825 and 1834 there were five successive directors of the mission. Nevertheless, the final reckoning justifies the founding of Mount Coke—it became the publishing centre for Kaffrarian Methodism.

[22] W. J. Shrewsbury (missionary), Journal, Nov. 24, 1826, *WMM*, 1827, p. 526.

[23] Mission statistics are drawn from *Minutes of the Albany District Meetings* (Grahamstown) which record the proceedings of the responsible committee and include annual statistical reports.

[24] S. Kay, *Travels and Researches in Caffraria* (London, 1833; hereinafter abbreviated as Kay, *Travels*), pp. 68-84, describes Mount Coke's early history, he having been the mission's first director. In addition there are his journals preserved in *WMM*, 1825 and 1826.

The same journey which forged the second link in Shaw's chain had taken the exploratory party northeastward across the broad reaches of the Kei River into Gcaleka territory where Hintsa ruled as paramount chief of the Xhosas. It was clearly important to gain a footing in such an important section, but the task proved frustrating, mainly because of missionary ignorance and neglect of Xhosa diplomatic formalities. Not until the end of May 1827 did the latest recruit, W. J. Shrewsbury, pass with his family over the Kei and unload his wagons on the site chosen for the third mission, Butterworth, which was named after a British member of Parliament who had been Lay General Treasurer of the W.M.M.S. The decision to set up home and mission at that place and time was undoubtedly unfortunate, for the Wesleyans had no formal permission to do so, and it would appear that in consequence a cloud hung over Butterworth from its beginning and prevented its enjoying the success its situation should have assured. In this instance, Wesleyan zeal outstripped Wesleyan wisdom, and Butterworth suffered the consequences for many a day. Chief Hintsa never completely approved its springing up on his doorstep; his subjects were naturally cautious about acting contrary to their chief's inclinations, and any success that came lay principally among the Fingos—an outcast people. The site also stood astride the main thoroughfares of tribal war, and consequently suffered from the political and military disturbances that frequently shook the area. The Methodists, nonetheless, persisted in their evangelistic work and valiantly sought to vanquish heathenism among the Gcaleka and their serfs, the Fingos.[25] But progress was painfully slow, and by 1834 the membership had not risen above twenty-two.

Yet Butterworth proved to be a useful investment, for it

[25] In addition to letters in *WMM*, 1827, 1828, Butterworth's history can be drawn from J. V. Shrewsbury (the missionary's son), *Memorials of the Rev. Wm. J. Shrewsbury* (London, 1869), pp. 256 ff.

served as an outpost from which further stations were established. About ten weeks after opening the new mission, Shrewsbury reconnoitred still further in a northeasterly direction with the hope of founding a station among another tribe—the Mambookies, as they were then known, but better described as the Bomvana. The tribe's old chief, Mdepha, was of distant European extraction, and welcomed the prospect of having a European missionary by his side. Almost two years passed by, however, before Shepstone, in May 1829, took up residence among the Bomvana and laid the foundations of Morley, the fourth link in Shaw's chain.[26]

The story of Morley seemed at first composed almost entirely of disasters: there were tragic deaths and frequent tribal disturbances. In October, 1829, the two resident missionary families were forced to flee before marauding warriors while the mission buildings were gutted by fire. When conditions permitted a return to the Bomvana, the original mission site was abandoned in favor of a better location, and the new Morley bore a reasonable fruitage in its early years.[27] From 1833, under the Rev. S. Palmer, it prospered and came to exercise a strong pacific influence over a wide area.

During his exploratory trip in May, 1825, Shaw clearly saw the desirability of planting missions among the Thembu and Mpondo tribes, both of which were numerous and influential east of the Kei. The Thembu occupied an inland region north of Butterworth, and were ruled by Vusani, who gave a fairly cordial welcome to the prospect of a mission among his people. Shortage of personnel and of funds prevented the Wesleyans from taking advantage of the situation before April, 1830, however, when they enabled Richard Haddy to camp in

[26] Morley's history is told, in great detail, in Shaw's Journals, *WMM*, 1830, pp. 56-63; Shrewsbury's Journals, *ibid.*, pp. 838, 839; *SMM*, pp. 500-503; Kay, *Travels*, pp. 376-380.

[27] Shepstone's account concerning Morley is given in *WMM*, 1831, p. 784; 1832, p. 377; 1833, p. 61.

Thembuland preparatory to building the station that was named Clarkebury in honor of Dr. Adam Clarke, the Methodist author of the famous Bible commentary.[28]

If it is true that "happy is the country which has no history" then Thembuland must have been reasonably content, for of all of Shaw's missions Clarkebury had the least recorded history. Later activities have amply compensated earlier silences, however, and it has long been the center of a thriving church life and occupies a prominent position today.

There remained yet one more people to be embraced by Shaw's initial planning. These were the Mpondo, an important tribe who held territory northeast of the Bomvana and southwest of Port Natal. They had been known to Europeans since 1686, but it was not until Wesleyans began work among them that their history and customs were discovered. They did not belong to the Xhosa group but to a different branch of the Bantu family, the Mbo. Entrance into their territory would bring the Methodists within reach of their immediate goal, Port Natal, so the Albany Committee were able to persuade the W.M.M.S. to make special efforts to find a missionary for such a strategic center.

While prospecting for sites among the Bomvana and Thembu in 1829, Shaw and Shrewsbury had visited the Mpondo chief, Faku, and secured his consent to the placement of a mission among his people; but as so often happened, the promised missionary, W. B. Boyce, did not reach his post until November, 1830. Even then, the site proved unsuitable and within seven months was moved to where Buntingville, as the mission was called, sent down strong roots that still support a vigorous work.

Boyce proved to be an excellent missionary and an exceptionally good linguist. It was he who discovered the vital principle of "euphonic concord" in Bantu languages, and brought system into their study. But his diocese was no

[28] Shaw, *WMM*, 1830, p. 56, and Kay, *Travels*, pp. 270, 271, and 285 ff. tell the story of Clarkebury's infancy.

sinecure. Buntingville's history proved as stormy as that of its sister missions, although it was the only one of Shaw's initial six to escape destruction by war. It became the base from which two other missions were soon founded—Shawbury among the Bhaca, and Palmerton, which was built on the farther side of the Mzimbvubu (River).[29]

Thus, within eleven years, the firm leadership of William Shaw enabled the Wesleyans to stake their claim to an extensive sphere of missionary activity. They drove their stakes firmly, with the result that the main features of their mission structure can be clearly traced today. Yet toward the close of 1834, when our survey concludes, it seemed probable that much of their work would be destroyed by the war that broke out between the Xhosa and the Colony. The Methodists allowed themselves to become embroiled in politics; some of their missionaries, notably Boyce, were over-eager to assist the British Government in its struggle against the Bantu tribes, and earned for their Society the reputation of being pro-colonial and, by implication, anti-African. This was not just, and when the smoke of battle lifted and men were able to view events more clearly, the Wesleyan image was not seriously impaired. Long before the war and its issues had been settled, the missionaries returned to their posts, restored what had been partially destroyed, and prepared for further advance.

It was the continuance of this dedicated spirit that gave to Methodism its primacy among Christian agencies in South Africa. Today they are second only to the Dutch Reformed Church (which is virtually the state church in the Republic). They count more than 325,000 members on their books and a further 500,000 adherents, or a total of 825,000 members and adherents. These worship in about 3,000 church buildings that

[29] Boyce is the chief historian for early days at Buntingville. His letters appear in *WMM*, 1831, 1832, and are supplemented by A. Steedman, *Wanderings and Adventures in the Interior of Southern Africa* (London, 1835), 2 vols.; see II, 269 ff.

are widely distributed throughout the country.[30] The early struggles, thanks to the wise ministry of William Shaw and some of his successors, were not in vain.

[30] Drawn from *Minutes of the Seventy-Ninth Annual Conference of the Methodist Church of South Africa* (Cape Town, 1961), pp. 23-30.

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW

CONSONANTS

א = ʾ	ד = *d*	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 = *s̀*
ג = *g*	ז = *z*	ל = *l*	פּ = *p̲*	ת = *t*
גּ = *g̲*	ח = *ḥ*	מ = *m*	צ = *ṣ*	תּ = *t̲*
ד = *d̲*	ט = *ṭ*	נ = *n*	ק = *q*	

MASORETIC VOWEL POINTINGS

ַ = *a*	ְ, ׃ (vocal shewa) = ᵊ	ֹ = *ō*
ָ = *ā*	ֱ, ֲ, ֳ = *ĕ*	וֹ = *o*
ֶ = *e*	ִ = *i*	וֺ = *ô*
ֵ = *ē*	ֵי = *î*	וּ = *u*
	ֹ = *o*	וּ = *û*

ABBREVIATIONS OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

AAS	Annales archéol. de Syrie	*BMB*	Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth
AASOR	Annual, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res.	*BQR*	Baptist Quarterly Review
ADAJ	Annual, Dep. of Ant. of Jordan	*BR*	Biblical Research (Chicago)
AER	American Ecclesiastical Review	*BRG*	Biblioth. Rerum Germanicarum
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung	*BS*	Bibliotheca Sacra
AfP	Archiv für Papyrusforschung	*BT*	Bible Translator
AJA	Amer. Journal of Archaeology	*BZ*	Biblische Zeitschrift
AJSL	Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang. and Literature	*CBQ*	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
		CC	Christian Century
ALBO	Analecta Lovan. Bibl. et Orient.	*CdE*	Chronique d'Égypte
ANF	The Ante-Nicene Fathers	*CH*	Church History
AO	Acta Orientalia	*CIG*	Corpus Inscript. Graecarum
ARG	Archiv für Reformationsgesch.	*CIL*	Corpus Inscript. Latinarum
ARW	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft	*CIS*	Corpus Inscript. Semiticarum
ASAE	Annales, Serv. des Ant. de l'Ég.	*CJTh*	Canadian Journal of Theology
ASB	Acta Sanctorum (ed. Bolland)	*CSEL*	Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.
AThR	Anglican Theological Review	*CT*	Christianity Today
AUSS	Andrews Univ. Sem. Studies	*ER*	Ecumenical Review
BA	Biblical Archaeologist	*EThL*	Ephemer. Theol. Lovanienses
BASOR	Bulletin, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res.	*ET*	Expository Times
Bib	Biblica	*HJ*	Hibbert Journal
BIES	Bulletin, Israel Expl. Soc.	*HThR*	Harvard Theological Review
BIFAO	Bulletin, Inst. Franç. d'Arch. Or.	*HUCA*	Hebrew Union College Annual
BiOr	Bibliotheca Orientalis	*IEJ*	Israel Exploration Journal
BJPES	Bulletin, Jewish Pal. Expl. Soc.	*Int*	Interpretation
BJRL	Bulletin, John Rylands Library	*JACh*	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 Arch.
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JR	Journal of Religion
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JThS	Journal of Theol. Studies
LQ	Lutheran Quarterly
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
MQR	Mennonite Quarterly Review
NKZ	Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nic. Fathers
NRTh	Nouvelle Revue Théologique
NT	Novum Testamentum
NTA	New Testament Abstracts
NTS	New Testament Studies
Num	Numen
OCh	Oriens Christianus
OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
Or	Orientalia
OTS	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
QDAP	Quarterly, Dep. of Ant in Pal.
RA	Revue d'Assyr. et d'Arch. Or.
RAC	Rivista di Archaeologia Cristiana
RB	Revue Biblique
RE	Review and Expositor
RdE	Revue d'Égyptologie
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
RSR	Revue des Sciences Réligieuses
SJTh	Scottish Journal of Theology
STh	Studia Theologica
ThEH	Theologische Existenz heute
ThQ	Theologische Quartalschrift
ThT	Theology Today
ThLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung
ThR	Theologische Rundschau
Trad	Traditio
ThS	Theological Studies
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
VC	Verbum Caro
VD	Verbum Domini
VCh	Vigiliae Christianae
VT	Vetus Testamentum
WThJ	Westminster Theol. Journal
WZKM	Wiener Zeitschr. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenlandes
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie
ZAS	Zeitsch. für ägyptische Sprache
ZAW	Zeitsch. für die alttes. Wiss.
ZDMG	Zeitsch. der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft
ZDPV	Zeitsch. des Deutsch. Pal. Ver.
ZKG	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte
ZHTh	Zeitsch. für hist. Theologie
ZKTh	Zeitsch. für kath. Theologie
ZNW	Zeitsch. für die neutest. Wiss.
ZSTh	Zeitschrift für syst. Theologie
ZThK	Zeitsch. für Theol. und Kirche

Printed by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands