

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
SEMINARY STUDIES

VOLUME XV

SPRING 1977

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

Cox, James J. C., Prolegomena to a Study of the Dominical *Logoi*
as Cited in the *Didascalia Apostolorum*: Part II.
Methodological Questions 1

McAdams, Donald, Riots as a Measure of Religious Conflict in
Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century England: Part II 17

Shea, William H., Adam in Ancient Mesopotamian Traditions 27

Strand, Kenneth A., Calvin and the Brethren of the Common Life:
The Role of Strassburg 43

Jaroš, Karl, Zur Bedeutung von צַרִיחַ in Ri 9, 46.49 57

Mullins, Terence Y., Benediction as a NT Form 59

Book Reviews 65

Books Received 94

From the Editor 95



ANDREWS UNIVERSITY PRESS
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN 49104, USA

ISSN 0003-2980

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
SEMINARY STUDIES

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

KENNETH A. STRAND

Editor

JAMES J. C. COX, RAOUL DEDEREN, GERHARD F. HASEL
LEONA G. RUNNING

Associate Editors

SAKAE KUBO *Book Review Editor*

GERHARD F. HASEL *Circulation Manager*

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

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

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

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

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

PROLEGOMENA TO A STUDY OF THE DOMINICAL
LOGOI AS CITED IN THE *DIDASCALIA APOSTOLORUM*
PART II: METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS*

JAMES J. C. COX

Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

In support of the various theological, liturgical, ethical, apologetical, and polemical propositions which he sets forth, the author of the *Didascalia Apostolorum* cites frequently,¹ usually in brief,² though sometimes at length,³ from both Jewish and Christian traditions, canonical and non-canonical.

As far as the Jewish traditions are concerned, he cites (i) from all three divisions of the *Tanak* (206 times),⁴ and (ii) from several as-yet-unidentified sources (5 times).⁵

In addition, he adds to an extensive citation from 2 Ki 21:1-16, 18 (= 2 Chr 33:1-13, 20) an apocryphal story of the repentance

* Abbreviations employed in this article, which are not spelled out on the back cover of this journal, indicate the following series: *GCS* = *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*; *HS* = *Horae Semiticae*; *SAKDQ* = *Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Quellenschriften*; *TU* = *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*.

¹ The Didascalist cites from Jewish traditions some 211 times, and from Christian traditions some 163 times.

² So, e.g., the citations from the Torah (Ex 20:17; *Didasc.* 1.1.2), the Nebi'im (Isa 66:2; *Didasc.* 2.1.5), the Kethubim (Pr 20:22; *Didasc.* 1.2.2), the "Gospel" (Mt 5:27-28; *Didasc.* 1.1.4), and the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 8:20-21; *Didasc.* 6.7.3).

³ So, e.g., the citations from the Torah (Num 18:1-32; *Didasc.* 2.25.15ff.), the Nebi'im (Ezek 18:1-32; *Didasc.* 2.14.14ff.), the Kethubim (Pr 7:1-27 + Pr 5:1-14; *Didasc.* 1.7.2ff.), the "Gospel" (Mt 25:34-40 + Mt 25:46; *Didasc.* 5.1.6ff.), and the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 15:13-29; *Didasc.* 6.12.10ff.).

⁴ The Didascalist cites from (i) the Torah (52 times), drawing most frequently on Exodus (18 times), Numbers (13 times), and Deuteronomy (13 times); (ii) the Nebi'im (103 times), drawing most often on Isaiah (55 times), Ezekiel (20 times), and Jeremiah (13 times); and (iii) the Kethubim (51 times), drawing most frequently on Proverbs (32 times), and Psalms (15 times).

⁵ See (i) *Didasc.* 2.23.3f.; (ii) *Didasc.* 2.44.1; (iii) *Didasc.* 2.62.2; (iv) *Didasc.* 4.1.2; and (v) *Didasc.* 6.18.13.

of Manasseh (*Didasc.* 2.22.10f.),⁶ the *Oratio Manassis* (*Didasc.* 2.22.12f.), and some further details concerning Manasseh and Amon (*Didasc.* 2.22.15f.).⁷

All of the citations drawn on Jewish traditions are introduced with citation formulae;⁸ all are cited as having the same basic authority;⁹ and many are cited under the specific title of the source on which they were drawn.¹⁰

⁶ Drawn on an unidentified source.

⁷ Drawn on an unidentified source.

⁸ For example, 34 citations (13 drawn on the Torah, 11 on the Nebi'im, and 10 on the Kethubim) are introduced with the citation formula, "*it is written*" (11 with the formula "it is written," alone; 23 with the formula "it is written in . . .," e.g., "it is written in the Law" [Ex 20:17; *Didasc.* 1.1.2]); 12 (5 drawn on the Torah, 3 on the Nebi'im, and 4 on the Kethubim) with the formula "*the Scripture saith/has said*"; 2 (both drawn on the Kethubim) with the formula "*the Holy Word saith*"; 4 with the formula "*it is/was said*"; 14 with the formula "*he saith/said*"; 27 with the formula "*he saith/said in/by*," e.g., "he saith in Wisdom" (Pr 31:10-31; *Didasc.* 1.8.3ff.), and "he said by Isaiah" (Isa 40:5; 52:10; *Didasc.* 5.7.22); 26 with the formula "*the Lord* (or *Lord God*) *saith/said*"; 6 with the formula "*Moses/Isaiah saith/said*"; etc.

⁹ No distinction is made between citations drawn on the *Tanak* and those drawn on sources outside the *Tanak*. For example, the *Oratio Manassis* (*Didasc.* 2.22.12ff.) and other apocryphal details (*Didasc.* 2.22.10f.; 2.22.15f.) are included along with material drawn on 2 Ki 21:1-16, 18 = 2 Chr 33:1-13, 20 (*Didasc.* 2.22.4ff.), without any distinction, the whole being introduced with the citation formula, "*it is written in the fourth Book of Kingdoms, and likewise, in the second Book of Chronicles, thus.*" The citation, "If you will be right with me, I also will be right with you; and if you will walk perversely with me, I also will walk perversely with you, saith the Lord of Hosts," drawn on an unidentified source (*Didasc.* 2.44.1), and the citation, "Imitate the ant, O sluggard, and emulate her ways . . .," drawn on Pr 6:6-8 (*Didasc.* 2.63.2), are introduced with one and the same citation formula, namely, "*for the Lord has said.*" And the citation, "Jacob shall be blessed among the firstborn," drawn on an unidentified source (*Didasc.* 6.18.13), the citation, "My son, my firstborn (is) Israel," drawn on Ex 4:22 (*Didasc.* 6.18.13), and the citation, "Every male that openeth the womb of his mother is blessed to the Lord," drawn on Ex 13:2, 12 (*Didasc.* 6.18.13), are introduced with one and the same citation formula, namely, "*as the Scripture saith.*"

¹⁰ For example, "it is written in *Genesis*" (Gen 4:7; *Didasc.* 2.16.2); "it is written in the *Book of Numbers*" (Num 24:9b[?]; *Didasc.* 1.2.1; Num 18:1-32; *Didasc.* 2.25.15ff.); "it is written in the *first Book of Kingdoms*" (1 Sa 8:10-17; *Didasc.* 2.34.2); "it is written in the *fourth Book of Kingdoms*" (2 Ki 21:1-16, 18 = 2 Chr 33:1-13, 20; *Didasc.* 2.22.4ff.); "it is written in *Proverbs*" (Pr 26:2; *Didasc.* 3.11.2); "it is written in *Isaiah*" (Isa 58:6; *Didasc.* 2.18.1; Isa 53:2-5; *Didasc.* 2.25.10; Isa 49:9a; *Didasc.* 2.34.7; Isa 53:11b; *Didasc.* 3.13.3; Isa 66:5; *Didasc.* 5.14.23; Isa 66:10 [?]; *Didasc.* 5.14.24; Isa 2:6a; *Didasc.* 6.5.4); "it is

As far as the Christian traditions are concerned, he cites (i) from the "Gospel" (134 times),¹¹ (ii) from Acts of the Apostles (9 times), (iii) from the Epistles (19 times), and (iv) from the *Oracula Sibyllina* (once).

Most of the citations drawn on the "Gospel" are introduced with citation formulae;¹² none of those drawn on the Acts of

written in *Hosea* (Hos 1:10a; *Didasc.* 2.34.3); "it is written in *Zechariah*" (*Zech* 8:19; *Didasc.* 5.14.15); and "it is written in the *Twelve Prophets*, [in] *Malachi* who is called the Angel" (*Mal* 2:14f.; *Didasc.* 6.22.7).

¹¹ The precise definition of the term "Gospel" will be discussed later.

¹² Of the 134 citations drawn on the "Gospel," 118 are introduced with citation formulae, and 16 without. The references are given in *TABLE A*.

Of these 118 citations introduced with citation formulae, the majority are introduced with citation formulae which are formulated with either the verb "to say" (80 times; for example, *Didasc.* 1.2.3: *wtwb 'mr b'wnglywn* [P. de Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum Syriace* (Leipzig, 1854 [reprint, Osnabrück/Wiesbaden, 1967]), p. 2.19] = *nam iterum in evangelio dicit* [E. Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum, Canonum Ecclesiasticorum, Traditionis Apostolicae, versiones Latinae, TU*, 75 (Berlin, 1963), p. 4.18f.] = καὶ γὰρ πάλιν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ λέγει [F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Paderborn, 1905 [reprint, Turin, 1964]), 1:9.2f.], "and again in the Gospel he says"), or the verb "to write" (12 times; for example, *Didasc.* 1.2.1: *wtwb dyn 'p b'wnglywn ktyb* [Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 2.14f.] = *propterea similiter et in evangelio scriptum est* [Tidner, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 4.12f.] = οὐσίως καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται [Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:7.23f.], "similarly also in the Gospel it is written").

The verb "to say" is sometimes employed alone (13 times), but most often with an explicit subject (for example, "the/our Lord" [29 times], "the/our Savior" [14 times], "the Lord our Savior" [twice], "our Lord and Savior" [3 times], "our Lord and Savior, Jesus" [once], "our Lord and Teacher" [once], etc.). It is not infrequently qualified by the phrase "in the Gospel" (20 times). The verb "to write" is sometimes employed alone (4 times), but more often it is qualified by the phrase "in the Gospel" (8 times).

Sometimes the formulae are quite expansive (for example, *Didasc.* 1.1.4: *'yk d'p b'wnglywn mhd̄t wms̄rr wms̄ml' 'sr' ptgm' dnmws'* [Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 1.22f.] = *dicit enim in evangelio recapitulans et confirmans et complens decalogum legis* [Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 3.7f.] = λέγει γὰρ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ἀνακεφαλαιούμενος καὶ στηρίζων καὶ πληρῶν τὴν δεκάλογον τοῦ νόμου [Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:5.17ff], "for he says in the Gospel renewing and confirming and fulfilling the ten words of the Law"; and *Didasc.* 6.23.2: *'p h̄w gyr m̄n wpr̄wqu gzyr̄yt m'l l'ylyn d̄swyn lh̄wyb' w'mr* [Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 120.8f.] = *nam et ipse dominus et salvator noster cum severitate respondens his, qui digni erant condemnatione, dixit* [Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 101.2ff.], "for our Lord and Savior himself also spoke with severity to those who were worthy of condemnation and said"); but more often they consist of

the Apostles,¹³ nor any of those drawn on the Epistles (with two possible exceptions)¹⁴ are so introduced.¹⁵ All of the citations drawn on the Christian traditions are cited as having the same basic authority;¹⁶ none are cited under the specific title of the

nothing more than the conjunctions *w*, "and," and *wtwb*, "and again," thereby linking the *logos* thus introduced with a previous *logos* introduced with a more formal citation formula (for example, *Didasc.* 6.18.15: "for he said . . . and . . . and . . . and . . ."), or *gyr*, "for," and *mtl hn'*, "wherefore" (for example, *Didasc.* 2.18.6 and 2.38.2, respectively).

¹³ See *Didasc.* 6.7.2 (Acts 8:18); 6.7.3 (Acts 8:20-21); 6.12.1 (Acts 15:25a [?]); 6.12.3 (Acts 15:1-2); 6.12.3 (Acts 15:4-5); 6.12.4 (Acts 15:7-8); 6.12.6 (Acts 10:9-16; cf. 11:4-10); 6.12.10f. (Acts 15:8-11); 6.12.12ff. (Acts 15:13-29).

¹⁴ See *Didasc.* 2.3.3 (1 Pet 4:8 [?]; cf. Pr 10:12) and *Didasc.* 2.53.2 (Eph 4:26 [?]; cf. Ps 4:4).

¹⁵ See *Didasc.* I (Introduction) (1 Pet 1:26); 1.8.1 (1 Cor 11:3); 2.1.1 (Tit 1:7a + 1 Tim 3:2a); 2.2.1 (1 Tim 3:2c); 2.2.1 (1 Tim 3:3, 6); 2.2.2 (1 Tim 3.2b, 4a); 2.6.1 (1 Tim 3:8a); 2.18.6 (1 Tim 3:2a); 2.24.4 (Tit 1.7b); 2.24.4 (1 Tim 3:3c; Tit 1:7b); 2.26.1 (1 Pet 2:9a); 2.49.2 (1 Tim 3:8a); 2.63.5 (2 Th 3:10b); 3.1.1 (1 Tim 5:9); 3.7.3 (Php 3:19b); 3.11.5 (1 Pet 3:9); 3.13.1 (1 Tim 3:8).

¹⁶ No distinction is made between the *logoi* with parallels in the canonical Gospels and those without. For example, both the *logos*, μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε, "Judge not, that you be not judged" (Mt 7:1 = Lk 6:37a), and the *logos* γίνεσθε τραπεζίται δόκιμοι, "Be approved money-changers" (cf. Pseudo-Clement, *Homiliae* 2:51; 3:50; 18:20 [B. Rehm and F. Paschke, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, 1: *Homilien*, GCS, 42; 2d ed. (Berlin, 1969), pp. 55.17; 75.20; 250.13]; etc.) are introduced with identical citation formulae, namely, λέγεται, "it is said" (*Didasc.* 2.36.7ff.); both the *logos*, οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἔλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα καὶ σχίσματα, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δὲ οὐ ἔρχεται, "Woe to the world because of scandals, for scandals and schisms must come; yet woe to the man by whom they come" (Mt 18:7 = Lk 17:1), and the *logos*, ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἰρέσεις, "There shall be schisms and heresies" (cf. Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 35.5ff. [J. C. T. Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum christianorum saeculi secundi* (Wiesbaden, 1851-1889 [reprint, 1969]), 2:118.3ff.]) are introduced by one and the same citation formula, namely, ὡς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτὴρ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "as our Lord and Savior, Jesus, said" (*Didasc.* 6.5.2); and both the *logos*, ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι, "The last shall be first, and the first last" (Mt 20:16; cf. Mt 19:30 = Mk 10:31; Lk 13:30), and the *logos*, ἰδοὺ ποιῶ τὰ πρῶτα ὡς τὰ ἔσχατα, καὶ τὰ ἔσχατα ὡς τὰ πρῶτα, "Behold, I make the first things as the last, and the last as the first" (cf. *Barnabas* 6.13 [F. X. Funk and K. Bihlmeyer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, SAKDQ, 2.1.1 (Tübingen, 1956), p. 17.18]; and Hippolytus, *In Daniel*, 6.37 [G. N. Bonwetsch and H. Achelis, *Hippolytus, Werke*, 1: *Exegetische und homiletische Schriften*; 1. *Der Kommentar zum Buche Daniel und die Fragmente des Kommentars zum Hohenliede*; 2. *Kleinere exegetische und homiletische Schriften*, GCS, 1 (Leipzig, 1897), p. 284.12]) are introduced with one and the same citation formula, namely, ὅτι εἶπεν, "for he said" (*Didasc.* 6.18.15).

source on which they are drawn.¹⁷

Of the 134 citations drawn on the "Gospel," 124 are citations of dominical *logoi*,¹⁸ one is a citation of a non-dominical *logos*,¹⁹ and nine are citations of Gospel narrative materials.²⁰

These prolegomena are concerned, in particular, with the 124 citations of dominical *logoi*,²¹ and their main aims have to

¹⁷ The one exception, namely, the citation (Mt 28.1f.) at *Didasc.* 5.14.11, which is introduced with the citation formula *b'wnglywn dyn dmt y hkn' ktyb*, "but in the Gospel of Matthew it is written thus" (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 88.20f.), is probably a later interpolation (so also R. H. Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments with an Introduction and Notes* [Oxford, 1929 (reprint, Oxford, 1969)], p. 182, n. 11). First, nowhere else does the Didascalist refer to any one of the Gospels (or, for that matter, any one of the NT writings) by name; second, the citation interrupts, quite awkwardly, the Didascalist's computation of the chronology of the passion; and third, the Didascalist nowhere else employs the adverb *hkn'*, "thus," to qualify the formula *ktyb*, "it is written" (cf. *Didasc.* 1.2.1; 2.16.1; 2.17.2; 2.35.2; 2.38.1; 2.58.3; 3.7.2; 3.10.10; 3.13.4; 5.4.3; 5.14.11). He employs *hkn'*, "thus," only to qualify the formula 'mr, "he said" (cf. *Didasc.* 2.15f. [twice]; 2.8.1; 2.45.3; 5.3.2; 6.15.3f. [twice]).

¹⁸ A complete index of the dominical *logoi* as cited in the *Didascalia*, tabulated, where such exist, according to their closest canonical parallels, is given in TABLE A.

¹⁹ *Didasc.* 2.39.2 (Lk 3:13).

²⁰ See TABLE B.

²¹ The Didascalist himself, on a number of occasions, refers to the "saying" he is citing as a "*logos*," and on several occasions, more specifically as a "*logos* of the Lord." For example, in *Didasc.* 2.42.4 he introduces the citation of two dominical *logoi* (to which the closest parallels in the canonical Gospels are Lk 6.37c and Lk 6.37b) with the formula, *hn' ptgm' . . . w [hn' ptgm'] = oũtos o lōgos . . . kai [oũtos o lōgos]*, "this *logos* . . . and [this *logos*]" (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 46.21f.); in *Didasc.* 2.46.5 he introduces the citation of a dominical *logos* (to which the closest parallel in the canonical Gospels is Mt 18.21) with the formula, *ptgn' d'myr mn mrn b'wnglywn = o lōgos o laantheĩs hyp̄ tou kur̄iou h̄mōn en t̄w eũaggel̄iō*, "the *logos* which was spoken by our Lord in the Gospel" (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 49.21f.); and in *Didasc.* 2.35.1 he introduces the citation of a dominical *logos* (to which the closest parallel in the canonical Gospels is Mt 5:20) with the formula, *ptgn' dmry' = o lōgos tou kur̄iou*, "the *logos* of the Lord" (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 41.24f.). Also, on a number of occasions, he employs the noun "Lord" (in the emphatic state: *mry' = o k̄ur̄ios*, "the Lord" [15 times], and with the first person plural pronominal suffix: *mrn = o k̄ur̄ios h̄mōn*, "our Lord" [22 times]) as the subject of the verb "to say" (35 times) or "to speak" (twice), in his introductory citation formulae, and in other dominical titles such as *mry' 'lh' = [o] k̄ur̄ios o thēos*, "the Lord God"

do with (i) the “determination” and (ii) the “evaluation” of those citations as they occurred in the original text of the Greek *Didascalia*.

1. *The Question of “Determination”*

Heretofore comparatively little has been done to work out an adequate methodology for the “determination” of both the *form* (in the less technical sense of the term) and the *content* of said dominical *logoi*. It has been tacitly assumed that by a simple retroversion of the Syriac translation, harmonized with a comparable retroversion of the Latin translation where extant and especially with the extensively edited rendering of the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, both the *form* (again in the less technical sense of the term) and the *content* of a given *logos* in the original text of the Greek *Didascalia* can be “determined” with a considerable degree of precision.²²

Furthermore, there has been a tendency to employ this assumption in a rather mechanical way. For example, when two of the witnesses agree and at the same time differ from the third it has been assumed, more often than has been warranted by the evidence, that the reading supported by the majority, regardless of the alignment of the witnesses, represents the more original; and when all three witnesses disagree with one another it has

(6 times), *mry' p̄rwqn* = [ὁ] κύριος ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, “the Lord our Savior” (twice), *mry' m̄syh'* = [ὁ] κύριος ὁ χριστός, “the Lord, the Messiah” (once), *mri w̄p̄rwqn* = ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, “our Lord and our Savior” (4 times), and *mri w̄mlp̄nni* = ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν, “our Lord and our Teacher,” etc.

²² Such seems to be implied by the procedures employed by P. Boetticher (P. de Lagarde) (*Constitutiones Apostolicae Graece*, in *Analecta Ante-Nicaena*, 2: *Reliquiae Canonicae*, ed. C. C. J. Bunsen [London, 1854], pp. 225-338), Funk (*Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:2-385), and H. Achelis and J. Flemming (*Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechts*, 2: *Die syrische Didaskalia*, TU, n.f., 10.2 [Leipzig, 1904], pp. 318-354); and by the remarks made by Connolly (*Didascalia Apostolorum*, pp. lxx-lxxv, and here and there in his footnotes), and G. Strecker (“On the Problem of Jewish Christianity,” in W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, trans. of *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum* by a team from the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins, ed. by R. A. Kraft and G. Krodel [Tübingen, 1964 (2d ed.); Philadelphia, 1971], pp. 244-257).

been similarly assumed, again more often than has been warranted by the evidence, that the reading supported by the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum* is the most original.

This methodology is inadequate. It does not take sufficient cognizance of the fact that neither of the Didascalists (Syriac or Latin), nor any of the Constitutors (Arabic, Ethiopic, or Greek), coming upon a citation of a dominical *logos* in his exemplar, consistently translates, or copies, what he finds in that exemplar: sometimes he translates, or copies, exactly what he finds;²³ sometimes he accommodates it to the context in which it occurs;²⁴ sometimes he edits it to suit his personal stylistic preferences;²⁵ sometimes he accommodates it to his contemporary Gospel traditions;²⁶ and sometimes he replaces it with a “dubbed-in” version drawn on his contemporary Gospel traditions.²⁷

A much more complex methodology—more complex in the sense that it takes account of many more variables of the kind just noted—is necessary. Each version (Syriac and Latin; Arabic, Ethiopic, and Greek, where extant) of a given *logos* must first be compared with every other occurrence of that particular *logos*, and/or its parallel, or parallels, in its own Gospel traditions—in both the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic literature—in order to determine whether the translator, or editor, has translated, or rendered, his exemplar *ad hoc*, accommodated it to his contemporary Gospel traditions, or replaced it with a “dubbed-in” version drawn on his contemporary Gospel traditions.

Obviously, if it can be shown by this method that he has employed a “dubbed-in” version drawn on his contemporary Gospel traditions, his rendering is of no practical value for the

²³ See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 1.1.7 and 3.11.3 (Syriac version).

²⁴ See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 6.13.3 and 6.14.8 (Greek version).

²⁵ See, e.g., the citation at *Didasc.* 1.1.4 (Syriac version).

²⁶ See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 1.6.10; 2.34.7; 6.12.11; and 6.17.6 (Syriac version).

²⁷ See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 2.16.1 and 6.14.4 (Greek version).

“determination” of the original text of the citation.²⁸ On the other hand, if it can be shown that he has accommodated his rendering to his contemporary Gospel traditions, those accommodations can be determined and set aside by the comparison proposed here. The basic elements that remain are of significant value for the “determination” of the original text of the citation.²⁹ Of course, if it can be shown that he has, in fact, translated, or copied, *ad hoc* from his exemplar, his rendering is of the utmost value for the “determination” of the original text of the citation.³⁰

If by this process of comparison it can be shown that his rendering is of value for the “determination” of the original text of the citation, the citation itself must then be analyzed (i) in terms of its relationship to its literary context, and (ii) in terms of the stylistic preferences of the translator, or editor.³¹

Only after all the elements that have resulted from accommodation (either to the contemporary Gospel traditions or to the literary context), or from the stylistic preferences of the translator, or editor, have been determined and set aside, is it responsible to compare the versions themselves (Syriac and Latin; Arabic, Ethiopic, and Greek).³²

I am persuaded that in this second process of comparison (namely, the comparison of the versions—Syriac and Latin; Arabic, Ethiopic, and Greek), the testimony of the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae* must be considered as *primary*, the testimony of the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum* as *secondary*, and the testimony of the Arabic and Ethiopic *Constitutiones Apostolorum* as *tertiary* evidence. In this connection, I am also persuaded that no one witness can be counted on to represent consistently the original reading, and that no particular majority of the wit-

²⁸ See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 2.16.1 and 6.14.4 (Greek version).

²⁹ See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 1.1.7 and 3.11.3 (Latin version).

³⁰ See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 6.13.3 and 6.14.8 (Syriac version).

³¹ See, e.g., the citations at *Didasc.* 6.13.3 and 6.14.8 (Greek version).

³² See, e.g., the sections on the *Reconstruction of the Greek Original*, especially in Studies 2, 5, and 7 in my forthcoming book, *The Dominical Logoi in the Greek Didascalia Apostolorum*.

nesses can be counted on to represent necessarily the original reading.³³

2. The Question of "Evaluation"

Heretofore either one of two procedures has been followed:

(1) It has been assumed that the dominical *logoi* cited in the *Didascaliae* (and in the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*) that have parallels in the canonical Gospels have, in fact, been drawn on those Gospels. As a result, an attempt has been made at "evaluating" those *logoi* only in terms of whether or not they have been drawn on manuscripts of this or that particular text tradition; for example, with respect to the Syriac translation, whether they have been drawn on manuscripts of the old Syriac traditions or on manuscripts of the Peshitta traditions.³⁴ (2) The basic assumption of (1), namely, that the dominical *logoi* cited in the *Didascaliae* (and in the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*) that have parallels in the canonical Gospels have, in fact, been drawn on those Gospels has been questioned. As a result, an attempt has been made at "evaluating" those *logoi* precisely in terms of whether the Greek Didascalist employed as his source, or sources, the canonical Gospels and/or some other source, or sources, such as a "harmony" of the Gospels, or the like.³⁵

These prolegomena are not concerned with the former of these

³³ Except, perhaps, where the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae* stand together and are supported by at least one of the versions of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, especially the Greek.

³⁴ See M. D. Gibson, *The Didascalia Apostolorum in English: Translated from the Syriac*, HS, 2 (London, 1903), pp. xvi-xviii.

³⁵ The only other really serious study of this question is that of Achelis and Flemming (*Die syrische Didaskalia*, TU, n.f., 10.2, pp. 318-354) who conclude that the Didascalist drew, in the main, directly from all four canonical Gospels. Connolly (*Didascalia Apostolorum*, pp. lxx-lxxv) and Strecker ("On the Problem of Jewish Christianity," in Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, pp. 244-257) follow them in this conclusion. A. Harnack (*Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* [Leipzig, 1904 (reprint, Leipzig, 1958)], 2.2, pp. 492-496) concludes that he drew, in the main, from an *Evangelienharmonie*, and contends that he did not draw from the fourth Gospel. Gibson (*Didascalia Apostolorum*, HS, 2, pp. viii-ix) agrees with Harnack in that she concludes that the Didascalist drew from a "Gospel Harmony," but she differs from him in that she contends that he did draw from the fourth Gospel.

inquiries, important as it may be.³⁶ They are concerned rather with the latter, and they aim to reach beyond that which has already been attempted and achieved in the search for responsible answers.

Again a more complex methodology—more complex in the sense that it takes into consideration a greater spectrum of relevant questions and consequently anticipates a greater spectrum of responsible answers—is required.

It seems to me altogether necessary to give attention to a sequence of relevant questions: (i) questions concerning both the “immediate” source, or sources, and (for want of a better term) the “ultimate” source, or sources, from which the Greek Didascalist’s *logoi* derive, (ii) questions concerning both the “source-historical,” “form-historical,” “gattung-historical,” and “redaction-historical” motives involved in the transmission and shaping of those *logoi*, and (iii) questions concerning both the place and the role of said *logoi*, at the point of their citation by the Greek Didascalist, in the development of the ongoing Gospel traditions.

(To be continued)

³⁶ They do, however, indirectly raise some serious questions about the use of works such as the *Didascaliae* and the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (which in their present form are once, twice, and thrice removed from their original Greek exemplars) in the critical *apparatus* of editions of the Greek New Testament such as those of E. Nestle and K. Aland (*Novum Testamentum Graece* [Stuttgart, 1963 (25th ed.)]) and K. Aland, et al. (*The Greek New Testament* [Stuttgart, 1975 (3rd ed.)]).

TABLE A

I. *Dominical Logoi cited with Introductory Citation Formulae*a) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in one
Canonical Gospel: Matthew*

1.	<i>Didasc.</i> I.1.4	Mt 5:27f.
2.	<i>Didasc.</i> I.6.10	Mt 11:28
3.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.1.1	Mt 12:36f.
4.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.1.5	Mt 5:5
5.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.1.6	Mt 5:7
6.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.1.7	Mt 5:9
7.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.1.8	Mt 5:8
8.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.11.1	Mt 16:19b/18:18a
9.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.17.6	Mt 18:10a
10.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.18.2	Mt 16:19bc/18:18
11.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.34.7	Mt 11:28-30
12.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.35.1	Mt 5:20
13.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.38.1	Mt 18:16b, 17
14.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.42.4	Mt 7:2a
15.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.45.2	Mt 6:3b
16.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.46.5	Mt 5:9a
17.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.48.3	Mt 7:2a
18.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.53.1	Mt 5:22a
19.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.53.3	Mt 5:23f.
20.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.62.2	Mt 10:5b
21.	<i>Didasc.</i> III.5.5	Mt 7:6bc
22.	<i>Didasc.</i> III.10.6	Mt 6:3
23.	<i>Didasc.</i> III.10.10	Mt 6:2
24.	<i>Didasc.</i> V.1.6ff	Mt 25:34-40, 46
25.	<i>Didasc.</i> V.14.22	Mt 5:4a
26.	<i>Didasc.</i> VI.12.11	Mt 11:28-30
27.	<i>Didasc.</i> VI.14.2	Mt 10:5b
28.	<i>Didasc.</i> VI.15.3	Mt 5:17
29.	<i>Didasc.</i> VI.17.6	Mt 11:28
30.	<i>Didasc.</i> VI.21.2	Mt 23:18-22
31.	<i>Didasc.</i> VI.23.2	Mt 25:41

b) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in one
Canonical Gospel: Luke*

1.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.16.1	Lk 23:34a
2.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.18.6	Lk 12:48b
3.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.21.5	Lk 6:37c-38a
4.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.42.4	Lk 6:37b (bis)
5.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.42.4	Lk 6:37c
6.	<i>Didasc.</i> VI.14.4	Lk 23:34a

c) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in one
Canonical Gospel: John*

1.	<i>Didasc.</i> II.24.3	Jn 8:3ff.
----	------------------------	-------	-----------

d) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in two
Canonical Gospels: Matthew and Mark¹*

1. *Didasc.* V.6.5 Mt 26:41b = Mk 14:38b
2. *Didasc.* VI.12.2 Mt 19:4b-6 = Mk 10:6-8

e) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in two
Canonical Gospels: Matthew and Luke*

1. *Didasc.* I.2.1 (Mt 5:44b) = Lk 6:28a
2. *Didasc.* I.2.3 (Mt 5:44c) = Lk 6:27b
3. *Didasc.* I.2.3 Mt 5:44 = Lk 6:27f.
4. *Didasc.* II.2.1 Mt 18:4 = Mt 23:12a =
Lk 14:11a = Lk 18:14b
5. *Didasc.* II.8.1 Mt 5:11f. = Lk 6:22f.
6. *Didasc.* II.17.2 Mt 7:3, 5 = Lk 6:41, 42b
7. *Didasc.* II.20.1 Mt 10:40; *Lk 10:16*;
cf. Mt 18:5 = Mk 9:37 = 9:48a
8. *Didasc.* II.20.8 Mt 18:22ff.; Lk 15:4ff.
9. *Didasc.* II.21.5 Mt 6:12 = Lk 11:4
10. *Didasc.* II.32.2 Mt 10:40; *Lk 10:16*;
cf. Mt 18:5 = Mk 9:37 = Lk 9:48a
11. *Didasc.* II.36.7 Mt 7:1 = Lk 6:37a
12. *Didasc.* II.38.1 Mt 18:15f.; Lk 17:3
13. *Didasc.* II.46.5f. *Mt 18:21f.*; Lk 17:4
14. *Didasc.* II.56.1 Mt 6:10 = (Lk 11:2e)
15. *Didasc.* II.56.2 Mt 12:30 = Lk 11:23
cf. Mk 9:40 = Lk 9:50
16. *Didasc.* II.59.1 Mt 12:30b = Lk 11:23b
17. *Didasc.* III.7.3 Mt 6:21 = Lk 12:34
18. *Didasc.* III.10.12 (Mt 5:44b) = Lk 6:28a
19. *Didasc.* III.10.12 *Mt 10:12f.* = Lk 10:5f.
20. *Didasc.* V.1.4 *Mt 10:32* = Lk 12:8
21. *Didasc.* V.3.2 *Mt 5:11* = Lk 6:22
22. *Didasc.* V.4.3 *Mt 10:37f.* = Lk 14:26f.
23. *Didasc.* V.4.4 *Mt 10:28* = Lk 12:4f.
24. *Didasc.* V.6.8 *Mt 10:33* = Lk 12:9;
cf. Mk 8:38 = Lk 9:26
25. *Didasc.* V.6.8 *Mt 10:37* = Lk 14:26;
cf. Mt 10:39a = Lk 17:33a; Jn 12:25a
26. *Didasc.* V.6.9 Mt 10:24; *Lk 6:40*;
cf. Jn 13:16, 15:20a
27. *Didasc.* V.14.3 *Mt 12:40b* = Lk 11:30b
28. *Didasc.* V.14.22 Mt 5:44d = Lk 6:28b
29. *Didasc.* VI.5.2 Mt 18:7 = Lk 17:1
30. *Didasc.* VI.5.4 Mt 23:38 = Lk 13:35a
31. *Didasc.* VI.14.7 Mt 12:32a = Lk 12:10a

¹ Where there is a significant difference between the parallels in the canonical Gospels, the parallel to which the Didascalist's citation is most closely related is italicized.

32. *Didasc.* VI.15.4 *Mt* 5:18b; *Lk* 16:17
33. *Didasc.* VI.16.12 *Mt* 13:15f. = *Lk* 10:23b)
34. *Didasc.* VI.19.4 *Mt* 10:24; *Lk* 6:40a;
cf. *Jn* 13:16, 15:20a
35. *Didasc.* VI.21.3 *Mt* 12:43ff. = *Lk* 11:24ff.
36. *Didasc.* VI.23.2 *Mt* 8:12 = *Lk* 13:28a;
Mt 22:13; 25:30; cf. *Mt* 13:42, 50; 24:51
37. *Didasc.* VI.23.5 *Mt* 7:21; *Lk* 6:46
- f) *Dominal Logoi with Parallels in two
Canonical Gospels: Mark and Luke*
1. *Didasc.* III.7.8 *Mk* 12:41ff. = *Lk* 21:1ff.
- g) *Dominal Logoi with Parallels in three
Canonical Gospels: the Synoptics*
1. *Didasc.* II.6.17 *Mt* 11:15; *Mt* 13:9 =
Mk 4:9 = *Lk* 8:8b; *Mt* 13:43b; *Mk* 4:23; *Lk* 14:35b
2. *Didasc.* II.17.4 *Mt* 21:13 = *Mk* 11:17 =
Lk 19:46
3. *Didasc.* II.20.10 *Mt* 9:12 = *Mk* 2:17a =
Lk 5:31
4. *Didasc.* II.32.3 *Mt* 3:17b = *Mk* 1:9b =
Lk 3:22c (D, it)
5. *Didasc.* II.35.2 *Mt* 19:21a = *Mk* 10:21a =
Lk 18:22a; cf. *Lk* 12:33a
6. *Didasc.* II.40.1 *Mt* 9:12 = *Mk* 2:17a =
Lk 5:31
7. *Didasc.* II.46.1 *Mt* 22:21b = *Mk* 12:17 =
Lk 20:25
8. *Didasc.* II.58.3 *Mt* 13:57b = *Mk* 6:4a;
Lk 4:24; cf. *Jn* 4:44
9. *Didasc.* III.13.2 *Mt* 20:26ff. = *Mk* 10:43;
cf. *Lk* 22:26f.; *Mk* 9:35 = *Lk* 9:48b; *Mt* 23:11
10. *Didasc.* V.4.3 *Mt* 16:25f. = *Mk* 8:35ff. =
Lk 9:24f.; cf. *Mt* 10:39 = *Lk* 17:33
11. *Didasc.* V.6.7 *Mt* 16:25 = *Mk* 8:35 =
Lk 9:24f.; *Mt* 10:39 = *Lk* 17:33; *Jn* 12:25
12. *Didasc.* V.7.2 *Mt* 24:13 = *Mk* 13:13b =
Lk 21:18f.; cf. *Mt* 10:22b; 10:30; *Lk* 12:7a
13. *Didasc.* V.12.6 *Mt* 9:14ff. = *Mk* 2:18ff. =
Lk 5:33f.
14. *Didasc.* VI.14.2 *Mt* 16:6 = *Mk* 8:15;
Lk 12:1b
15. *Didasc.* VI.14.3f. *Mt* 12:32b = *Lk* 12:10b;
Mk 3:29a
16. *Didasc.* VI.14.6 *Mt* 12:31f. = *Lk* 12:10;
Mk 3:28f.
17. *Didasc.* IV.15.3 *Mt* 8:4 = *Mk* 1:44 = *Lk* 5:14
18. *Didasc.* VI.18.15 *Mt* 20:16; cf. *Mt* 19:30 =
Mk 10:31; *Lk* 13:30

19. *Didasc.* VI.21.1 *Mt* 13:12 = *Mk* 4:24c-25 =
Lk 8:18bc; *Mt* 25:29; *Lk* 19:26
20. *Didasc.* VI.22.3 *Mt* 22:31f. = *Mk* 12:26 =
Lk 20:37
21. *Didasc.* VI.22.3 *Mt* 22:32b = *Mk* 12:27a =
Lk 20:38a

h) *Dominical Logoi the Various Components of which
 have Parallels in Differing Contexts
 in the Canonical Gospels*

1. *Didasc.* II.20.9 *Lk* 7:48ff.; cf. *Mt* 9:2b =
Mk 2:5b = *Lk* 5:20b; *Mt* 9:22a + *Mk* 5:34a = *Lk* 8:48;
Mk 10:52a = *Lk* 18:42; *Lk* 17:19
2. *Didasc.* III.7.2 *Mt* 18:19 + *Mt* 21:21b =
Mk 11:23; cf. *Mt* 17:20b; *Lk* 17:6b
3. *Didasc.* V.4.2 *Mt* 10:33a = *Lk* 12:9a +
Mk 8:38a = *Lk* 9:26a + *Mk* 8:38c = *Lk* 9:26b + *Mt* 10:33b =
Lk 12:9b + *Mk* 8:38d = *Lk* 9:26c + credal formula
(*Didasc.* VI.23.8); cf. *Mt* 24:30
4. *Didasc.* V.14.1 *Mt* 26:34 = *Mk* 14:30 =
Lk 22:34; cf. *Jn* 13:38b + *Mt* 26:21ff. = *Mk* 14:18ff.; cf. *Jn* 13:21ff.
5. *Didasc.* V.14.3 Synoptic + Johannine type
material + *Jn* 16:32 + *Mt* 26:31b = *Mk* 14:27b
6. *Didasc.* VI.13.3 *Mt* 7:15, 16a (cf. *Lk* 6:44a)
+ *Mt* 24:24a = *Mk* 13:22a + *Mk* 24:11f.; *Mt* 24:13 =
Mk 13:13b = *Lk* 21:19

i) *Dominical Logoi with
 Parallels outside the Canonical Gospels*

1. *Didasc.* I.1.7 (cf. *Did.* 1:2)
2. *Didasc.* I.2.3 (cf. *Did.* 1:3; Justin, 1 *Apol.* 15:9; 2 *Clem.* 13:4;
Constit. Apost. VII.2.2)
3. *Didasc.* I.10.1 (cf. 2 *Clem.* 13:2) (?)
4. *Didasc.* II.8.2 (cf. Tertullian, *de Bapt.* 20) (?)
5. *Didasc.* II.36.9 (cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.28.177)
6. *Didasc.* III.11.3 (cf. *Did.* 1:2)
7. *Didasc.* V.14.22 (cf. *Did.* 1:3; Justin, 1 *Apol.* 15:9; *Pap Oxy* 1224)
8. *Didasc.* VI.18.14 (cf. *Barn.* 15:4)
9. *Didasc.* VI.18.15 (cf. *Barn.* 6:13)

j) *Dominical Logoi with No Known Parallels*

1. *Didasc.* II.25.2 (?)
2. *Didasc.* VI.5.2

II. *Dominical Logoi cited without
 Introductory Citation Formulae*

a) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in one
 Canonical Gospel: Matthew*

1. *Didasc.* II.32.3 *Mt* 5:22bc
2. *Didasc.* II.39.5 *Mt* 18:17b

- b) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in two Canonical Gospels: Matthew and Mark*
1. *Didasc.* VI.14.8 Mt 24:24a = Mk 13:22a
- c) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in two Canonical Gospels: Matthew and Luke*
1. *Didasc.* II.36.5 Mt 6:20; Lk 12:33b
2. *Didasc.* II.53.7 Mt 18:22; Lk 17:4
3. *Didasc.* II.54.2 Mt 10:12 = Lk 10:5
4. *Didasc.* V.6.8 Mt 8:12 = Lk 13:28a;
Mt 22:13; 25:30; cf. Mt 13:42, 50; 24:51
- d) *Dominical Logoi with Parallels in three Canonical Gospels: the Synoptics*
1. *Didasc.* V.6.2 Mt 26:41a = Mk 14:38a =
Lk 22:46b

TABLE B

- I. *Gospel Narrative Materials cited with Introductory Citation Formulae*
1. *Didasc.* III.13.4f. Jn 13:4ff.
- II. *Gospel Narrative Materials cited without Introductory Citation Formulae*
- a) *Gospel Narrative Materials with Parallels in one Canonical Gospel: Matthew*
1. *Didasc.* V.17.2 Mt 21:46
2. *Didasc.* V.19.4 Mt 27:24f.
- b) *Gospel Narrative Materials with Parallels in one Canonical Gospel: Luke*
1. *Didasc.* II.20.9 Lk 4:18b
- c) *Gospel Narrative Materials with Parallels in two Canonical Gospels: i) Matthew and Mark, and ii) Mark and Luke¹*
1. *Didasc.* III.12.4 Mt 27:56 = Mk 15:40b
cf. Jn 19:25b
2. *Didasc.* V.17.2 Mk 11:18b = Lk 19:48b
- d) *Gospel Narrative Materials with Parallels in three Canonical Gospels: the Synoptics*
1. *Didasc.* V.14.14 Mt 28:1, 9 = Mk 16:1f.,
(9) = Lk 24:1, 10
2. *Didasc.* V.17.2 Mt 26:3ff. = Mk 14:1f. =
Lk 22:2; cf. Jn 11:47ff.
3. *Didasc.* V.17.2f. Mt 26:6, 15f. = Mk 14:3, 10f.
= Lk 22:3ff.; cf. Lk 7:36

¹ Where there is a significant difference between the parallels in the canonical Gospels, the parallel to which the Didascalist's citation is most closely related is italicized.

RIOTS AS A MEASURE OF RELIGIOUS CONFLICT IN SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND

PART II*

DONALD McADAMS
Southwestern Union College
Keene, Texas

4. *A New Thrust in the Riots from 1716 to the 1770's: Attack on Methodists*

The emerging Whig supremacy that followed the Hanoverian succession removed the threat to the Anglican Church from Catholics and Dissenters alike. These religious minorities could now be tolerated. But hatred ran deep, and sporadic riots against them continued throughout the reigns of the first two Georges. From 1716 to the 1770's, however, the riots against Methodists were more frequent and more severe than those against the old religious minorities.

This revival movement that began to sweep England following the conversion of John Wesley and then the field preaching of George Whitefield in 1739 was never a political threat. In fact, the political conservatism and authoritarianism of Methodism was so strong that some historians consider the stability of England during the French Revolution a result of the Methodist influence. But Methodist revivals often did threaten the dominant position of local Anglican leaders and aroused the suspicion of the high church Tory squirearchy.

A few examples of Methodist persecution give support to the statement of W. E. H. Leckey that "there were few forms of mob violence they did not experience."¹³ In 1744 a Methodist preacher

* The first part of this article was published in *AUSS* 14 (1976): 289-300.

¹³ William Edward Hartpole Lecky, *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, New ed., 7 vols. (London, 1897-1899), 3: 71.

named Seward was killed at Monmouth. John Wesley narrowly escaped death on several occasions when riots broke out following his preaching. A serious riot occurred in Norwich in 1752. The cause was the preaching of Mr. Wheatley, a Methodist who was having a great impact on the town. From November 21, 1751, to July 9, 1752, high church mobs harrassed the Methodist meetings. Throughout the period the mayor tried to keep the peace, but with little success. Crowds usually numbering around 300, but on occasion reaching 3,000, gathered regularly on Sunday morning to assault those who came out to listen to Wheatley's sermons. For a time in February riots occurred daily. During the riots there were numerous assaults and at least one rape. Wheatley himself was severely beaten. The mobs also attacked other Dissenting meeting houses and the homes of many of the leading Dissenters. The constant turmoil, however, never completely escalated into a primary riot. Numerous arrests, the presence of some dragoons, and the fact that the riots had a limited objective prevented these disorders from becoming a primary riot.¹⁴

The decline of riots against Catholics and Dissenters after 1716 should not lead us to believe that primary riots were less frequent. If anything, they were more frequent. But from 1716 to the time of the American Revolution, economic and political disputes were greater irritants to urban workers than were religious minorities. The weaver riots in London in July and August of 1736 and the great riots for "Wilkes and Liberty" during the years 1768 to 1774 are examples. The Wilkite mobs, among the most famous in English history because of their political importance, were just huge crowds of political demonstrators who happened to turn a bit violent. They intended to insult, not to kill and destroy, though

¹⁴ *A True and Particular Narrative of the Disturbances and Outrages . . . in Norwich* (London, 1752). For an account of a similar disturbance at Sheffield in 1743 see the passage from Charles Wesley's Journal, quoted in *English Historical Documents 1744-1783*, ed. D. B. Horn (New York, 1957), pp. 388-389.

some of that did happen along the way.¹⁵

5. *The Final Riots Against Catholics and Dissenters*

The lack of primary riots against Catholics and Dissenters indicates that the conflicts of the 17th century, the Reformation legacy, were declining. There remained, however, two great riots near the end of the eighteenth century which marked the end of religious riots in English history. The first of these two riots was directed against Catholics. It was not that Catholics were any longer a threat to the Anglican establishment, but a residue of the hatred that had so marked the 17th century remained, a hatred kept alive by Guy Fawkes Day celebrations and still seen in Ulster today.

The Gordon Riots, the most severe riots in English history, kept London in turmoil from June 2 to 8, 1780. The violence commenced when the mad Scot, Lord George Gordon, assembled a crowd of 60,000 at St. George's Fields, Southwark, to obtain signatures for the petition to Parliament prepared by his Protestant Association and calling for the repeal of recently passed measures that gave Catholics partial relief from the restrictions on their civil rights.¹⁶ The crowd quickly became a riotous mob threatening the House of Commons. Gangs began to split off and attack the private Catholic chapels attached to foreign embassies. For five days the mob ran rampant throughout the metropolis. The magistrates and constables, unwilling to ask for military force to assist them, could not keep order except in the morning hours when most of the rioters rested. The riots reached a climax on Wednesday, June 7. That day George III took the matter into his own hands and ordered the military into the city. By that evening a camp of 10,000 troops was forming in Hyde Park.

¹⁵ George Rudé, *Wilkes and Liberty: A Social Study of 1763-1774* (Oxford, 1972).

¹⁶ The Act of 1778 repealed portions of the Act of 1699-1700 that condemned papists keeping schools to perpetual imprisonment and disabled all Catholics from inheriting or purchasing land.

On the next day the soldiers stopped the last of the looting and destruction.

No one knows how many died in these riots. Estimates run as high as 1,000. The military killed 210 on the spot, and many more died in the crush of burning and falling buildings. The riots left extensive and widespread destruction in the City, Middlesex, and outparishes. The mobs had first pulled down Catholic chapels and schools and then turned their attention to the homes and property of Catholic merchants, businessmen, and shopkeepers, and the houses of some of the justices who opposed them. The mobs commenced their destruction with the now-customary pattern of gutting the buildings and burning the contents in the streets, but as the riots proceeded looting became more general and fires began to spread to surrounding houses. This happened when the works of the Catholic distiller, Thomas Langdale, were burned, consuming £38,000 worth of gin; the fire spread to twenty-one neighboring houses. Eight prisons were also fired after about 1,000 prisoners had been released. The destruction of the riot was later estimated at nearly £100,000—£63,000 in private property and £30,000 in public buildings.¹⁷

The widespread loss of life and property shocked contemporaries, but not until George Rudé undertook a study of the rioters has the behavior of the mob been fully understood.¹⁸ Rudé discovered no trace of a plan; apparently each group recognized a "captain," usually a local man who emerged as leader on the spot, and attacked buildings near where they lived. About 70 per cent of the rioters came from the wage-earning class of apprentices and artisans. In this largest of all English riots the destruction was directed. Rudé has proved by a careful

¹⁷Two valuable books cover in great detail the Gordon Riots. J. Paul de Castro, *The Gordon Riots* (Oxford, 1926) and Christopher Hibbert, *King Mob: The Story of Lord George Gordon and the Riots of 1780* (London, 1958).

¹⁸George F. E. Rudé, "The Gordon Riots: A Study of the Rioters and their Victims," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Fifth Series* 6: 93-114.

comparison of where property was destroyed and where Catholics lived that the riots were primarily anti-Catholic, and that they were directed only against rich Catholics. The mobs had no intention of making general war on the 14,000 Catholics who lived in the metropolitan area. They limited their attacks to the priests and teachers and the rich. Generally, the mobs followed the pattern of pulling down the buildings and burning the wreckage in the streets. Fires spread only by accident. Rudé also asserts that the rioters rarely looted and plundered. They destroyed the wealth in the streets rather than carrying it off.

The Gordon Riots were the last primary riot directed against Catholics; and even so, only Catholics of influence were targets of the mob. Eleven years later the last great riot against the Dissenters occurred, in Birmingham. Like the Gordon Riots, this riot was not a reaction to any growing threat from Dissent, though the general hostility towards Dissenters had been exacerbated by their recent agitation for repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts.¹⁹ The riot against the Dissenters was called forth by a new fear of revolution, this time the political revolution taking place in France.

The riot began on the night of July 14, 1791, after the Birmingham Dissenters had held a public dinner to commemorate the fall of the Bastille two years before. For the next four days the mob handled Birmingham as they chose. The magistrates, at first unenthusiastic supporters of order, rushed bands of constables from one place to another but usually arrived after the mobs had left.

The major buildings destroyed included three meeting houses and fifteen private homes. Most of the latter were not just single

¹⁹ The Test and Corporation Acts dated from the reign of Charles II. They prohibited Dissenters from holding municipal offices, accepting civil or military offices under the crown, or sitting in Parliament without partaking of the Anglican communion. Though these acts were largely circumvented, the Dissenters bitterly resented them. Attempts to have them repealed had failed in 1787, 1788, and 1790.

family dwellings, but great multi-story estates. One owner later received £10,000 in damages.²⁰ The most famous dwelling destroyed was the house, irreplaceable library, and scientific laboratory of Dr. Joseph Priestly. One contemporary writer states that besides these great houses destroyed, perhaps 160 houses of lesser Dissenters were pulled down. Even if this writer exaggerates by 100 per cent, the loss was great. The only estimate of casualties comes from the same source: sixty killed and many more wounded.

The behavior of the mob fits the pattern that we have seen in the other great primary riots. Though there was some plundering, the main motive seems to have been indignation. The rioters carefully avoided setting fire to houses when this would threaten neighboring dwellings,²¹ and they left alone the Methodists and followers of the late Countess of Huntingdon who assured the mobs that they were for Church and King. Most of the destruction was directed against Dissenters and others who applauded the French Revolution. The mobs numbered about 2,000 hard core rioters, with an additional 8,000 on several occasions.²²

Significantly, the last primary riot directed against a religious minority, the Birmingham Dissenters, occurred when Englishmen were becoming aware of the threat which the doctrines of the French Revolution were posing to established institutions. The slogan of the rioters, "Church and King," was appropriate, as the Dissenters were seen to be a threat not only to the Anglican Church but also to the Monarchy. The last violent attack on an old danger had become intertwined with a new fear. But the riot was still clearly an attack by the forces of order against the elements of change.

²⁰ In all the claims for damages came to £35,095/13/6. The amount paid was £26,961/2/3.

²¹ Most of the large houses were fired, but they were fairly isolated dwellings. Only one threatened to catch a neighboring house on fire.

²² *An Authentic Account of the Riots in Birmingham, on the 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th Days of July, 1791 . . .* (Birmingham, 1791).

6. *An Era of New Issues*

The nearly twenty-five years of war against France and the rapid industrialization of England that marked the turn of the century altered this. The new conflicts in society no longer revolved around religion. It is interesting to note that Englishmen experienced a religious revival in the 19th century that in magnitude rivaled the Reformation of the 16th century. But Religion was no longer an issue which produced riots, Ireland excepted. Indeed, the 19th century saw even greater assaults on the privileged position of the Anglican Church. And valiant defenders rallied again and again to defend the "Church in Danger." But the mass of urban dwellers were no longer committed to this establishment, at least with sufficient zeal to riot in its defense. The issues which now called forth the violence of the populace were economic and political. And the mobs rioted in demand for change, not in opposition to it. The violence at Spa Fields and Peterloo, and at Bristol and Nottingham in 1831, were not in support of the establishment against a religious minority, but rather a blow from below against the establishment itself.

The new issues can be clearly seen in the biggest riot of the reform period, the Bristol riot of 1831. A fitting conclusion to this study of religious riots is a brief look at this great riot. The Birmingham riot of 1791 was the last urban riot of the old regime; the Bristol riot of 1831 was a typical riot of the modern age.

The riot, in support of the reform movement which would culminate in the Great Reform Bill of 1832, started on October 29, 1831, the day appointed for the opening of the Commissions of Assize in Bristol. Sir Charles Wetherell, an unflinching anti-reformer and M. P. for Bristol, was expected in Bristol to preside over the Commission in his capacity as Recorder of the city. The reformers hoped that the people of Bristol would give him some demonstration for the reform bill to prove their desire for reform. Everybody expected trouble: the magistrates had appealed to the Home Secretary for military protection, and the Political

Union (the reformers) had demanded that the magistrates resign if they could not keep order by themselves in their own town.

On Saturday morning, the 29th, Sir Charles arrived in Bristol. The magistrates had prepared thoroughly, and they succeeded in escorting him safely through the huge hostile crowds that had gathered along his route to the Guildhall. But such confusion reigned that Sir Charles was forced to adjourn the court till Monday. After the gentlemen had moved with some difficulty to the Mansion House, the mob, numbering 2000 or 3000, began pelting the building with stones. The constables beat them off, but that night they returned in larger numbers and drove the constables into the house. The soldiers that had been procured in case of trouble protected the Mansion House throughout the night, but in the city there was scattered fighting. The next morning the riots began in earnest with a vigorous attack that left the Mansion House in ruins. By afternoon smaller mobs were moving against new targets. Soon all the prisoners in Bristol had been liberated and their prisons burned. The reluctance of the soldiers to fire seemed to encourage destruction. By nightfall the toll houses, the Bishops Palace, and private dwellings of anti-reformers all over the city were being looted and burned. The rioters normally took out the plate, valuables, and furniture, then set fire to the house with torches and inflammable liquid. The customs houses went next. By Sunday night all of Queen's Square, one of the largest and most fashionable squares in the city, was in flames.

Before daybreak on Monday, numerous people were coming into the city to join the rioters, and plundering increased all over town. But in the afternoon, yeomanry from surrounding towns began to arrive, and in association with the regular troops started to clear the streets. The mounted troops charged repeatedly to break up the mobs while about 5000 citizens armed with staffs and badges stationed themselves at strategic points throughout the city to keep the mobs from regrouping. Gradually the

streets were cleared. By Monday night only the crackling of the still-burning buildings greeted the troops riding in from towns as far away as Plymouth. Even a frigate was ordered into the King's Road in Bristol Channel.

The destruction and loss of life was immense. Virtually the entire of Queen's Square, about 150 yards on a side, was consumed by fire, and throughout the last night six huge fires cast dancing light over the looting and fighting. Neither public nor private property, neither rich nor poor, were safe. The city looked like a sacked citadel. The fighting—which was not simply charges breaking up mobs, but repeated attacks against barricades—had taken many lives. Perhaps 500 died in the battles with the military or in the crashing, burning buildings. Many more were wounded. Though much property was later recovered, a parliamentary commission set the damage at £68,208/1/6. Five of the twenty-six rioters capitally convicted eventually died for their crimes. Many others finished their lives in Australia. During the days of the Bristol riots, riots also broke out at Dorchester, Derby, Bath (when a mob tried to keep troops from leaving for Bristol), and Nottingham (the Duke of Newcastle later received £21,000 for the burning of Nottingham Castle).²³

The difference between the Birmingham and Bristol rioters is obvious. The first rioted to shouts of Church and King, the second rioted to cries of Reform and King. The first rioted against change, and demonstrated discipline; the second rioted for change, and lacked discipline.

7. In Conclusion

In conclusion, it is clear that primary riots—religious or non-religious, and whatever the objective—were not the characteristic

²³ *The Bristol Riots, Their Causes, Progress, and Consequence*, by a Citizen (Bristol, 1832); *A Plain Account of the Riots at Bristol*, etc. (Bristol, 1831); John Latimer, *Annals of Bristol in the Nineteenth Century* (Bristol, 1887); *Bristol and Its Environs: Historical, Descriptive and Scientific* (London, 1875), p. 65; A. C. Wood, *A History of Nottinghamshire* (Nottingham, 1947), pp. 304-307; Roland Mainwaring, *Annals of Bath, From the Year 1800 to the Passing of the New Municipal Act*, etc. (Bath, 1838), p. 375.

forms of violence during the turbulent period of the Reformation. Secondary riots were frequent during that period. There were numerous rural disorders, even insurrections against royal authority, but the Tudors kept the cities under control. In the 17th century religious conflicts were the major cause of primary urban riots, indicating that religion was the major divisive issue in urban society. In every case the rioters committed their violence in support of the Anglican center against Puritans, (and later Dissenters) on the left and Catholics on the right. Moreover, in every case except for the "Mutiny" in London in 1848 when the Puritans controlled the government, the violence was disciplined; it was directed against specific targets, not against authority generally. This violence came to an end shortly after the Hanoverian succession which secured the safety of the Anglican Church. Thereafter, till the last quarter of the 18th century, economic and political questions were the cause of the great riots in English cities. Then in one last outburst, the mobs assaulted Catholics in 1780 and Dissenters in 1791, the rioters again demonstrating the discipline characteristic of their 17th-century predecessors.

These last riots marked the end of religion as an issue of such deep-rooted concern to the urban masses that it could trigger violent outbursts. Thereafter new issues, economic and political, occupied the attention of the English working class. With the growth of class consciousness the enemy was no longer religious minorities; rather, it was the established order itself, the authority that had been for 250 years so important to the mass of Englishmen as a bulwark against threats, real or imagined, from Catholics and Dissenters.

(Concluded)

ADAM IN ANCIENT MESOPOTAMIAN TRADITIONS

WILLIAM H. SHEA

Andrews University

Since the recovery and publication of texts from the Ancient Near East is a continuing endeavor, the materials already published need to be reexamined from time to time in the light of more recent information. The case in point for reexamination here is the Mesopotamian story of Adapa, which is noted for its parallel with the early chapters in Genesis as a reference to man's squandered opportunity for gaining immortality. Two new minor—but interesting—pieces of information relating to this parallel have come to light recently, one from linguistics and the other from further references to Adapa. Before turning to these additional details, however, I shall turn to the principal previously known sources utilized in the discussion that follows.

Four fragmentary cuneiform texts published between 1894 and 1930 provided the pieces of the puzzle necessary to put Adapa's story together. The longest of the four (B) was recovered from the only deposit of cuneiform tablets ever found in Egypt, the land of hieroglyphic writing. The unique archaeological context in which this tablet was found dates the form in which this portion of the story appears to the 14th century B.C. Three other fragments of the story (A, C, and D) were discovered during the excavations of Ashurbanipal's famous library at Nineveh, these copies thus dating to the 7th century B.C. or slightly earlier. The first of these three is the only fragment of the story preserved in poetry, and the last two were copied by the same scribe, according to the writing on the tablets. The most recent and readily available translation of the narrative reconstructed from these texts is found in J. B. Pritchard's standard reference work, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*.¹ An excellent summary of the story

¹ See *ANET*, 3d ed. (Princeton, 1969), pp. 101-103 for the story of Adapa.

by an Assyriologist appears in A. Heidel's paperback, *The Babylonian Genesis*.²

As the outline and details of this ancient hero's story have been clarified, comparisons with the Biblical story of Adam—both similarities and contrasts—have become evident. The literary category to which these two works belong is a general and convenient point of comparison from which to start. Not infrequently the story of Adapa is referred to as a myth. Like the epic of Gilgamesh, however, this narrative centers upon a human hero and his actions; hence it comes closer in character to epic than it does to myth, even though it contains mythological elements.³ The narratives in Genesis that deal with Adam have also been referred to as myths—sometimes in the pejorative sense, sometimes not. They too can be characterized more correctly as epic. As far as content is concerned, therefore, these two works belong to a similar literary genre, in the broader sense of the term. The difference between form and function should not be minimized, however, and that difference is one of the contrasts discussed below.

The principal parallels between the Adapa epic and the account of Adam's actions in Genesis are readily apparent. They are threefold in nature: (1) Both subjects underwent a test before the deity, and the test was based upon something they were to consume. (2) Both failed the test and thereby forfeited their opportunity for immortality. (3) As a result of their failure certain consequences passed upon mankind.

Even in such broadly similar features, though, there are elements that differ between the two stories. For example, the commodities for consumption in the two tests are different. Adapa was tested with bread and water while Adam and Eve were tested with the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

² The first Phoenix paperback ed. was published by the U. of Chicago Press in 1963. The first hardcover ed. of this work was published by the same press in 1942. See pp. 122-124 for Heidel's comments on the story of Adapa.

³ For a recent definition of these terms, see F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, 1973), p. viii.

Although this difference in detail is not striking, it is significant. Bread was a staple in the ancient world, and the grain from which it was produced was the principal crop of the Mesopotamian plain. In the Adapa epic this end-product of man's agricultural endeavor has been transferred to the realm of the gods where it was served, fittingly enough, to their earthly visitor. In Genesis, on the other hand, the food that served as the object of the test was a product of the garden of God in its pristine and primeval state as it came from the hand of the Creator.

The final sentence upon both subjects was the same: death. This sentence is even given in rather similar terms, but those terms have quite different meanings in their respective contexts. Anu told Adapa, "You shall not have life," and then commanded, "Take him away and return him to his earth." He obviously meant that Adapa had to descend from heaven to earth, his former residence. Adam was also told that he would return to his earth, but this referred to his interment in the earth and the consequences of such an interment. The different function this formal similarity serves in these sources could be called a functional shift by a student of comparative religion. Different conceptions of man's fate after death might account for such a shift; but this is merely a suggestion, and other explanations are possible.

The different consequences involved in the third major parallel emphasize the matter of function even more strongly than the elements of difference in the two preceding parallels. Adapa's failure resulted in the "ill he has brought upon mankind, and the disease he brought upon the bodies of men." This consequence is also implicit in the account of Adam's fall, but it is not explicitly stated in Gen 3. The emphasis there is rather upon difficulty in labor, both in the field and in childbirth, followed eventually by death. One would expect Adam's resistance to the inroads of disease might still be quite high so soon after he lost the freshness and vigor of eternal youth. This could be one reason why disease is less prominent as a consequence in the story

of his fall than it is in Adapa's, but the principal reason for the emphasis upon the ills of mankind as the specific consequence of Adapa's failure appears in the epilog to his epic.

The last five lines on the fourth and final tablet of the Adapa epic contain an incantation of Ninkarrak, the goddess of healing. In her exercise of this function Ninkarrak could either induce disease or bring about healing from disease. The negative side of her activity appears in the next-to-the-last curse upon those who disregard the stipulations of Hammurabi's famous code of laws.⁴ Here, a more favorable response from her was invoked on behalf of one already stricken, at least in the late Assyrian form of the text. Thus the ultimate origin of the sufferer's ailment in Adapa's failure is magically connected with the incantation by which it was to be removed. The explanation served to strengthen the efficacy of the spell. A similar connection can be found in the use of the creation myth in which the mother goddess was active to insure safe childbirth.⁵ Modern practitioners might limit the usefulness of such techniques to psychosomatic medicine, but the ancients considered them applicable to the whole gamut of human afflictions.

These examples illustrate the problem of functional shift the student of the religious thought of ancient Mesopotamia soon encounters in his search for parallels with Gen 1-11. Such episodes almost always appear in contexts quite distinct from those in which they occur in the Bible, a point too little emphasized in the discussion of such parallels.⁶ The flood story in the epic of Gilgamesh is related in connection with the search by Gilgamesh for an answer to the problem of death.⁷ The purpose of the present form of the creation myth known as *Enuma Elish* was not

⁴ *ANET*, p. 180.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.

⁶ A possible exception to this general rule is the flood story in the Atrahasis epic, which deserves a detailed examination that cannot be performed here. The primary sources necessary for such an examination are presented by W. G. Lambert in *Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Oxford, 1969).

⁷ *ANET*, pp. 72-73.

primarily to describe the creation of man but to explain and extol the supremacy of Marduk, the god of Babylon.⁸ The supposed parallel with the Tower of Babel, Enlil's corruption of the language of mankind, appears in connection with a political discussion of suzerainty between the king of Uruk and the lord of Aratta [Ararat].⁹ Functional shift occurs not only across cultures but also linearly within a single culture; i.e., the creation myth was used in different ways at different times within the same Mesopotamian culture continuum.

Gen 1-11 contrasts sharply with both the structure and function of such themes as they appear elsewhere in the Ancient Near East: in structure, because in Genesis they were collected and organized into one brief, coherent, and composite picture, whereas elsewhere they appear only as disparate pieces in different places at different times; in function, because this portion of the Bible was purposefully organized as the protohistory of mankind containing essentially all the major explanations of origins. In rather concrete and nonphilosophic terminology, Gen 1-11 describes the origin of the world of plants, animals, and man (chaps. 1-2); the entrance of sin and death (chap. 3); the flood that brought about the physical world as it now is (chaps. 6-8); the continuity of man before and after the flood (chaps. 4-5, 9-11); and the distribution of man (chap. 10), his languages (chap. 11a), and the faithful (chap. 11b) over the surface of the earth after the flood. Further discussion of the structure and function of Gen 1-11 would take us too far afield into literary criticism and the idea of history in the ancient world.¹⁰ Suffice

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.

⁹ S. N. Kramer, "The 'Babel of Tongues': A Sumerian Version," *JAOS* 88 (1968): 108-110.

¹⁰ The reader who may wish to pursue these subjects further is referred to W. G. Lambert, "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis," *JTS*, n.s., 16 (1965): 288-289; W. C. Kaiser, "The Literary Form of Genesis 1-11," in J. B. Payne, ed., *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* (Waco, Texas, 1970), pp. 48-49; R. C. Denton, ed., *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East* (New Haven, Conn., 1966), and H. Frankfort, et al., *Before Philosophy*, Penguin paperback ed. (Baltimore, 1966).

it to say simply that Gen 1-11 constitutes a truly remarkable literary, religious, and historiographic achievement in the context of the prephilosophic thought of the ancient world.

On the more mundane level of similarities between the stories of Adapa and Adam, two additional minor parallels might be mentioned before turning to the contrasts between the materials. The first of these is the matter of clothing, for both sources specifically mention two sets of garments. Before going up to heaven Adapa was told by Ea, the god of wisdom and of his city Eridu, to put on mourning clothes. These were for the purpose of ingratiating himself with the gods who served as the gatekeepers of heaven so they would intercede for him later. Then upon being ushered into the presence of the high god Anu, Adapa was offered not only bread and water but also new garments and oil with which to anoint himself. Following Ea's instructions Adapa accepted the new garments and the oil but rejected the bread and water of life. In the biblical account, Adam and Eve first made garments for themselves from fig leaves (Gen 3:7), but God subsequently clothed them with animal skins (Gen 3:21).

The gatekeeper gods who admitted Adapa to heaven are identified as Tammuz and Gizzida. Adapa appeared in mourning before them because they were no longer on earth, and in this way he gained their sympathy and support. In Gen 3:22 the gatekeepers of Eden on earth, not heaven, are identified as cherubim. The vowels added to the original consonants of this word by much later scribes make it into a simple plural. A slightly different vocalization would turn this word into a dual. This reading would yield a pair of cherubim guarding the garden gate. The Biblical view of the cherubim as servants of God, whether dual or plural, assigns them to a class of angels. Pairs of Assyrian *karibi* were also stationed at gates (of cities or temples), but Egyptian representations of such beings appear closer in form and function to the cherubim of the Bible than do the Assyrian ones.¹¹ Adapa's pair aided his cause by interceding

¹¹ For illustrations and discussion, see the entry on "Cherubim" in S. H.

with Anu on his behalf, while in Adam's case the cherubim served as guardians to prevent him from entering his Edenic home from which he had been expelled. The cherubim could also have served as a medium of communication between God and man, but it is difficult to see them interceding with God on man's behalf as the divine pair did in the case of Adapa.

The gatekeeper gods bring us to the most basic and obvious contrast between the two stories under consideration: the difference between the monotheism of the Bible and the polytheism of Mesopotamia. In Adapa's case the gods operate on four levels. Ea was one of the high gods, but in the Adapa epic he appears principally in his position as the god of Eridu and Adapa's patron. The gatekeeper gods function on an intermediate stage of action; then there is Ilabrat, the vizier of Anu, and finally the great high god himself. Each of these is characterized by different thoughts and actions in the case of Adapa, while the God of the Bible was the sole and sovereign ruler who dealt with Adam and Eve.

The polytheistic problem is most acute with Ea. He told Adapa to refuse the bread and water he would be offered when he got to heaven, because it was the bread and water of death, when actually it was the bread and water of life. Adapa followed his advice faithfully and lost his opportunity for a place among the gods and for immortality. The common evaluation of Ea's advice is that he deliberately deceived Adapa. This seems paradoxical, since Ea is commonly depicted as man's best friend. An alternative interpretation offered by a noted Sumerologist, S. N. Kramer, is that he deceived Adapa unwittingly.¹² The difficulty with this proposal is that Ea was the god of wisdom and that at the very juncture of the text where Ea gives Adapa his instructions, Ea is referred to as "he who knows what pertains to

Horn, ed. *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary* (Washington, 1960), pp. 188-190.

¹²S. N. Kramer, "Mythology of Sumer and Akkad," in S. N. Kramer, ed., *Mythologies of the Ancient World*, Anchor paperback ed. (Garden City, 1961), p. 125.

heaven." In either case, Adapa was obedient and was deceived by his god. This contrasts with Adam's situation: Adam's God made the choices and their consequences quite clear.

According to the text, it seems more likely that Ea deceived Adapa deliberately rather than unwittingly. The reason for this deception is not clear. Ea may have been loathe to lose such a devoted worshiper who provided for him so abundantly. The idea of friction in the pantheon may also be involved here, since Anu concluded, "Of the gods of heaven and earth, as many as there be, whoever gave such a command [as Ea to Adapa], so as to make his own command exceed the command of Anu?" If there is any Biblical parallel to Ea's actions, it would have to be with respect to the serpent's, not God's, activity. Knowledge (wisdom), or the lack of it, played a prominent part in the serpent's proposal to Eve. By inducing man to disobey God, the serpent also attempted "to make his own command exceed the command" of God. At any rate, the responsibility for the consequences issuing from Adapa's choice lay with Ea since he deceived Adapa while in the biblical account man bears that burden since he made his own free choice contrary to correct instructions.

The nature of man's offense also differs considerably between the two stories. Adapa was out in his boat catching fish for Ea's temple when the south wind, evidently on the Persian Gulf, overturned his boat and cast him into the sea. For this affront Adapa cursed the south wind, and his curse was sufficiently effective that it broke the wing of the wind so that the wind did not blow on the land for seven days. For this occurrence Adapa was summoned to answer before Anu. Adam and Eve, on the other hand, directly violated an express command of God, a violation that by the very nature of things transgressed several of the Ten Commandments. Adapa's offense, in essence, was that he upset the course of nature, while Adam's offense was moral in nature.

The scene of action in the Adapa epic also differs considerably

from that in Genesis. Of 130 lines of text on four tablets, slightly over half refer to what happened in heaven and a little less than half describe the course of events on earth. In Genesis, all of Adam's actions occur on earth. Thus the picture is that of Adapa receiving the royal summons to appear in the heavenly court in contrast to God's going in search of Adam. In one case man ascends to heaven while in the other God comes down from heaven. The latter picture conveys a more solicitous interest in man's welfare. In contrast to this interest, the great high god Anu laughed at Adapa when the latter refused the bread and water of life and lost his opportunity for immortality.

More similarities and contrasts could be drawn between these two works, but this sampling gives some idea of the more readily recognizable comparisons. From the Adapa epic we can turn now to other texts that mention this ancient hero. Cuneiform texts that mention the cities before the flood have been known for quite some time. The Sumerian king-list, in particular, lists eight extremely long-lived kings from the five antediluvian cities that held sway over men.¹³ Attempts have been made to match the names of these kings with those in the Sethite genealogy of Genesis 5, but such attempts have met with little success. One reason for this lack of success is that such an approach is an oversimplification of the Mesopotamian traditions about the antediluvians.

According to those traditions there was not one line of heroes before the flood but two. These two groups appear in cuneiform sources as a line of kings and a line of wise men. The Bible concurs with such a tradition in general by placing the Cainite genealogy of Gen 4 alongside the Sethite genealogy of Gen 5. Thus there are four lines for comparison, not just two, and the alternate lines in both sources have received less than their

¹³ *ANET*, pp. 265-266. The major commentator on the Sumerian king-list, T. Jacobsen, has suggested that the antediluvian section of the list originally was a separate piece. The subsequent discovery of a text with the antediluvian list alone confirms this. J. J. Finkelstein, "The Antediluvian Kings: A University of California Tablet," *JCS* 17 (1963): 39-40.

deserved attention. A comparison of these four lines cannot be carried out here, but the line of wise men should be noted in particular because of Adapa's significant position in it. W. W. Hallo has stressed this line of wise men in some recent studies, and these studies provide convenient sources of information for discussion of the subject.¹⁴

The texts available concur unanimously that Eridu was first in the line of the five cities that ruled before the flood. The names of the two kings who ruled at Eridu appear in order as Alulim and Alagar. The names of the wise men associated with Alulim and Alagar are Adapa and Uanduga, respectively. This locates Adapa as contemporaneous with the first king of the first antediluvian city, according to the tradition. In some studies of the parallels between the Adapa epic and Genesis published before this information became available, the objection was raised that the parallel was imprecise because there were men on earth before Adapa and therefore his offense against the gods could not have been the first committed by man.¹⁵ Such an objection is still technically correct, but it now carries less weight.

If questioned closely, a resident of ancient Sumer probably would have admitted that people lived on earth before the generation of Alulim and Adapa. Such a question misses the point somewhat, however, as the texts appear to indicate that the Sumerians believed that Alulim and Adapa belonged to the first *significant* generation of mankind. The reason for this lies in their political theology. Regardless of how the development took place, by the end of the Early Dynastic period kingship was firmly established as an integral and indispensable part of the Mesopotamian way of life.¹⁶ Subsequent political theology

¹⁴ W. W. Hallo, "Antediluvian Cities," *JCS* 23 (1970): 57-58; and W. W. Hallo and W. K. Simpson, *The Ancient Near East: A History* (New York, 1971), pp. 29-32. Lambert, p. 17, has noted that there is some variation in the order in which the antediluvian wise men appear in the texts in which they are attested. The order followed here is that adopted by Hallo.

¹⁵ See Heidel's work cited in n. 2, above; also M. F. Unger, *Archaeology and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1960), p. 42.

¹⁶ Hallo and Simpson, pp. 38-39. Lambert, p. 18, comments on this point:

shaped itself around that fact. Thus both in the beginning and after the flood, meaningful human activity began "when kingship was lowered from heaven . . ." ¹⁷ Kingship was one of the givens from the gods. Thus by being contemporaneous with the first earthly king, Adapa was in essence a *de facto* member of the first generation of mankind. This parallel with Adam may be added to the list of principal parallels with which this study began.

Passing reference should be made to the designation of Adapa as a wise man. The first fifteen lines of the epic extol his virtues, especially his wisdom. Such commendation of a nonroyal personage is exceptional in cuneiform literature. This emphasizes his position not only as the first but also the foremost among the antediluvian wise men. The number and nature of the references to Adapa also overshadow those of his fellow, King Alulim. While Adam is not specifically referred to as a wise man in Scripture, it would not be difficult to see how he could have acquired such a reputation. As the long-lived progenitor of mankind it seems only natural that he would also have been the first great instructor of his descendants, especially in communicating God's dealings with him to them.

Finally, there is the matter of the names, Adapa and Adam. One does not have to be a specialist in linguistics to see a basic similarity between them. The only significant difference occurs in the case of the fourth letter, the last consonant, *p* and *m* respectively. Phonologically speaking, *p* and *m*, along with *b* and *w*, fall into the same category of letters or sounds known as labials

"From Sumerian literature to Berossus it is everywhere assumed that the human race was at first and naturally barbarous. Civilization was a gift of the gods and that is the way to understand kingship coming down from heaven, as quoted above. The gods gave it as an institution for regulating society." These two stages of creation in the Mesopotamian view also provide an interesting contrast with the view of creation found in Genesis, although that difference is not prominent in comparing Adam with Adapa. While the gods of Mesopotamia first created brute man and later civilized him by giving him kingship, the creation in Genesis was "very good" from the beginning.

¹⁷ The phrase appears twice in the Sumerian king-list. *ANET*, p. 265.

in which the lips play a large part in pronunciation.¹⁸ It is clear from comparative studies of both ancient and modern languages that phonemes of the same type may interchange between languages and between dialects of the same language. The old Semitic word for the sun and the sun-god, *Shamas*'s (vocalized *Shemesh* in the Hebrew Bible), provides an excellent example of such an interchange that is directly relevant here. According to texts recovered from ancient Ugarit, this word was spelled and presumably spoken with a medial *-p-*, *Shapsh* (the vocalization is not entirely certain), in the Canaanite dialect in use at this site on the Syrian coast in the Late Bronze Age.

The interchange of labials that took place historically in the shift from *Shamash* to *Shapsh* is the same required for the development of *Adapa* from *Adam*. *B* sometimes served as an intermediate step in the development from *m* to *p*, but there is no direct evidence to indicate that it did in this case. The shift from *m* to *b* involves the loss of nasalization, and the loss of "voice" accounts for the exchange of *p* for *b*. Thus the changes necessary to go to *Adapa* from *Adam* are linguistically well known, and such a development is attested in the example cited above. Further examples could be culled from the appropriate lexicons.

The following development may be posited in the case under consideration here: *Adam* > *Adama* (> *Adaba*?) > *Adapa*. The phonological interchange could also have occurred in the opposite direction, but that possibility is less likely because nasalization is more often lost than gained. The final vowel presents no problem, as *Adam* appears in Hebrew with a final vowel letter as a noun meaning "ground, soil," and *Adapa* occurs without the final vowel in an unpublished syllabary text with the meaning of "man."¹⁹ The names *Adam* and *Adapa* can be equated with

¹⁸ For the linguistics involved here, see S. Moscati, ed., *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Wiesbaden, 1964), pp. 24-26.

¹⁹ *ANET*, p. 101.

minimal difficulty along well-known linguistic pathways, and this constitutes the fifth prominent parallel between these two sources.

The principal parallels between the story of Adam in Genesis and the Adapa epic can be summarized now by incorporating those that have come to light into the list of those that were known previously: (1) Both subjects underwent a test before the deity and the test was based upon something they were to consume. (2) Both failed the test and thereby forfeited their opportunity for immortality. (3) As a result of their failure, certain consequences passed upon mankind. (4) According to their respective sources both subjects qualify as members of the first generation of mankind. (5) Their names can be equated with minimal difficulty according to well-known linguistic phenomena.

The more parallels that accumulate between these stories, the closer the relationship between them appears. The question is, What is that relationship? Past studies on this and other parallels between Mesopotamian traditions and Genesis have tended to concentrate on the problem of transmission of the subject matter. The solution to this problem is limited by logic to one of three possibilities: (1) The residents of Mesopotamia borrowed from the Hebrews. (2) The Hebrews borrowed from Mesopotamia. (3) Both received such materials from a common source. Since Mesopotamian civilization antedated Israelite society, and since such stories circulated in that older civilization, few have given serious consideration to the possibility that the residents of Mesopotamia borrowed from the Hebrews. Scholars have generally made their choice between the remaining two possibilities upon the basis of the assumptions with which they approached these materials. Scholars who see a considerable degree of dependence upon Mesopotamian sources in the early chapters of Genesis attribute this to direct borrowing.²⁰ Conservative scholars have generally attributed such similarities to a common source.²¹

²⁰ E. Speiser, *Genesis* (Garden City, N.Y., 1964), pp. LV-LVII.

²¹ Unger, p. 37; I. M. Price, et al., *The Monuments and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, 1958), p. 127.

A. T. Clay, an Assyriologist who taught at Yale between 1910 and his death in 1925, nominated the Amorites as that common source.²² His proposal did not receive wide acceptance at the time he made it, but it is being examined again with renewed interest. The reasons for this renewed interest are threefold: (1) the recognition of western elements in eastern myths, especially in *Enuma Elish* and in the flood story of the Atrahasis epic;²³ (2) increasing recognition of the widespread extent of the Amorite migrations in the earliest part of the Middle Bronze Age;²⁴ (3) the common attribution of Abraham's migration to the same period.²⁵ As a part of the same process, though not necessarily an "Amorite" himself, Abraham could well have been the vehicle through which some of the information later incorporated into the early chapters of Genesis was conveyed.²⁶

The relation which these separate stories bear to the historicity of the original person and event involved deserves discussion also. Admittedly, it is difficult to argue for such historicity on the basis of the Mesopotamian tradition in view of the mythological elements it contains. It is of interest, however, that such a story

²² In *The Empire of the Amorites* (New Haven, 1919) and *The Early Civilization of the Amurru* (London, 1925).

²³ For West-Semitic elements in the Atrahasis epic, see W. F. Albright, "From the Patriarchs to Moses: I. From Abraham to Joseph," *BA* 36 (1973): 22-26. For similar elements in the Creation myth, see T. Jacobsen, "The Battle Between Marduk and Tiamat," *JAOs* 88 (1968): 104-108.

²⁴ This is the subject of considerable historical and archaeological study at the present time, and the literature on it is extensive. For an introduction to the subject and a brief bibliography, see Hallo and Simpson, pp. 71-72.

²⁵ This date for Abraham has been popularized especially by W. F. Albright and Nelson Glueck, and a significant number of scholars have followed them in that interpretation. Albright, pp. 15-18, gives Albright's last statement on this subject. Glueck's view developed through his surface archaeological research in the Negev and Trans-Jordan. The original reports of this research appear in several of the *Annals* of the American School of Oriental Research entitled *Explorations in Eastern Palestine*. They have been condensed in more popular form in *The Other Side of the Jordan* (New Haven, 1940) and *Rivers in the Desert* (New York, 1959). The dating of Abraham in Albright's Middle Bronze Age I is much debated at the present time, but a consideration of that controversy would take us too far afield from our purpose here.

²⁶ Even accepting Moses as the author of Gen 1-11 does not imply that he received all the information for those narratives by revelation *de novo*.

stems from the cradle of civilization and the place where writing began. As with the flood story, the closest parallel is also the earliest. In other words, it is possible to view these two separate sources as independent witnesses to a common event. If that is the case, then a functional shift has occurred in one direction or the other. Presuppositions again will color the explanations given for such a shift. Those who see the parallels involved as evidence that the Hebrews borrowed from Mesopotamia generally adopt the view that the biblical account has been demythologized or historicized.

The conservative commentator, on the other hand, can suggest that such a shift occurred in the Mesopotamian direction because of (1) the mythological elements the Mesopotamian version contains, (2) the function the Mesopotamian version serves in its currently known context, and (3) linguistic considerations that suggest the name Adapa is a secondary development from Adam, as noted above. None of these arguments is particularly convincing in and of itself, but taken together they contribute some support to the claim for the originality of the biblical account. While these lines of evidence do not constitute proof for the historicity of Gen 3, they are germane to the discussion of that problem, and it is of considerable interest that the name of the first human personage in biblical history has been recovered in a similar context from an extra-biblical source.

JOHN CALVIN AND THE BRETHERN OF THE COMMON LIFE: THE ROLE OF STRASSBURG

KENNETH A. STRAND
Andrews University

In an earlier issue of *AUSS*, I noted certain lines of influence by which ideals of the Brethren of the Common Life reached John Calvin early in his career in France, prior to his reform activities in Geneva.¹ This Brotherhood, a movement with whose schools both Desiderius Erasmus and Martin Luther had had direct contact, established no houses, schools, or dormitories in France. Nevertheless, Calvin there imbibed its influence in various ways, most notably during his stay at the College of Montaigu and through the Fabrisian circle of humanistic reformers.

But such contacts were neither the last nor the only means by which concepts and practices of this northern reform movement reached Calvin. In Strassburg, where the Geneva reformer made his home from 1538 to 1541 (for most of the duration between his First and Second Geneva periods) and where he pastored a group of French refugees and taught in the school system reorganized by Johann Sturm in 1538-39, he definitely felt the impact of ideals fostered by the Brotherhood. This was especially true with respect to matters of educational reform, and may have been true in other ways as well. It is the purpose of the present brief essay to outline some of the highlights of Strassburg's mediating role between the Brethren of the Common Life and Calvin.

1. *Sturm and Educational Reform*

Sturm's program of educational reform in Strassburg, instituted in the very year of Calvin's arrival, combined the various independent schools of the city into one system and utilized a "grade"

¹ See *AUSS* 13 (1975): 67-78.

or "class" structure in which students moved progressively to higher grades or classes according to their achievements. Sturm also introduced Greek into the curriculum and provided for specialization of subject matter at the two highest levels. His work along these lines has often been hailed as a pioneer achievement in the history of modern education, and the influence of that work on the system which Calvin introduced in establishing his famous Geneva Academy in 1558-59 is generally recognized.

What is often overlooked is that Sturm's educational "innovations" were really based on what he himself had learned by first-hand experience from the Brethren of the Common Life in Liège when he was exposed to their educational system during the years 1521 to 1524.² Indeed, he himself in a document dated February 24, 1538, makes this absolutely clear, for in outlining his plan for Strassburg education, he refers to the Liège pattern.³ And Liège, in turn, followed antecedents fostered, or at least influenced, by the Brotherhood, such as the school system in Deventer and John Cele's work in Zwolle.⁴

And what, precisely, was the Liège pattern to which Sturm made reference? What was it that he discovered as he attended the Brethren's school?

By 1515 the Brethren of the Common Life in Liège had been

² See esp. R. R. Post, *The Modern Devotion* (Leiden, 1968), pp. 558-567, for a treatment of the Liège Brethren and their school. In some respects, Post's work must be taken with caution for reasons indicated in my review article in *AUSS* 8 (1970): 65-76.

³ Post makes reference to this document in *The Modern Devotion*, p. 558. For the text and a more complete treatment see G. Bonet-Maury, *De opera scholastica fratrum vitae communis in Neerlandia* (Paris, 1889), pp. 89-95. Also of interest is the document outlining curriculum as given in Karl Engel, *Das Gründungsjahr des Strassburger Gymnasiums 1538-1539* ("Festschrift I," n.p., n.d.), pp. 139-140. A photostatic copy of this curricular outline has been provided in "Appendix A: 1538 Program of Sturm in Strashbourg," in Julia S. Henkel, *An Historical Study of the Educational Contributions of the Brethren of the Common Life* (Ph.D. Dissertation; University of Pittsburgh, 1962), pp. 236-237.

⁴ On the Deventer and Zwolle Brethren's educational interests and John Cele's activities, see esp. Albert Hyma, *The Brethren of the Common Life* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1950), pp. 115-116.

given control of all education in that city.⁵ This school had eight classes, and Sturm outlines the subjects taught in each. Reading, writing, and grammar were taught in the eighth, or lowest class. The ordinary university-preparatory or "gymnasium" type of instruction was given basically in classes 7 through 3. The top two classes furnished instruction similar to what might be found in university liberal arts courses, such as philosophy (Plato and Aristotle) and geometry (Euclid). Greek and rhetoric were additions to the curriculum beyond what was usual in the medieval schools. The latter two subjects were introduced at the "gymnasium" level, but continued to be taught through the 2d class. Theology was taught in the highest class.

It is not at all certain that the teaching of rhetoric at this level made its earliest appearance in Brethren-operated schools or in schools where the influence of the Brethren was significant; but it does seem that the addition of Greek to the curriculum was an innovation by the Brethren, at least in transalpine Europe. Instruction in Greek was in evidence, for example, under Alexander Hegius in Deventer before the end of the 15th century; and it seems also to have been taught in Zwolle by 1516 and in Gouda by 1521.⁶

The addition of theology as a subject at the highest level appears to be an innovation on the part of the Liège Brethren themselves. This is not to say that education generally was not religious. In that age it most certainly was, for the entire curriculum from first to last was pervaded by a basic religious concern; and particularly among the Brethren was such a religious concern in evidence. Moreover, the daily lives of students in Brethren schools or in Brethren dormitories were guided by a strong religious emphasis characterized by prayer and by the reading of Scripture and other religious literature.⁷ Nevertheless, the introduction of

⁵ For a succinct and good summary of the details (noted only very cursorily in the present essay), see Post, pp. 559-560.

⁶ See *ibid.*, p. 562.

⁷ The spiritual emphasis in Brethren houses and schools has been noted by Albert Hyma in several of his major works, including *The Brethren of the*

theology as a specific subject taught in a pre-university educational setting seems to have been an innovation by the Brethren in Liège.

The upper two classes in the Liège school provided for instruction in philosophy, geometry, law, and theology; and it is interesting to note that these are precisely the same subjects which Sturm built into the curriculum of the top two grades of his system in Strassburg. Furthermore, both Liège and Strassburg had basically an eight-grade pattern, with Greek and rhetoric introduced into the curriculum. The Strassburg plan actually refers to nine classes (in this respect somewhat similar to the Brethren's nine-grade school in Amersfoort); but the first or lowest class seems to have been a preliminary year, with the gymnasium proper beginning with the second class.⁸

Shortly before establishing his Geneva Academy, Calvin paid a return visit in 1556 to Strassburg where once again he had opportunity for first-hand observation of Sturm's educational system. Calvin's own institution utilized a nine-grade plan, wherein the training in the lowest seven classes paralleled the training traditionally given in the gymnasia.⁹ This lower division of the Academy was designated as the "schola privata." Each class in it was placed under a "regent"; but as a practical measure for actual instructional purposes, further subdivision into smaller

Common Life (see n. 4, above), and *The Christian Renaissance: A History of the "Devotio Moderna,"* 2d ed. (Hamden, Conn., 1965). In the latter publication the entire text of the original constitution of the Brethren of the Common Life at Deventer is given on pp. 441-474. This is an extremely valuable document which provides first-hand knowledge of the practices of the early Brethren.

⁸ See esp. Henkel, pp. 212-213. (On Amersfoort, see *ibid.*, pp. 68-69, 171-177; and W. van Rootselaar, *Amersfoort 777-1580* [Amersfoort, 1878], 2: 279, 354.) It seems that Sturm originally had in mind a 14-grade system, divided into nine lower classes and five upper classes; but this proposed 14-grade system he apparently never put into effect. What evidently is the main outline of its curricular content has been summarized by Hyma, *Christian Renaissance*, p. 296.

⁹ Williston Walker, *John Calvin: The Organiser of Reformed Protestantism (1509-1564)* (New York, 1908; reprint ed. with introductory bibliographical essay by John T. McNeill, 1969), pp. 365-366, gives a most useful summary, a few highlights of which are indicated herein.

groups seems to have been made. Annually there was a promotion, a sort of "graduation" of students from one class to the next. Interestingly enough, Greek was made part of the curriculum, as was the case in Liège and Strassburg.

The top two classes in Calvin's Geneva Academy were termed the "schola publica," and they provided specialized training. For these highest classes there were "public professors" of Greek, Hebrew, and Philosophy, with Calvin and Theodore Beza serving as teachers of Theology.

In total perspective, the schools of the Liège Brethren, of Sturm, and of Calvin bear striking resemblance to one another in organizational scheme and in curricular content. The similarities, particularly in the context of Calvin's well-recognized dependence upon Sturm and of Sturm's personally acknowledged use of the Liège pattern, indicate that Strassburg played a significant mediating role in impressing the Geneva Reformer with the educational ideals and practices of the Brotherhood of the Common Life.

Although this particular line of educational influence from the Brethren to Calvin is the clearest and the easiest to document, it may not have been the only manner in which the Brethren's educational concepts reached him in Strassburg. In Schlettstadt, Louis Dringenberg had begun as early as 1441 to teach according to ideals fostered by the Brethren in Deventer, where he had studied; and among products of the Schlettstadt school system were the humanist Jacob Wimpheling, who in 1501 founded a gymnasium in Strassburg, and Jerome Gebweiler, who in 1507 went to Strassburg to supervise reform of the cathedral school in the city. Moreover, when Sturm arrived in Strassburg in 1537, the two Latin schools were taught by Otto Brunfels and John Sapidus, further educators of the Schlettstadt tradition. Thus, earlier than Sturm's arrival, education in Strassburg had already been touched indirectly by influences emanating from the Brotherhood, though certainly the impact was not as sweeping as when

Sturm introduced changes based on his first-hand experience with the Brethren's school in Liège.¹⁰

2. *Bucer and Theological Concepts*

Other influences from the Brethren of the Common Life also reached Strassburg. For one thing, the important Strassburg reformer Martin Bucer had been a Dringenberg student in Schlettstadt.¹¹ Moreover, Bucer was profoundly influenced by the writings of Wessel Gansfort, a humanist who had spent most of the last two decades of his life (d. 1489) in close association with the Brethren in Deventer; and Bucer had also been led to a significant change in thinking by a personal visit of Hinne Rode, rector of the school of the Brethren in Utrecht. Indeed, it was Rode who was chiefly responsible for Bucer's adoption of the latter's well-known views on the Eucharist. Of the visit from Rode, which took place in November of 1524, the Strassburg Reformer himself has given the following account:

When the writings of Carlstadt appeared, I was forced to make an investigation. . . . I consulted Luther, who answered me in a friendly manner. . . . In the meantime there came to me a pious man, named John Rhodius. . . . Although he regards Luther as his teacher, he nevertheless owes at times more to Gansfort. I am amazed that we make so little of Gansfort.

This man Rhodius was my guest. He, with the Bible in his hands, discussed consubstantiation with me at great length. I defended Luther's view with all the force at my command, but soon noticed that I could not meet his arguments, and that one cannot maintain the view I sought to uphold, if one adheres to the Bible as the final authority. So I had to relinquish my own view on Christ's physical presence, although I was still in doubt as to the meaning of the words ["This is my body"]. Carlstadt, for more than one reason, could not satisfy me.¹²

It may be of interest to note that Carlstadt had very likely been influenced toward his views on the Lord's Supper by a brief document on the Eucharist written by Cornelius Hoen, an

¹⁰ On the role of Schlettstadt, and for information of the kind that is furnished in the present paragraph, see esp. Hyma, *Christian Renaissance*, pp. 284, 287-288.

¹¹ See *ibid.*, p. 287.

¹² As given in English translation by Albert Hyma, *Martin Luther and the Luther Film of 1953* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1957), pp. 186-187. For further details of the meeting between Hoen and Bucer, as well as for general background, see *ibid.*, pp. 181-190, and Hyma, *Christian Renaissance*, pp. 285-286.

earlier product of the Utrecht Brethren's school, of which Rode was rector. Rode apparently carried this document with him as he made his contacts, not only with Bucer in 1524, but also with Oecolampadius in Basel and with Zwingli in Zurich in 1523.¹³

As for Calvin, it is well known that his theological focus and church administrative insights were significantly sharpened through association with Bucer in Strassburg during the years 1538-1541, even though the basic direction and content of the Geneva Reformer's religious and church-organizational concepts had been developed earlier. As for Calvin's already keen interest in the Eucharist, this was augmented at this time, if his expanded attention to the subject in his second edition of the *Institutes* as well as the production of his *Small Treatise on the Holy Supper* can be taken as evidence.¹⁴ It has been suggested, as well, that Calvin's mature views on justification and on predestination were mediated to him through Bucer, who in turn had gained insights on these matters from northern reformers such as Gansfort and Rode.¹⁵ Indeed, one expert in the field has even declared that "Hinne Rode was more of a 'Calvinist' in 1520 than Calvin was in 1535!"¹⁶

3. In Conclusion

It may be well, in concluding, to reiterate a word of caution similar to that given in the previous essay; namely, that we

¹³ See Hyma, *Martin Luther*, pp. 185-186.

¹⁴ The *Petit Traicté de la Sainte Cene* was prepared in Strassburg, although it was not actually published until 1541, after Calvin's return to Geneva. Its place of publication was the latter city. Walker, p. 230, feels that in Calvin's attention to the Eucharist in his 2d edition of the *Institutes* (1539), as well as in the *Petit Traicté*, there is an irenic spirit; and the very language Walker uses in this regard cannot but make one conclude that somehow Calvin derived this conciliatory sort of attitude from Bucer. In a somewhat different vein, and in dealing with a broader sweep of religious practices and theological concepts, Hyma, *Christian Renaissance*, p. 287, indicates that in a number of particulars, Calvin took with him, when he left Strassburg in 1541, "the local [Strassburg] views." Among items which Hyma notes are such matters as church organization, the use of Psalms in the church service, church-state relations, justification by faith, the Eucharist, etc.

¹⁵ See Hyma, *Christian Renaissance*, pp. 282-288.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 286.

must take care not to overemphasize the role which the Brotherhood of the Common Life may have had in molding Calvin's religious thought and practice.¹⁷ Certainly Calvin absorbed numerous influences from many directions. Nevertheless, his stay at the Montaigu in Paris, his contact with the Fabrisian circle of reformers, and his association with Sturm and Bucer in Strassburg surely were among the more significant avenues through which ideals and concepts fostered by the Brethren of the Common Life did indeed reach him.

Perhaps the most striking, as well as the most clearly demonstrable, line of influence from this Brotherhood to him was that pertaining to educational reforms. Moreover, it was an area of activity that brought well-deserved recognition both to the Brethren themselves and to Calvin. The fame which the Brethren achieved as educators is quite aptly illustrated, for example, in a statement made by the Belgian Jesuit Miraeus about the middle of the 16th century: "Does not the Society of Jesus, following the example of the Brethren, open schools throughout the whole world?"¹⁸ Calvin, on the other hand, did not personally, of course, "open schools throughout the whole world"; but his Geneva Academy soon became "world famous," and its influence reached truly afar. To it and from it streamed a multitude of reform leaders and educators of various European countries—reform leaders and educators who not only carried with them Calvin's Protestant theology of Geneva, but who also fostered and disseminated various spiritual and educational ideals which had, in reality, come to Calvin from that northern reform movement known as the Brotherhood of the Common Life.¹⁹

¹⁷ See *AUSS* 13 (1975): 78.

¹⁸ Quoted in Marcel Godet, *La congrégation de Montaigu (1490-1580)* (Paris, 1912), p. 107, n. (continuation of n. 1, p. 106).

¹⁹ Walker, pp. 366-367, has a useful section on the impact which Calvin's Geneva Academy had from the very first. He points out that in its earliest three years, its students included Florent Chrestien, tutor of Henry IV of France; Thomas Bodley, founder of the Bodleian Library in Oxford; Francis Junius, of University of Leiden fame; and other individuals who have gained significant historical renown.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON CALVIN AND THE INFLUENCE OF
THE BRETHREN OF THE COMMON LIFE IN FRANCE

KENNETH A. STRAND

The foregoing article is the second (and concluding) one in my treatment of John Calvin in relationship to the Brethren of the Common Life. The earlier article, in *AUSS* 13 (Spring 1975): 67-78, dealt primarily with (1) the direct influence of the Brotherhood upon Calvin at the College of Montaigu, and (2) the Brotherhood's indirect influence on Calvin through the Fabrisian circle of humanists (including Lefèvre d'Étaples himself). Since the time when I prepared the manuscript for that first article, a valuable book dealing with Calvin's "spirituality" and the roots of that "spirituality" has appeared: Lucien Joseph Richard, *The Spirituality of John Calvin* (Atlanta, 1974). Because of the importance of this publication, brief attention to it will be given here, specifically in certain matters that relate to the theme of my own earlier article.

First of all, it should be noted that Richard's work takes basically the form of a theological analysis whereas my presentation was more historical in its emphasis. Richard not only deals with salient features of Calvin's thought, however, but also analyzes major thrusts of various forerunners, including the *Devotio Moderna* (of which the Brethren of the Common life formed a central component), Jean Gerson, Francesco Petrarch, Erasmus, and Lefèvre (pp. 12-77). His careful analysis does much toward uncovering—or at least toward pointing in the direction of—various strains of late medieval thought which informed Calvin's "spirituality."

With regard to the *Devotio Moderna*, Richard's summaries of the "inward" type of spirituality evidenced in works by early leaders and writers of the movement (see his pp. 13-39) are basically correct, and they provide a useful compendium for quick reference. Also, he properly acknowledges the influence of this movement in France (see pp. 32, 48-49).

His treatment of the *Devotio* is somewhat imbalanced, however, by his stress on the supposed "anti-intellectualism" and "asceticism" of that movement. His conclusions in this regard seem based largely on his analysis of a relatively few works of devotional type, with special emphasis on the Thomas à Kempis version of the *Imitation of Christ*

(which admittedly reflects the attitude which Richard discerns).¹ But was the "inwardness" of the *Devotio Moderna* really as anti-intellectual and as ascetic as Richard has assumed? Constitutions of early Brotherhoods, plus evidence regarding the Brethren's educational work and their book-copying and printing activities—these would seem to indicate otherwise.² One may wonder if Richard has not been unduly influenced by the monumental work of R. R. Post, *The Modern Devotion* (Leiden, 1968), which too tends to minimize the intellectual attitudes and activities of the Brethren.³

Richard seems to feel that an "Erasmian" humanistic influence in France brought theology and spirituality together there, whereas the *Devotio Moderna* had separated the two by its depreciation of the intellectual and theological.⁴ In this regard two important questions must be asked: (1) Was the Erasmian influence as great in France as

¹ Even the *Imitation* itself had appeared in earlier versions that were less anti-intellectual, ascetic, and monastically inclined. For an excellent discussion of this matter, see Albert Hyma, *The Brethren of the Common Life* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1950), pp. 145-194, and also Hyma's English translation of Book I of the *Imitation* as found in the Eutin manuscript: *The Imitation of Christ by Gerard Zerbolt of Zutphen* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1950).

² Michael Schoengen has published the early Zwolle constitution in his *Jacobus Traiecti alias de Voecht narratio . . .* (Amsterdam, 1908), pp. 239-273. More readily accessible is the Deventer constitution edited by A. Hyma and included in his *The Christian Renaissance: A History of the "Devotio Moderna"* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1924), pp. 440-474, and reprinted in K. A. Strand, ed., *The Dawn of Modern Civilization: Studies in Renaissance, Reformation and Other Topics Presented to Honor Albert Hyma* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1962, 1964), pp. 361-395 (hereafter cited as *Dawn*), as well as in the 2d ed., enlarged, of *The Christian Renaissance* (Hamden, Conn., 1965), pp. 440-474. The basic treatment of the educational work of the Brethren of the Common Life is Julia S. Henkel, *An Historical Study of the Educational Contributions of the Brethren of the Common Life* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1962); and she has also provided important highlights of this educational work in "School Organizational Patterns of the Brethren of the Common Life," in *Dawn*, pp. 323-338 (reprinted in K. A. Strand, ed., *Essays on the Northern Renaissance* [Ann Arbor, Mich., 1968], pp. 35-50). For a brief but rather comprehensive survey of the printing interests and activities of the Brethren, see my chapter "The Brethren of the Common Life and Fifteenth-Century Printing: A Brief Survey," in *Dawn*, pp. 341-355 (reprinted in *Essays on the Northern Renaissance*, pp. 51-64), and also cf. works cited therein.

³ See my review of Post in *AUSS* 8 (1970): 65-76.

⁴ Two striking quotations from Richard will suffice to illustrate the point: "It is in this new vision of theology that Erasmus' original contribution was made. It is here also that he differed most from the *Devotio Moderna*. Instead of abandoning theology as being a distraction to the spiritual life,

Richard assumes? (2) Was this influence so diametrically opposite to that of the Devotio?

Though admitting that Erasmus himself surely did make an important impact on French humanism, we may wonder whether that impact has not been overestimated by Richard—at least with respect to the earliest French humanists. First of all, the various early transalpine humanists tended to draw on *common sources*, such as Italian humanism, and *both* Erasmus and Lefèvre imbibed of influences from the Devotio Moderna as well (historical realities recognized by Richard). Second, there was interaction also among early Northern humanists themselves, whether Dutch, French, German, or English—but the process generally was indeed one of *interaction* rather than one-way borrowing (a matter evidently not so readily discerned by Richard). In any event, the following statement by Richard is quite jolting: “A majority of the French Humanists born around 1490 were Erasmians, men like Lefèvre d’Etaples, Guillaume Budé and others” (p. 57). Lefèvre was born about 1455 (if not earlier), and he had studied classics and had also visited Italy a number of years before Erasmus first began manifesting humanistic interests! And even Budé, born in 1467, was a young adult by 1490, as well as probably being slightly senior in age to Erasmus (if Erasmus was born in 1469, his more likely birth year than the alternatively suggested 1466).

The crucial question that needs attention here, however, is whether or not Richard is correct in his concept that Lefèvre, through Erasmus’s influence, worked to “breach the separation between theology and spirituality” (p. 70) *in contrast to* a separation which presumably the Devotio Moderna had made in this respect. Richard recognizes that Lefèvre was “deeply influenced by the *Devotio Moderna*” too, and he properly states that this fact has been “conclusively demonstrated by L. Salley [actually, C. Louise Salley]” (p. 69). But Salley’s work, called to attention in my earlier article, reveals that the Devotio Moderna nourished Lefèvre’s religious thought in *very much the same way* in which Richard declares that Erasmus did! It is unfortunate that Richard apparently had access only to the abstract of Salley’s Ph.D. dissertation, not to the dissertation itself, nor even to Salley’s extensive chapter in the Albert Hyma Festschrift

Erasmus integrated theology into it” (p. 67). “But although in continuity with the *Devotio Moderna* in many of its tenets, the spirituality of the French humanists differed from the *Devotio Moderna* in its most original contribution: its integration of the intellectual and spiritual life. This integration of theology and spirituality began under the influence of Erasmus and resulted in the elaboration of a *docta pietas*” (p. 73).

volume *The Dawn of Modern Civilization*.⁵ Moreover, if Richard had dealt more broadly with both Erasmus and the Devotio, the distinction which he has made between the influence of Erasmus and that of the Devotio would certainly be blurred, if not obliterated.⁶

The Northern humanists generally (including Erasmus) and the Devotio *both* looked back to ancient sources for religious thought as well as for practice, a fact rightly stressed by Richard for Erasmus but apparently not given due consideration by him for the Devotio. However, as far as purely *theological* interests are concerned, we may go a step further: Although both the humanists and the Brethren of the Common Life tended to decry finespun scholastic argumentation, the latter appear to have been more open toward scholastic theology than were the humanists, if the kinds of books used and disseminated by the Brethren may be used as any sort of criterion in this regard.⁷ And in the same connection, one may ponder also the fact that a staunch and conservative theologian Noel Beda, who attacked the Fabrisian reformers, could quite readily be the successor of his mentor Jean Standonck (a disciple of the Brethren of the Common Life) as head of the College of Montaigu. Would such a facile transition have been possible if Beda's predecessor had been a humanist of the

⁵ Her extensive chapter, "Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples: Heir of the Dutch Reformers of the Fifteenth Century," appears in *Dawn*, pp. 75-124.

⁶ Richard's analysis of Erasmus's thought, careful as this analysis is (see his pp. 57-69), rests too heavily on a rather limited range of that humanist's works, especially the *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* (important as that work certainly was in France); certain other major productions of Erasmus, such as the *Praise of Folly* and *Familiar Colloquies*, have been more or less bypassed. As for Richard's treatment of the Devotio Moderna, materials of the kind mentioned earlier in this "Additional Note" (see the references in n. 2, above) would have provided a more adequate and accurate perspective than was obtainable from his attention so exclusively to a limited number of works of devotional type.

Even his treatment of certain pioneer leaders of the Devotio who were responsible for some of these devotional works seems, however, to suffer somewhat too. For instance, Gerard Zerbolt of Zutphen (d. 1398), whose *De Reformatione Virium Animae* and *De Spiritualibus Ascensionibus* Richard summarizes quite fairly, surely deserves more recognition for scholarship than what Richard grants him. (Thomas à Kempis, e.g., wrote of Zerbolt in *Vita Ger. Sutph.*, par. 6, that the "scholars and great writers gave him high praise for his learning.")

⁷ See my chapter in *Dawn*, referred to in n. 2, above, and the sources called to attention in that chapter. Works by scholastic theologians, such as Anselm of Canterbury and Bonaventura, were among the kinds of books in which the Brethren of the Common Life took an interest.

"Erasmian" or "Fabrisian" sort? (Then too, there is the case of nominalist theologian Gabriel Biel, who was actually a leader of the Brethren in Upper-Rhenish Germany.⁸)

Finally, a word must be said about Richard's concluding remarks. He states that Calvin's spirituality "differed radically from the *Devotio Moderna* on three essential points: it was a spirituality of service within the world; it was accompanied by a new religious epistemology which made possible a reinterpretation of ecclesiological models and laid sound foundations for individualism in spirituality; and it asserted the inner unity of Christian life and theology" (p. 174). On all three counts, Calvin's spirituality was more similar to, than different from, the emphases of the *Devotio Moderna*. Especially in connection with the first of Richard's three "essential points" of difference, it may be pertinent to add here a fact aptly called to attention by Albert Hyma:

Unlike many of the monks, the Brethren of the Common Life, with rare exception, preferred a busy life of "good works" in the cities to peaceful meditation in the country. "We have decided," wrote the brethren at Zwolle in 1415, "to live in cities, in order that we may be able to give advice and instruction to clerics and other persons who wish to serve the Lord."

The foregoing analysis of Richard's publication is not intended to be a comprehensive review, nor should the questions I have raised be allowed to detract from the real worth of this book. I have dealt specifically with issues relating to the topic treated in my own article on the Brethren's possible impact on Calvin in France; and in this matter, Richard's work has failed to take into account several important matters. However, it is well to repeat here two cautions set forth in my original article: (1) the need to take care, in harmony with Salley's suggestion, not to consider Lefèvre as a "Protestant before the Reformation"; and (2) the necessity to remember, as I emphasized (reiterated also in my second article), that both "Lefèvre and Calvin were certainly influenced by factors from more than one direction," the latter's religious development being "especially complex."¹⁰

Richard's work is valuable in that it cuts new ground in the per-

⁸ William M. Landeen has treated Gabriel Biel in a number of publications. For a brief summary of pertinent information, see Landeen's article "Biel, Gabriel" in *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 1: 161-162.

⁹ A. Hyma, *Renaissance to Reformation* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1951), p. 131.

¹⁰ *AUSS* 13 (1975): 77-78.

spective from which it presents and analyzes various important aspects of Calvin's theology. But it is important too, as indicated earlier, in pointing toward some of the varied medieval backgrounds which informed and nurtured Calvin's "spirituality."¹¹ (A more general review of Richard's *The Spirituality of John Calvin* will appear in the "Book Reviews" section of a forthcoming issue of *AUSS*. This will take note particularly of several pertinent matters not dealt with in the foregoing discussion.)

¹¹ On p. 51, above, I have indicated the main "forerunners" mentioned by Richard. His analysis could probably well have been expanded to include Nicholas of Cusa (1401-64), whose work influenced Lefèvre; and in my own article too, perhaps at least a passing reference to this important cleric would have been appropriate.

Indeed, as early as 1490 Lefèvre was acquainted with Nicholas of Cusa's writings. The latter, in turn, had been influenced by the Brethren of the Common Life, having attended school in Deventer and also having had later contacts with the *Devotio Moderna*. Shortly before his death, he provided funds for the establishment of a dormitory in Deventer, where the pupils were to dress like the Brethren. See Hyma, *Christian Renaissance*, p. 262, for these and other details.

BRIEF NOTES

ZUR BEDEUTUNG VON צריח IN RI 9, 46.49

KARL JAROŠ

Linz, Austria

J. A. Soggin¹ hat zuletzt vermutet, dass man Migdal-Sichem ausserhalb der Stadt Sichem suchen muss,² d.h., dass Bet-Millo von Migdal-Sichem zu unterscheiden wäre. Eine Begründung für die Trennung von Migdal-Sichem und Bet-Millo ist die, dass man darauf hinweist, dass die archäologischen Grabungen in Sichem keine Krypta unterhalb des Tempels des El-berit nachweisen konnten.³ Doch diese Argumentation überzeugt nicht.

Das Targum⁴ übersetzt צריח nicht und interpretiert es auch nicht. J. Levi⁵ versteht צריח wohl im Sinne von "Turm."⁶ LXX A übersetzt mit *ἄχρωμα* "Festung," LXX B mit *συνέλευσις* "Zusammenkunft," Peschitta liest statt צריח vermutlich בריח,⁷ Vulgata übersetzt mit "turris." Die alten Uebersetzungen zeigen, dass man sich bei der Interpretation von צריח unsicher war, doch nie die Bedeutung "Untergeschoss" erwogen hatte.

Die Konkordanz kann zur Bedeutung des Wortes kaum etwas beitragen, da צריח ausser in Ri 9, 46.49 nur noch in 1 Sam 13, 6 vorkommt.

Vier Inschriften aus dem arabischen Raum können jedoch die Bedeutung von צריח aufhellen:

1) Zeile 1 der Inschrift vom Wādi Išé, *CIS*, 2, 1, Nr. 350, heisst es:

¹ *ZDPV* 83 (1967): 195.

² J. T. Milik, *RB* 66 (1959): 561: "Le seriah du temple de Ba'al Berit est une grotte aménagée dans la pente du mont Ebal." J. T. Milik deutet צריח in 3 Q 15 VII 11 und 3 Q 15 IX 4.7 als "hypogée" (cf. M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, R. de Vaux, *Les petites grottes de Qumran, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan*, 3 (Oxford, 1962): 237.

³ Archäologische Literatur über Sichem bei K. Jaroš, *Sichem: Eine archäologische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Jos 24*, *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 11 (Freiburg i. Schweiz und Göttingen, 1976).

⁴ Cf. A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, 2 (Leiden, 1959): 68.

⁵ *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim*, 3te Aufl., 1 (Leipzig, 1881): 336.

⁶ Cf. M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature*, 2 (London und New York, 1903): 1301.

⁷ Cf. E. Nielsen, *Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation* (Copenhagen, 1955), S. 164.

קברא דני רצ׳יחא רבא די בה רצ׳יחא זעיכא די ברא מנה די בה בת׳
מקבריך עבדח גוהיך.

“Hoc monumentum, et *conclave* magnum quod in eo est, et *conclave* parvum quod intus est et quae in isto sunt sepulchra, opus loculorum.”⁸

Ich meine, dass צ׳יח hier als Innenraum des Oberbaues eines Grabes am besten erklärt werden kann.⁹

2) In der Inschrift CIS, 2, 1, Nr. 213, kann צ׳יח wohl mit “cella” wiedergegeben werden.¹⁰

3) Zeile 1 und 2 einer nabatäischen Inschrift aus Petra, RÉS, 3, Nr. 1432, lautet: אצלח בר אצלח זי עבד אצלח בר אצלח
2 דנה צ׳יחא די עבד אצלח בר אצלח

“1 Jenes sind die Säle und die Cisterne, welche machte Ašlah, Sohn des Ašlah.”

“2 Dies ist der Saal, welchen machte Ašlah, Sohn des Ašlah.”

4) In einer anderen nabatäischen Inschrift (36 n. Chr.) heisst es:¹¹ ולארכססה חלחין חכיך מן כפרא רצ׳יחא

“und der Arioche zwei Drittel von der Grabhöhle und Kammer.”

Auf Grund dieses inschriftlichen Befundes komme ich zu der Überzeugung, dass צ׳יח primär eine *abgeschlossene-ingeschlossene Räumlichkeit* meint: dies kann ein gewöhnlicher Raum, eine Cella, der Oberbau eines Grabes und eine Grabkammer sein.¹²

Somit ist es höchstwahrscheinlich, dass die בעלי שכם in dem gewaltigen Tempel des El-berit (Tell Balata, Feld V) Schutz suchten. Es bieten sich dafür die Türme wie der Innenraum des Tempels an.¹³

⁸ CIS, 2, 1: 310. Cf. auch DISO, S. 247; J. T. Milik, *Recherches d'épigraphie proche-Orientale*, 1: *Dédicaces faites par des Dieux*, BHA 92 (Paris, 1972): 149.

⁹ Cf. z.B. AOB, S. 237-240.

¹⁰ Cf. auch DISO, S. 247.

¹¹ E. Euting, *Nabatäische Inschriften aus Arabien* (Berlin, 1885), Nr. 15, S. 53-55.

¹² Es ist auch noch darauf hinzuweisen, dass צ׳יח im äth. “Oberraum,” im sab. und arab. “Turm” heissen kann; cf. W. Gesenius, *Thesaurus . . . Linguae Hebraicae et Chaldaeae*, 2 (Leipzig 1835): 1186; W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, 12te Aufl. (Leipzig, 1895), S. 673; L. Köhler und W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden, 1953), S. 816; L. E. Toombs und G. E. Wright, *BASOR* 169 (1963): 30, n. 35; G. E. Wright, *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City* (New York und Toronto, 1965), S. 126-127; M. Höfner und A. Jamme, *Sabaean Inscriptions from Maḥram Bilqis (Mārib)* (Baltimore, 1962), S. 104.

¹³ Das Heiligtum von Sichem war vermutlich schon in kanaanäischer Zeit eine Asylstätte. Israel dürfte das Asylrecht von den Kanaanäern übernommen haben; cf. auch *Eretz Israel* 3 (1954): 135-146:

ב.דינור, דמותן הדרתית של עיר המקלט וטכס מזן ההסרת בהן

BENEDICTION AS A NT FORM

TERENCE Y. MULLINS
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

In his study of Pauline benedictions and doxologies, L. G. Champion classified these into three groups (to be noted below), but he did not establish a formula for either the benedictions or the doxologies.¹ Furthermore, although he related the origin of NT benedictions and doxologies to the LXX and synagogue worship, he did so on a thematic basis rather than exploring the path of literary relationship; and, in fact, the examples he cites from the LXX are mostly not benedictions at all, either in form or in theme.

The present study proposes, first of all, to elucidate a "benediction formula" which actually appears in the examples called to attention by Champion; and second, to examine whether Champion's statement that Christians adopted the expression "from the Septuagint or the synagogue"² applies to the structure of the formula itself.

1. *The NT Form*

Champion's *first group* is an "opening-type" statement, of which he says, "At the opening of each letter a wish is expressed."³ This statement is χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ in Rom 1:7, 1 Cor 1:3, 2 Cor 1:2, Gal 1:3, Eph 1:2,

¹ L. G. Champion, *Benedictions and Doxologies in the Epistles of Paul* (Oxford, 1934).

² *Ibid.*, p. 85. By way of contrast, Robert Jewett, "The Form and Function of the Homiletic Benediction," *ATR* 51 (1969): 22, locates the origin of the NT benediction in "some portion of Early Christian worship which was intrinsically flexible—such as the sermon." This certainly seems an interesting possibility to entertain, but I feel that the ultimate pattern of the NT benediction lies in the LXX and the immediate significance lies in its NT use. Jewett, too, sees possible LXX significance, saying, "The concentration of these optatives in benediction units may have been influenced by LXX usage, since the optative is used there mainly for wishes and blessings" (pp. 23-24).

³ Champion, p. 13.

Php 1:2, 2 Th 1:2, and Phm 3; it is χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν in Col 1:2; and it is χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη in 1 Th 1:1. His *second group* is a “closing-type” statement, of which he says, “At the end of each letter is a benediction, and these show greater variations.”⁴ He makes reference to the closing benedictions in Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, and Philemon. His *third group* is made up of what he refers to as “similar formulas . . . found in other parts of the Epistles,”⁵ and he calls attention to thirteen examples (three each in Romans, 1 Thessalonians, and 2 Thessalonians; two in Philippians; and one each in 2 Corinthians and Ephesians).

The three groups of statements called to attention by Champion all contain the same basic elements: *wish*, *divine source*, and *recipient*. One optional element occurs: *the addressee*. These elements appear in different orders, and consistency in the order may be used to identify or classify the form into “types.”

Champion’s first group (“opening-type” benediction) reveals the following order in Rom 1:7, 1 Cor 1:3, 2 Cor 1:2, Eph 1:2, Php 1:2, 2 Th 1:2, and Phm 3:

<i>wish</i>	/	<i>recipient</i>	/	<i>wish</i>	/	<i>divine source</i>
χάρις	/	ὑμῖν	/	καὶ εἰρήνη	/	ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν
						καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

Gal 1:3 has essentially the same statement, but ἡμῶν follows κυρίου, while Col 1:2 concludes with ἡμῶν, and 1 Th 1:1 concludes with εἰρήνη.

Champion’s second group (“closing-type” benediction) has the following order:

wish / *divine source* / *recipient*

The exact wording tends to vary slightly in the different examples. A few times an element is missing, as, e.g., lack of reference to the divine source in Col 4:18. The additional element of addressee, ἀδελφοί, is given in Gal 6:18.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid., p. 14.

Champion's third group may be called "intermediate-type" benedictions. These have several interesting features, none of which appears in all examples: (1) There is a tendency to sublimate the *wish* to the *divine source* so that instead of saying *the peace/of God/be with you*, it says, *the God/of peace/be with you*. Both grammatically and substantially there is a difference between these two statements, yet formally *peace* may be said to be the *wish* factor in each. (2) Another feature is the splitting up of the elements in this "intermediate type." For example, instead of all the *wish* being given at once, it will often be separated by other elements into two or more sections. One of the most fractured benedictions is 2 Th 3:5, where the order is *divine source/first wish/recipient/first wish (continued)/divine source/second wish/divine source*. (3) There is frequent use of the order *divine source/wish/recipient*. This order is present in simple pattern often enough that we may classify it as "sub-type A" of the "intermediate type." From Champion's list, Rom 15:33, 2 Cor 13:11, Php 4:9 and 1 Th 3:11 illustrate this sub-type A.

2. Benediction Form in the LXX

Although Champion did not establish a benediction formula and although the illustrations he has given from the LXX are mostly not benedictions at all, there are in the LXX benedictions which do show a clear structure. The three basic elements—*wish*, *divine source*, and *recipient*—are in evidence in these benedictions, and two optional items may also occur—the *addressee*, and the *reason for the blessing*.

There are three types identifiable by the order in which the basic elements appear, but these are not functionally different. The choice of one type rather than another seems largely a matter of style.

Type I presents the basic elements in the order *divine source/wish/recipient* and may be elaborated considerably. A simple example of this type is 2 Ki (2 Sam) 24:23:

<i>divine source</i>	/	<i>wish</i>	/	<i>recipient</i>
ὁ θεός σου	/	εὐλογήσαι	/	σε.

Type II presents the basic elements in the order *wish/recipient/divine source*. Again, this type may be elaborated with optional elements, with further description of the *wish* after the *divine source*, or with other ornamentation. A simple example of Type II is Ruth 2:4:

<i>wish</i>	/	<i>recipient</i>	/	<i>divine source</i>
εὐλογῆσαι	/	σε	/	κύριος

Probably the best known benediction in the OT is Num 6:24, which begins as a Type II benediction but exhibits, in verses 25 and 26, some interesting variations which probably represent a distinct Type III, with the order *wish/divine source/recipient*.⁶ This particular benediction thus consists of three distinct benedictions. Their structure is as follows:

<i>wish</i>	/	<i>recipient</i>	/	<i>divine source</i>
εὐλογῆσαι	/	σε	/	κύριος
καὶ φυλάξαι	/	σε,	/	

<i>wish</i>	/	<i>divine source</i>	/	<i>wish (continued)</i>	/	<i>recipient</i>
ἐπιφάναι	/	κύριος	/	τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ	/	ἐπὶ σε
			/	καὶ ἐλεῆσαι	/	σε,

<i>wish</i>	/	<i>divine source</i>	/	<i>wish (continued)</i>	/	<i>recipient</i>
ἐπάραι	/	κύριος	/	τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ	/	ἐπὶ σε
			/	καὶ εὖ	/	σοι
				εἰρήνην.		

3. Correspondence between the LXX and NT Types

That the LXX was used by first-century Christians is generally recognized, and it seems clear that the LXX benediction forms must have been familiar to the Christian writers and worshippers of that century. It is a matter of interest and importance, there-

⁶ Here, of course, I differ with Robert Jewett, who says of Num 6:24-26 (p. 31): "The form here is typically Hebraic, and the differences with New Testament formulas are so great that the possibility for formal influence would seem to be eliminated." The reason for our different conclusions lies

fore, to note that the following correlations exist between the several basic types of benedictions, as determined by the order in which the basic elements first appear:

<i>LXX Type</i>	<i>NT Type</i>	<i>Order of Basic Elements</i>
Type I	Intermediate Sub-Type A	Divine Source/Wish/Recipient
Type II	Opening Type	Wish/Recipient/Divine Source
Type III	Closing Type	Wish/Divine Source/Recipient

NT examples of Type I ("intermediate, sub-type A") are Rom 15:33, 2 Cor 13:11, Php 4:9, 2 Th 2:16, 17; also Rom 15: 5, 6, Rom 15:13, 1 Th 3:11, 1 Th 5:23, 2 Th 3:5, and 2 Th 3:16. Also qualifying on the basis of beginning with mention of the *divine source* would be Rom 16:20, 2 Tim 4:22, Heb 13:20, and 1 Pet 5:10.⁷

NT examples of Type II ("opening type") are those so designated by Champion and already indicated above; but in addition, the list may be expanded to include Eph 6:23, 2 Tim 1:18, 2 Tim 2:7, 2 Tim 4:18, and Rev 1:4. Additions to the Type-III ("closing type") benedictions listed by Champion are the following further NT examples: Php 4:7, 2 Tim 1:16, and Rev 22:21.

Two further points should also be mentioned here: (1) On surveying the NT benediction in light of the analysis of the LXX benediction, we find that five or six NT benedictions have the fifth element, the *reason*. These are Rom 15:5, 6, Rom 15:13, 1 Th 3:12, 2 Tim 1:16, Heb 13:20, and perhaps 2 Tim 1:18. (2) If we look for significant differences between the LXX benedictions and the NT benedictions, we find that the NT benediction is often a distinctive epistolographic form. This is especially true of the opening-type and closing-type benedictions, both of which are used in lieu of traditional elements of

in our meaning of "form." I see form in terms of the functional elements of a set formula; Jewett describes the form of the benediction in terms of colonmetric thought segments and strophes.

⁷ Here and in the following listings I go beyond Champion's data in the Pauline epistles, and I also include other NT materials.

the opening and closing forms. In any case, the use of the benediction in a letter is functionally different from its use in a narrative.

4. *Conclusion*

In conclusion it may be stated (1) that in the NT there is discernible a basic benediction form, differentiated into several "types" by the order in which the essential elements occur; (2) that the several types representing this form appear also in the LXX; and (3) that in view of early Christian use of the LXX, it seems reasonable to conclude that the NT form was patterned after that of the LXX, the OT used by the early Christian church. Thus Champion's opinion that the NT benediction derived "from the Septuagint or the synagogue" does apply to the structure of the formula itself.

BOOK REVIEWS

Beach, Bert Beverly. *Ecumenism—Boon or Bane?* Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1974. 314 pp. + 6 unnumbered pages of Index. \$8.95/\$6.95.

The author of *Vatican II: Bridging the Abyss* has brought us another publication in which his expertise in dealing with ecumenical affairs is fully manifested. In his Introduction to this new volume, the author suggests that the question in its title is a significant one which "the thinking Christian cannot ignore," and moreover, that a "simple 'boon' or 'bane' reply would be as meaningless as it would be deceptive" (p. 16). Some two dozen brief but information-packed chapters following the Introduction (which is a fairly lengthy chapter in itself) provide ample evidence of the correctness of both of the foregoing suggestions. Well qualified both as an historian and a first-hand observer and participant in various activities of the present-day "ecumenical movement," Beach traverses with ease and accuracy both the historical backgrounds and the current issues.

Five chapters ("Ecumenical—Past, Present, Prospect," "A Story of Division," "A Story of Fifteen Centuries of 'Unity,'" "The Church Becomes the Churches," and "Dressing the Ecumenical Soil") provide a necessary historical backdrop by tracing the concepts—and the historical realities (or unrealities)—of Christian unity and unification down through the centuries of the Christian era (pp. 23-82). Next follows a chapter entitled "The Ecumenical Tide Rolls In" (pp. 83-108), which traces the development of the modern ecumenical movement itself from the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910 up through the Bangkok Conference (the latest significant meeting at the time this book was written). Beach does go beyond this latter meeting by looking forward to, and briefly speculating about, a planned 1975 Djakarta fifth meeting of the Assembly of the World Council of Churches (which, incidentally, actually met in Nairobi, Kenya). The author's brief notations and evaluations regarding the theological and practical perspectives of such meetings of the World Assembly as Evanston 1954 and Uppsala 1968 are useful.

The next chapter, "Is Division Sin?" (pp. 109-115), deals with a central concept underlying ecumenism. In this chapter Beach analyzes the claim which is "frequently repeated in ecumenical literature that division is sin" (p. 109) and perceptively points out what ecumenists generally fail to note: "There is no doubt that spiritual division and spiritual alienation are sins, but organizational and ecclesiastical division is often simply a recognition of divisive heretical tendencies, apostasy, or immoral practices causing the already existing spiritual division. *Not separating* ("come out of her, my people") from such divisive influence and unspirituality could very well be sin" (p. 111).

The further chapters in this volume (a total of 17) treat various specific issues of vital concern in assessing the ecumenical movement, such as doc-

trinal softness, recent syncretistic tendencies, attenuation in evangelistic and missionary enterprise, socio-political emphasis, and "eschatological blindness." Each chapter is profusely documented with statements from authoritative writers (some of the striking cautions or expressions of concern come from leading spokesmen for the ecumenical movement itself). The author's familiarity with historical antecedents and with current trends in many parts of the world enable him to illustrate in an interesting, helpful, and authoritative way the various points that he makes. He indicates with fairness modern ecumenism's strengths and contributions, but also unflinchingly calls attention to its vulnerable points and weaknesses. And it is notable that throughout his discussion he repeatedly calls attention to the biblical perspective in relationship to the various issues with which he deals.

It is evident that this book by a Seventh-day Adventist church administrator in Northern Europe (he is currently executive secretary of the Northern Europe-West Africa Division of Seventh-day Adventists, with offices in St. Albans, England) is addressed primarily to Seventh-day Adventists, for it includes a set of "SDA Questions Regarding the WCC" (pp. 283-292); but this reviewer would hasten to add that in his opinion the book has great value for any interested reader, regardless of denominational affiliation. Its penetrating coverage of a wide array of relevant issues, carefully weighed and evaluated, provides a helpful review for the specialist and a comprehensive introduction for the layman in the field of ecumenical studies. A "Glossary of Terms" (pp. 293-296) will be of added help to the general reader. And the volume includes an extensive bibliography of works referred to (pp. 297-314), as well as an index (unnumbered pp. 315-320).

This book is particularly well written, and the author's flair for picturesque expression enhances the readability (as one example: "These statements or declarations [ecumenical statements or declarations analyzing world problems] almost invariably suffer from a kind of Biblical vitamin deficiency, causing eschatological anemia and Parousia blindness" [p. 197]). Perhaps the major fault of the book—if indeed it may be classified as a fault—is the fact that such a large number and array of authorities are quoted or referred to that it becomes difficult at times for the reader to keep in mind just who these individuals are and why they are important to the discussion. The name of W. A. Visser 't Hooft is undoubtedly so well known to the general reader as not to need identification, but the same may not be true about a multitude of less familiar figures. It should be stated, however, that the author has obviously endeavored to be helpful by what is an apparent attempt to identify persons whenever they are first mentioned in the text.

In conclusion, it may be reiterated that *Ecumenism—Boon or Bane?* presents a broad overview of both the historical backgrounds and the major current issues of concern with regard to the modern ecumenical movement. It has been written by an expert who approaches his subject from the biblical perspective, and who provides information and insights which should prove valuable to specialists and to laymen alike.

Beckmann, David M. *Eden Revival: Spiritual Churches in Ghana*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1975. 144 pp. Paperback, \$3.95.

If I were asked to select one of the many recent books that have been published on the independent church movement in Africa to give the general reader a feeling for both the extent and intensity of the movement, I would probably recommend *Eden Revival*.

Several reasons justify my selection. First of all, *Eden Revival* is not an anthropological or technical study, which is not to say that it is not scholarly or reliably grounded in fact. Scholarship has many dimensions; and the value of clear, penetrating description, based on thorough investigation and understanding, should not be minimized. From beginning to end it reads almost like a novel; and if some academicians should perchance feel it is a little lacking in social science analysis and theory, this is more than amply compensated for by the lucidity and clarity with which it portrays Eden Revival Church, its services, congregation, and leader.

The second reason for my selection is that it admirably fulfills two basic requirements for an introductory study. It combines a macroscopic study in historical dimension of the development and status of the spiritual church movement in Ghana with a microscopic study of Eden Revival Church. The survey section moves rapidly, yet does not fail to touch the main characters, events, movements, and mission background of the spiritual church movement. The reader feels adequately informed to commence a closer look at the Eden Revival Church when the end of this section has been reached. The section which deals specifically with Eden Revival Church rapidly and vividly tells the reader what he most wants to know about Eden: who the adherents are, why they come to Eden, how they worship, what the church teaches, how the collectivity is organized, and something about its finances and leader, Yeboa-Korie. It contains the most intimate and vivid character description of a spiritual church leader of which I am aware in the whole literature on the independent church movement in Africa. The intensity of the total picture is one of the things that make this book distinctive.

Beckmann concludes his study with a summary of the major characteristics of the spiritual church movement and enlarges upon its significance for the rest of Christianity. In doing so he notes some striking similarities, particularly a participatory style of worship service and methods of spiritual healing and exorcism, between the Ghanaian spiritual churches and some Pentecostal churches in the U.S.A. Beckmann also outlines his theory of a basic continuity between some aspects of trance in African traditional religion, African independent churches, and the phenomenon of glossolalia in Pentecostal churches. This brief section appears to be somewhat speculative and possibly even controversial. It is not intrinsic to the major thrust of his argument and might perhaps have been better relegated to a separate publication.

Certainly, Beckmann's insights regarding the significance of the spiritual church movement for the understanding of the future of Christianity, in Western society as well as Africa, are worth taking seriously; for it is no longer a peripheral development of peculiar interest to missionaries and specialists alone. It is an important expression of Christianity and has some-

thing to say to each of us. Nobody crystallizes this message more distinctly and compellingly than does Beckmann.

Andrews University

RUSSELL STAPLES

Beegle, Dewey M. *Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1973. 312 pp. Paperback, \$4.95.

Dewey M. Beegle's *Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility* is not just a revision of his *The Inspiration of Scripture* (1963). As even the new title might suggest, the present work is a thoroughly revised and expanded presentation of the same basic thesis, but with important inclusions. Seven of his original twelve chapters show major expansion, bringing the discussions up to date and filling out their coverage. Two original chapters are combined in the 1973 work. An entirely new chapter has been added (chap. 4), which deals with recognizable traditions in the biblical period. The remaining original chapters have been worked over to one degree or another.

In the main, the newly added material in *Scripture, Tradition, and Infallibility* addresses Roman Catholic discussions of inerrancy, tradition, and infallibility since Vatican II, in addition to the Protestant views. For readers not familiar with Beegle's earlier work, the purpose of both volumes is to bring evidence from many relevant areas to bear on the nature and operation of inspiration/revelation. Of special concern for him are concepts of biblical inerrancy which he feels are not only untrue to the claims of Scripture for itself, but may virtually block out some of the richness which God's word might otherwise bring to us.

Several points in this worthwhile volume merit probing. Beegle's view of Moses' inspiration seems to suffer from his general ambiguity about the nature of revelation. At Sinai, Moses combines a knowledge of Hittite suzerainty treaties with insight into Yahweh's sovereign care for Israel—and the result is the Ten Commandments (p. 35). A bit later in the book, however, Beegle suggests that the death of a Sabbath-breaker is directly decreed by God (p. 78); Moses is there reduced to a rather passive role. Inspiration is admittedly dynamic, and does in fact operate in a variety of ways in Scripture. But perhaps a more thorough inductive appraisal of those various ways would bring to view a more biblical concept of the divine in Scripture.

The distinction in Beegle between primary and secondary revelation is not altogether clear. Primary revelation appears to enjoy the distinction of superior originality (p. 71), though it is unclear who will judge this relative quality. Secondary revelations, on the other hand, "involve more of the rational activity of the channel of revelation" (p. 71). I am rather sure Beegle does *not* mean to imply that those elements in Scripture that are less rational are more inspired. He and I are both unsure how to distinguish between these two areas of revelation. The problem becomes acute, Beegle admits, if one tries to extract secondary revelation from the fabric of Scripture (p. 118). The subtleties of this admission should perhaps lead Beegle to drop or greatly down-play the distinction in the first place. At any rate,

the purpose of the two categories is not as clear within Scripture as it is in the relation between Scripture and later tradition.

I agree with Beegle that an everlasting suspension of judgment is not a satisfactory answer to some apparent problems posed by certain textual anomalies. However, there is something to be said for the clear realization that human conclusions based on human perception of data are intrinsically tentative.

As controversial as it once may have seemed, Beegle's book is an important contribution to the current discussion of inspiration in many circles. Its message will doubtless speak to many students of the Bible who have had difficulty squaring facts as they perceive them with the presupposition of an inerrant biblical record. His presentation of the nature of God's revelation will eventually constrain thoughtful persons to examine not just the inductive biblical evidence regarding inspiration, but ultimately their fundamental presuppositional stances concerning God's nature and his methods of self-disclosure. For us, often, the proper question is less "How *did* God reveal himself?" than "What method of self-revelation will my presuppositions sanction for God's use?"

Beegle rightly contends that while God could have totally preserved his revelation from error at every stage, by choosing fallible human media he in fact accepted the liabilities inherent in those instruments. God's purposes are presumably served by his choices. In this connection, Beegle's stress on the fact that Scripture does not specifically claim inerrancy for itself is significant. He properly disdains a doctrine of inspiration whose premises would permit apparent problems in the Bible to force the Christian back to unavailable autographs for a false religious security.

Berrien Springs, Mich.

LARRY MITCHEL

Berkouwer, Gerrit C. *Holy Scripture*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1975. 377 pp. \$8.95.

Thirteenth in the widely hailed series of *Studies in Dogmatics* by Amsterdam theologian Gerrit C. Berkouwer, this volume discusses the doctrine of Scripture with the overall scope and penetrating insight into theological issues that readers of earlier volumes have come to expect. It is a Reformed Christian doctrine of Scripture which the author articulates in discussion with a lengthy roster of noted thinkers from times past and present. Behind these theologians and systems stand the creeds and confessions; behind them the Bible itself, looming large as usual in Berkouwer's concern as a vital stream of revealed truth which gives theology its meaning.

As edited as well as translated by Jack B. Rogers, the book addresses itself essentially to non-specialists. The material of the original two-volume work, *De Heilige Schrift*, has been decreased by approximately one third. Berkouwer's central message regarding the nature and authority of Holy Scripture comes out clearly. The first four chapters tend to lay the groundwork for the contemporary interest in the authority and interpretation of the Bible. They

treat successively Scripture and the certainty of faith; the inner witness of the Spirit to the believer's acceptance of the written Word; the rise and meaning of the idea of a normative *canon* of Scripture in the Christian Church; and the interpretation of Scripture in accordance with its divine intent. The remaining nine chapters cope with issues linked to the confession that Scripture is "God-breathed," among others the nature of inspiration, historical relatedness and infallibility, the inscriptionation phenomenon, and the perspicuity, sufficiency and reliability of the Bible. "Holy Scripture and Preaching" precedes a final chapter where the Dutch theologian suggests guidelines to a scientific study of the Bible.

What we have here is a classic Reformed theology considered in a manner which is entirely up to date. For myself I found the discussion of the central place which the canonical aspect of Scriptures has been given in the Christian church, and of the manner in which the *human* instrument functioned in the God-breathed Scripture, to be of special interest. Others will no doubt find themselves looking to different chapters for explanation of some of the problems related to the issue of biblical authority.

One could wish, however, that more attention had been given to such developments in current Roman Catholic theology as the transition from a mechanical to a more "organic" understanding of the phenomenon of inspiration, and of its implications for Catholic exegesis. It would have been helpful, too, if Berkouwer had given more extensive treatment to the difficult issue as to whether the perspicuity-clarity element of Scripture is likely to slip essentially away from us as we find ourselves confronted with new questions and new problems. Has the author really answered the question by declaring that it depends essentially on one's definition of perspicuity (p. 297)?

In its eagerness to maintain Scripture's divinity, fundamentalism has usually not realized the significance of the Bible's human aspect. It is Berkouwer's merit to try to come to grips with the problem of whether attention to the human character of the Bible might not be of great importance for its correct understanding. His volume will doubtless stand for years as one of the most complete evangelical defenses of the full authority of the Bible, and help to carry the evangelical discussion on inspiration to a higher level.

Andrews University

RAOUL DEDEREN

Brueggemann, Walter, and Wolff, Hans Walter. *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975. 155 pp. Paperback, \$4.95.

This book is a collection of seven articles—three by Hans Walter Wolff and four by Walter Brueggemann. It is basically a theological analysis of the Pentateuchal traditions with reference to their present kerygmatic significance.

Brueggemann's introductory chapter reviews the history of Pentateuchal study with particular emphasis given to the work of four individuals: Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918), Hermann Gunkel (1862-1932), William Foxwell Albright (1891-1971), and Gerhard von Rad (1901-1971). The chief contribution

of each scholar is found in the type of question his particular approach inspired. With Wellhausen the concern was to determine the literary strand to which the text belonged. Gunkel was interested in the preliminary phase of the material, attempting to determine the life-setting from which the text came. Albright focused attention on historical questions. By means of archaeological excavations, and linguistic and philological studies, he sought to reclaim the historicity of the Pentateuchal narratives and to determine the uniqueness of Israelite faith. The questions raised by von Rad (and his followers) were theological in character and were developed from a form-critical perspective. He analyzed the ways in which the biblical traditions were reworked so as to express the normative faith of Israel in the face of new situations and challenges.

In chap. 2, Brueggemann explains the practical value that Wolff's kerygmatic approach has for OT study, suggesting a possible connection between the confessional stance of evangelical Christians in Germany during the Nazi rule and the protests of faithful Israel when it called into question the cultural values of its day. The four basic documents of the Pentateuch (JEDP) proposed by critical scholarship are understood as major attempts to proclaim Israel's faith in the face of crises (p. 32). Each of these "documents" is discussed separately in the next four chapters. The kerygma of the Yahwist, the Elohist and the Deuteronomistic Historical Work (DtrH.) are treated by Wolff in chaps. 3, 4, and 5 respectively. Brueggemann explores the kerygmatic forces of the priestly writers in chap. 6.

In the concluding chapter, Brueggemann makes a dispassionate plea—presumably to evangelicals—to distinguish between the question of literary authorship and that of theological legitimacy. In his opinion, the documentary hypothesis does not call into question the authority of the Bible, but simply expresses the process through which the literature came into being. A similar concern was advanced earlier by George Eldon Ladd in *The New Testament and Criticism* (1967). Aimed at conservative Protestants, Ladd's work proceeds from the thesis that "the Bible is the Word of God given in the words of men in history" (p. 12) and, consequently, cannot be adequately understood unless its historical origins are reconstructed by scientific means.

The reaction to criticism among evangelicals is a mixed one. Some opposition simply stems from an anti-intellectual bias deeply rooted in charismatic or Pentecostal traditions. Other negative responses arise from an anxiety over the loss of reverence for the Bible as the Word of God. Biblical criticism has acquired a monstrous image partly because of the negative results of scholarship in the past and partly due to the apathy among intellectuals towards pastoral concerns. When traditional views, once held in high esteem, are shattered, the church becomes disillusioned. Unless more positive results are forthcoming from critical studies, the disillusionment will lead to despair and ruin.

Critical exegesis must be linked with the homiletical task in order to bridge the chasm between the university and the church. The work of Brueggemann and Wolff represents such an effort. Their emphasis on a kerygmatic approach to the OT expresses a pastoral concern which is a step in the right direction. When ministers are adequately prepared to grasp the theological themes expressed in the Pentateuchal traditions, they will be able to proclaim God's

Word to the church in a fresh and vital way. While evangelicals will still be reluctant to embrace wholeheartedly the critical methodologies of Brueggemann and Wolff, they doubtless will follow with keen interest the direction that this approach will take.

Fletcher, N.C.

JOSEPH J. BATTISTONE

Carlston, Charles E. *The Parables of the Triple Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. xviii + 249 pp. \$11.95.

This is a redaction-critical study of the parables common to the Synoptic tradition. Previous critical approaches to the parables, those of Dodd and Jeremias, applied the form-critical method to determine what materials in the parables go back to Jesus himself and what may be attributable to the development within the Christian community. Carlston expressly states, in opposition to these, that he studies these parables not in themselves as part of the message of Jesus Christ but only as a part of the total text. This somewhat enigmatic statement is partly explained by the reason he gives for this, i.e., the temptation to rescue as much of the tradition as possible and to depreciate the contributions of the evangelists. The previous statement, however, is filled with hidden assumptions, i.e., that the form-critical approach neglects the rest of the text and that the contribution of the evangelists is necessarily substantial.

Carlston's method magnifies any differences noted between the particular Gospel being studied and its source and labors to find some theological significance in the change.

Three sections make up this book. The first deals with the Markan Parables in Matthew, the second with the Markan Parables in Luke, and the last chapter all the Markan Parables, not only those found in Matthew and Luke. The author indicates that this book is only a part of a larger work, presumably one dealing with all the parables, those in a dual tradition as well as those found only in one. It is understandable that this work should be limited to the parables of the triple tradition inasmuch as the author is doing a redaction-critical study. However, since he is not studying the parables in themselves but only as part of the total text, he should have given some rationale for limiting himself to this particular part of the tradition. In other words, if it is not for the message itself of the parables, why does he focus on them? Does he expect to find them to be more fruitful than narrative sections or non-parabolic sayings sections for redaction-critical study? If so, why?

Carlston, following his presuppositions, does a very careful analysis of the changes he sees being made by the evangelist. His discussion of Lk 5:36-39 may be taken as an example. When one compares Luke's version of this with Mark's, he will notice how awkward it is. Then Luke adds a somewhat ambiguous statement at the end: "And no one after drinking old wine desires new; for he says, 'The old is good.'" Carlston fairly gives three possible interpretations of Luke's passage based on the differences noted

above, then concludes that Luke "urges the incompatibility between the old and the new and at the same time insists on the superiority of the *old*" (p. 65). The reason this conclusion is reached may possibly be because the method tends to emphasize differences rather than similarities. Actually, Marcion's omission, even if he understood it in the sense given above, is not conclusive. Also the method attempts to relate these differences to the issues present at the time of the evangelists rather than at the time of Jesus. Carlston speculates that there could very well have been in existence some Christian innovators who were Marcionite in tendency and needed to be told that the old was also good. Because of the nature of the study, it emphasizes the creativity of the evangelist. In this case, he intentionally makes his text say the opposite of what Jesus actually said. In actuality the Lukan passage could very easily have been interpreted to mean that the old and new are incompatible and that it is difficult for people who are used to the old to change to the new, which of course is a fact of life.

A good example of the type of strata that are posited in the Gospels before they are fixed in the form known to us is given in Carlston's discussion of Mk 4:30-32, the parable of the mustard seed. The first stage is in the *Sitz im Leben* of Jesus when it emphasized the contrast between the small beginning and great ending. In the second stage the tree imagery suggests Dan 4, which was brought in to legitimize the entrance of the Gentiles into the Church. In the third stage we return to the first, when Mark again returns to the original emphasis. It is difficult to see how one can say that Mark returns to the original emphasis without changing any of the contents of the parable but by simply placing it before the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly. Also, without more explicit indications in Mark, it is not very clear to see the tree and its shade as representing a shelter for the Gentiles.

It is unfortunate that Carlston has not given a summary of each of its three sections showing the result of his redaction-critical study. The very purpose of his work to indicate the tendencies and theological emphases of each evangelist would have been well served by such summaries.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Conzelmann, Hans. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch; bibliography and references by James W. Dunkly; edited by George W. MacRae, S.J. *Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. xxii + 323 pp. \$19.95.

This is a translation of Conzelmann's commentary first published in 1969 as part of the Meyer series. English-reading students are fortunate in having this translation, and the attractive format of the series invites the reader to its contents. No doubt because of space limitations the exegesis is short, and full discussion is not possible. Too often the author must simply give his opinion without providing the full evidence necessary. Nevertheless, the

commentary is a model of conciseness in treating as it does the various problems of the book within the space limitations.

Space for footnotes has not been slighted. Fortunately, if the discussion in the text is short the reader can pursue it in the literature cited in the notes. Throughout there are also short excursuses.

In introductory matters, it is worthy of note that Conzelmann sees 1 Corinthians as a unity, though with chap. 13 he wavers. He is opposed to Schmithals' contention that Paul's opponents had a thoroughly worked-out mythological Gnosticism. Instead he considers them proto-Gnostics. He sees also behind all the parties one basic erroneous doctrine—the pneumatic Christology of exaltation. Against this Paul presents his theology of the cross, which destroys human wisdom and boasting. His opponents desire the exalted Christ without the crucified Christ. Another way in which Paul deals with those who think they already enjoy all the eschatological benefits is to point to the fact that the parousia and judgment are yet future and therefore the blessings are yet to come. This is what Conzelmann calls the "eschatological proviso." These two features appear again and again throughout the commentary.

Throughout, Conzelmann also provides interesting aphoristic statements such as "they are to look where 'nothing' is to be seen" in connection with 1:26; "holiness is not the goal of conduct, but its presupposition," in connection with 5:7; "freedom cannot cancel itself by making me unfree," in connection with 6:12.

In regards to certain "problem" passages, Conzelmann favors the uncertain view rather than the optimistic in 7:16 against Jeremias; spiritual betrothal in 7:38, *exousia* as protection against cosmic power in 11:10, vicarious baptism in 15:29.

The excellent bibliography, and the indices of biblical and nonbiblical citations, of subjects, and of modern authors enhance the value of this commentary.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Finegan, Jack. *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1974. 203 pp. \$10.00.

The unique feature of this approach to NT textual criticism by the noted professor of NT History and Archaeology at the Pacific School of Religion is suggested by the title and the subtitle, "A Working Introduction to Textual Criticism." But before introducing the student to a number of manuscript reproductions the author devotes a section to a large number of technical matters, and a second section to the history of the discipline known as textual criticism.

In the first section he deals with the materials on which ancient books were written and the forms these books took. Then he quite overwhelms the student with such technical matters of paleography as quires and folios, recto and verso, columns and ruling, opisthograph and palimpsest, punctuation, abbreviations, canons, prologues, colophons, stichometry, euthaliana, etc.

In less than 30 pages he then gives a history of textual criticism down to the production of modern critical editions of the Greek NT. There follows a systematic but concise list of the principal Greek manuscripts of the NT together with the location and date of each. For a list of the ancient versions, however, the student is referred elsewhere. The same is true for patristic writers, the third witness to the text of the NT.

The "encounter" with the Greek manuscripts in Part III is in the form of a first-hand contact with photographic reproductions of fragments or pages of manuscripts of the Gospel of John. As far as possible these reproductions are in or near the size of the original. Finegan has chosen manuscripts of John because that gospel is better represented by the papyri than is any other NT book.

Particular attention is given to the variants of Jn 1:3-4 and 1:18, and an attempt is made to develop some basic principles of textual criticism and to draw conclusions regarding the correct reading of these verses.

Some attention is then given to the reading of these verses in the Latin versions as represented by Jülicher's *Itala* and Wordsworth and White's critical edition of the Latin Vulgate. But no attempt is made to deal with individual Latin manuscripts or with any other version. This is one of the weaknesses of the book, but it is difficult to see how students could be introduced directly to the manuscripts of all the ancient versions. The language problem is insurmountable. It does appear, however, that a list of the available versions could be given, and that there could be a discussion of their values and the problems faced in their use.

Some attention is also given to the passages in Irenaeus and Origen in which Jn 1:3, 4 and 1:18 are quoted. Here again, a list of the more important patristic writers might be given together with a discussion of the special value of the evidence from them, and the problems faced in using them. In fairness, it must be said that some of this is brought out. The book closes with a statement regarding the future of the study.

Professor Finegan has written an interesting, lucid, and scholarly introduction to a complicated subject. He has made the study of NT manuscripts exciting and vital.

Loma Linda University
Loma Linda, Calif.

WALTER F. SPECHT

Francis, Fred O., and Sampley, J. Paul, eds. *Pauline Parallels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. ix + 388 pp. Paperback, \$10.95.

This comprehensive parallel of Paul's writings (ten epistles) will prove to be a useful tool for students of Paul. Each spread of two pages has ten columns, one for each of the epistles in canonical order. At a glance, one can see all the parallel passages in Paul's writings. These parallels have been chosen on the basis of similarities of language, images, and letter structure or form. The arrangement is such that each of the epistles stands in its entirety in canonical order. Thus Romans is given in its entirety with

its parallels, followed by 1 Corinthians, etc. The passages from the epistle which is given in its entirety are always placed within bold vertical lines. Parallels from the Acts and Pastoral Epistles, OT quotations and allusions, and textual variants are placed below these main parallels in smaller print.

A Table of Parallels is found at the beginning. It lists a short title for the section (called primary paragraph); then the verses in this section from the epistle are given, followed by the parallel sections from the rest of the nine epistles and the pages on which these are found.

There are two indexes in the back, one of the primary paragraphs and one of the Acts and Pastoral Epistles in Notes.

Anyone doing exegesis or theology of Paul's writings should refer to this useful tool.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Hayes, John H. *Son of God to Super Star: Twentieth-Century Interpretations of Jesus*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976. 255 pp. \$14.95/6.95.

According to the preface, "the purpose of this volume is to introduce the interested reader to a spectrum of twentieth-century interpretations of the historical Jesus" (p. 9). It is not a comprehensive survey but a representative selection, emphasizing especially the last twenty-five years. The author presents the views of those represented with extensive quotations.

After an introductory chapter providing the nineteenth-century background, Hayes presents Jesus as the Christ of Orthodoxy (David Smith, E. Stauffer), the Apocalyptic Visionary (Schweitzer), the Constant Contemporary (Barton, Enslin, Matthews), the Jew from Galilee (Klausner, Vermes), the Proclaimer Calling to Decision (Bultmann and the New Questers), the Messianic Suffering Servant (the mainstream of British and American scholars), the Political Revolutionary (Eisler, Brandon), the Black Messiah (Cleage) the Messianic Schemer (Schonfield), the Founder of a Secret Society (Morton Smith), the Qumran Essene (Edmund Wilson, A. Powell Davies, C. F. Potter), the Sexual Being (Montefiore, Phipps), and the Creation of the Early Church (Drews, Couchoud, Allegro).

A bibliography is presented for each chapter at the end of the book. It is unfortunate that the author did not present a critique of each of the views. He seems to be quite capable of doing it. At the least the bibliography could have included critiques of these positions.

While a careful reading of the books of the authors treated is necessary to grasp more fully and comprehensively their viewpoints, nevertheless this is a helpful introduction to the variety of positions held concerning Jesus in recent years. This, after all, is all that the author intended.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. xii + 426 pp. \$14.95.

Hanson's work represents a fascinating attempt to establish the roots of apocalyptic eschatology within the native Israelite prophetic tradition. Instead of viewing apocalyptic as a second-century foreign intruder, Hanson sees it as part of a continuum which begins with prophetic eschatology and develops into apocalyptic eschatology. The essential nature of apocalyptic is "found in the abandonment of the prophetic task of translating the vision of the divine council into historical terms" (p. 29). The historical and sociological matrix of apocalyptic is said to be found in the struggle between hierocrats and visionaries within the postexilic community.

The key to Hanson's interpretation is what he calls the "contextual-typological" method. The "context" is the hierocratic-visionary struggle which Hanson postulates, and to buttress his arguments he uses the typologies of poetic structure and meter, of prophetic oracle genres, and of the prophetic eschatology-apocalyptic eschatology continuum (p. 29).

The work of Weber, Mannheim, and Troeltsch in the area of sociology of religion forms the basis for outlining the sociological struggle within the postexilic community, though, surprisingly, the central role of these sociological studies is specifically delineated rather tardily (not beginning until p. 211). As Hanson reconstructs the scene, the Zadokite priesthood is seen as controlling the "official" religious life of the community, both during the exile and after. Ezek 40-48 is the restoration plan of the hierocrats with Haggai and Zech 1-8 containing hierocratic polemic against the visionaries who are the disciples of Second Isaiah and include disenfranchised non-Zadokite members of the community. The visionaries hold Isa 60-62 as a revival restoration plan, insisting that all the people, not just the Zadokites, should be priests (cf. Isa 60:21; 61:5-6). The polemic of these visionary democrats against the ruling hierocracy is to be found in the oracles of Third Isaiah and Zech 9-14, and it is here that apocalyptic eschatology develops, pointing increasingly to the cosmic instead of the historical as the realm of Yahweh's action as hopes fade for vindication and fulfillment in the present age.

For those who relish "ground-breaking" approaches to old problems, Hanson has provided a fascinating study. He argues his case thoroughly, even passionately, and the result is quite readable unless one gets bogged down in his structural-metrical analyses. Whether or not Hanson has proved his case, however, is another matter. One of the reasons why an innovative study such as Hanson's is possible is the paucity of material relating to the post-exilic era, and what little there is remains open to widely variant interpretations. Although Hanson wishes to avoid "extremely cautious" reconstructions (such as Ackroyd's *Exile and Restoration*), as well as "speculative" ones which go far beyond the evidence, he has probably erred on the side of speculation. But this is a readily excusable fault if the ensuing discussion proves productive.

One of the major questions that must be faced in evaluating this study is the viability of the "contextual-typological" method. The sociological context seems to have been established largely from the studies of Weber

and Mannheim rather than from firm, datable evidence in the documents themselves. Hanson clearly intends for the "typologies" of poetic meter and prophetic genres to corroborate his reconstruction, but here again the lack of clear historical allusions in the oracles and the absence of analogous dated models weaken the force of his argument. Furthermore, the dominant impression gained from the biblical documents interpreting the postexilic era is that there was hardly enough life in Yahwism to support cultic life at all, much less two rival groups. Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Ezra and Nehemiah all depict the cult in need of major revival; yet Hanson projects two rival groups, each with a plan for restoration and each vying with the other for domination.

A tantalizing aspect of this study is the relationship of Hanson's theological stance to his treatment of the biblical text. The issue is raised explicitly on pp. 259-260 where he draws a parallel between the strife-torn community of Israel and the modern religious person's experience. He concludes that "the religious life . . . involves struggle, and can even be characterized as a dialectic of faith" (p. 260). The final chapter (V) develops these implications more completely as an appeal is made to maintain the dialectic of faith. The extremes to be avoided are "a flat theology of expediency" on the one hand, and a "utopian theology of escape" on the other. Hanson sees the prophet Isaiah as approaching the ideal: vision is integrated into politics without losing its normative character (p. 410). This preference for the classical prophetic tradition is evident in numerous passages throughout the study, as is Hanson's negative posture towards "hierocrats." The apocalyptic visionaries, however, are depicted more as tragic figures who are mercilessly alienated from the community by a heavy-handed hierocratic establishment.

In short, this reviewer is intrigued by *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, but suspects that the influence of Weber-Mannheim-Troeltsch and Hanson's distinct preference for the classical prophets over oppressive hierocrats and escapist visionaries have perhaps unduly colored both his treatment of the text and his reconstruction of the postexilic era. Given the author's starting point, the work is brilliantly done, but its enduring worth remains to be established.

Walla Walla College
College Place, Wash.

ALDEN THOMPSON

Kelsey, David H. *The Use of Scripture in Recent Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. x + 227 pp. \$11.95.

The author is best known through his *The Fabric of Paul Tillich's Theology* (1967) and serves as Professor of Theology at Yale University. The volume under review is "a descriptive study of some of the methods some theologians employ in doing theology" (p. 4). In contrast to Langdon Gilkey's *Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language* (1969), which treats the "problem of method" of theology as the problem about the "sources, content, and criteria of theology as a form of thought" (p. 121), Kelsey's monograph is confined to seven case studies of what theologians have *said* about the authority of scripture compared with what they *do* with scripture

in actual practice. The seven case studies reflect the modern theological pluralism and are drawn from a number of "theological positions" all claiming in some way or other to be in harmony with the Bible. The stated aim is "to help prompt fresh insight into theological positions that have come to be anyway" (p. 7).

Four leading questions are put to each of the cases studied: (1) What aspect (s) of scripture is (are) taken to be authoritative? (2) What is it about this aspect of scripture that makes it authoritative? (3) What sort of logical force seems to be ascribed to the scripture to which appeal is made? (4) How is the scripture that is cited brought to bear on theological proposals so as to authorize them?

The staunch, capable defender of orthodoxy of the late 1880s and 1890s, B. B. Warfield, the Calvinist theologian of Princeton, is the first to whom the questions are put. His view on the plenary inspiration of the Bible as expounded in his famous essay on "The Church Doctrine of Inspiration," published in his *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (1948), is examined. For Warfield the content of the Bible is authoritative and the content is the Bible's doctrine which "biblical theology" puts into "one consistent system." In Kelsey's view this is "a kind of biblical positivism" (p. 23). The University of Frankfurt theologian H. W. Bartsch uses a much more recent version of "biblical theology" which Kelsey calls "biblical concept theology" because it deals with one or more interrelated concepts. For Bartsch the concept of reconciliation communicates peace. The demise of this approach is described, according to the author (p. 31 n. 24), by B. S. Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (1970). Both Warfield and Bartsch, although they differ radically on their view of inspiration, hold that the Bible is authoritative because of some intrinsic *property* of the biblical text.

In contrast to this "biblical concept theology" of "classical Protestant orthodoxy, current 'evangelical' theology, and pre-Vatican II Roman Catholic theology" stand in opposition to all the others that "understand 'authority' functionally, i.e., as a function of the role played by biblical writings in the life of the church when it serves as a means by which we are related to revelation" (pp. 29-30). G. E. Wright's influential study *God Who Acts* (1952), in which he emphasizes that the Bible is "recital, in which Biblical man confesses his faith by reciting the formative events of history as the redemptive handiwork of God" (p. 38), is contrasted with K. Barth's famous discussion of the humanity of Jesus Christ (*Church Dogmatics*, Vol. 4, Pt. 2). Both Wright and Barth employ narratives to authorize theological proposals; the former *directly*, the latter *indirectly*, by providing rules guiding what a theologian says today.

The last three theologians, L. S. Thornton, P. Tillich, and R. Bultmann, are grouped together because for them the authoritative aspect of scripture is neither its doctrinal (Warfield) and conceptual (Bartsch) content nor its recital (Wright) and narrative (Barth), but its "images" (Thornton) or "symbols" (Tillich) or "myths" (Bultmann). The "images," "symbols," or "myths" signal the occurrence of the revelatory event. Scripture is a collection of such revelatory occurrences that men have expressed verbally in concrete iconic ways. Scripture is important not because it provides a set of factors accessible to a historian or because it tells a story, but because by "expressing" in "images" or "symbols" or "myths" the occurrence of the revelatory,

saving events, it somehow links us with those events. Kelsey reacts to Tillich: "Why insist that saving events today depend in any way on Jesus? . . . If there is no connection between what is said (with only indirect appeal to scripture) about making human life whole today and what is said (with direct appeal to scripture) about the person of Jesus, then Christology would seem to have become logically dispensable for contemporary Christian theology" (p. 74). And to Bultmann's view that the revelatory, saving event is located in the subjectivity of the man of faith it is countered that Bultmann opens himself to the objection "that he thereby systematically distorts an obvious and central feature of most canonical scripture" (p. 84). Kelsey sees L. Gilkey and P. Ricoeur using scripture in the manner of Tillich.

The second part of this tome deals with the issue of "authority." It is argued that there is no single concept of authority, but that there are rather a number of related but importantly different concepts. Kelsey's proposals concerning scriptural authority for theology involve analyses about the relations among the concepts "church," "tradition," "scripture," and "theology."

This is a rich book. No one can lay it aside without being stimulated in a variety of ways. It is an exposé of neo-orthodox theology's achievements and failures. The most crucial question any reader will ask, if he is eager to transcend the limits of a theology conditioned by modern culture, is, Where do we go from here? That question begs for an answer.

Andrews University

GERHARD F. HASEL

Kubo, Sakae, and Specht, Walter. *So Many Versions?* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1975. 244 pp. \$5.95/2.95.

With so many new versions of the Bible (over 100 so far this century) confronting the English reader today, a book to aid in their appraisal and selection is especially appropriate. The task of furnishing such an aid is carried out in the present volume with the thoroughness and care that have come to be expected of Kubo and Specht.

In an introductory statement, significant trends in twentieth-century Bible translations are observed. Three are outstanding: (1) Abandonment of the KJV tradition in the "official" Bibles, (2) the almost complete dominance of the use of the best Greek text in the NT, and (3) incorporation of the principles of linguistics. The continued appearance of new translations is said to be necessary because of the discovery of older and better manuscripts, an improved understanding of the original languages, and the constant changes occurring in the English language itself.

Next the authors proceed to their primary purpose of providing a fairly comprehensive and detailed evaluation of 20 or so of the most important English versions. These include the RSV, Phillips', The Modern Language Bible, The Living Bible, The Jerusalem Bible, Today's English Version, The NEB, The New American Standard Bible, and the New International Version, among others. Generally a full chapter is given to each version so that the book reads somewhat like a series of book reviews. Kubo and

Specht do a commendable job of ferreting out the idiosyncracies of each version, and they supply numerous examples to help the reader gain a feeling for the text. Indeed, the quotations cited are sometimes more than adequate, tending to break the flow of thought. Attention is given to such details as grammar, punctuation, format, and chapter divisions. One of the most helpful features is the background information included describing why the the version was prepared and under what circumstances. Both assets and liabilities are observed for each, with the most telling criticism directed against those based on less than the best text (e.g. Knox), or those taking excessive liberties in translation (e.g. The Living Bible). Generally, criticism seems even-handed and justified and is always extended respectfully.

It is not clear to what readership the volume is directed. If for the educated layman, perhaps more attention should have been given to appropriate background information, as for example a brief general history of the English Bible, and also perhaps to the definition of a few somewhat technical terms employed such as "autograph," "Western" text, and "emendation."

A concluding chapter provides specific guidelines for selecting a version. Three primary criteria are proposed and discussed: (1) The underlying text, (2) accuracy in translation, and (3) the quality of the English employed. To the question which version is best, the authors supply this perceptive answer: "Perhaps no one version will be sufficient for today. This may well be an age when multiple versions are needed. If one asks, 'Which version is best?' we need to add the questions, 'Best for whom' and 'Best for what?'" (p. 201).

In addition to a bibliography, an annotated list of twentieth-century English translations arranged in chronological order is supplied in an appendix, further enhancing the value of this already very useful study. Indeed, this is no doubt the best treatment of the subject available today, although almost certainly not the last, for as Kubo and Specht rightly observe, "No translation of the Bible can ever be considered final. Translations must keep pace with the growth in biblical scholarship and the changes in language" (p. 14). Thus new translations will require new evaluations.

Walla Walla College
College Place, Wash.

D. MALCOLM MAXWELL

McGavran, Donald. *The Clash between Christianity and Cultures*. Washington, D.C.: Canon, 1974. 83 pp. Paperback, \$1.75.

McGavran has written many books on mission in which he has made outstanding contributions to thinking about mission theory and practice. Years ago he was one of the early writers to advocate that the evangelical goal of individual conversions should be broadened to include the possibility of bringing entire communities to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The scope of his research and writing is amazingly broad and ranges from mission work among primitives to principles of church growth in modern urban communities. At the same time, his outlook is staunchly evangelical; and not infrequently we find him in the thick of the battle, defending the case for

evangelical missions against those who advocate a less Gospel-centered style of mission.

In this book we find McGavran at work on two fronts. As the title of the book suggests, he deals in the first instance with the very important matter of the relationship of the Gospel to the culture of the local people. His very important second concern is that the essentials of the Gospel be preserved intact in the process of cross-cultural communication. Along the way, he makes the point that the Bible can be taught to, and understood by, primitive people.

In the first two chapters McGavran outlines problems in connection with the task of teaching the truth of Jesus Christ in such a way that Christianity is authentically understood and experienced in local cultural forms. He illustrates the difficulties inherent in the process by describing less-than-happy solutions historically adopted by the Church in its mission experience. The third chapter describes four specific aspects of the Gospel/culture conflict and affirms that the sources of tension are usually located in a core complex of cultural components. Christianity can be abstracted into several components for analytical purposes; and if this is done, it becomes clear that the hub of the Gospel/culture tensions is located in the central core of those things that are believed. Thus the insightful missionary need not be overly perturbed or confused regarding peripheral phenomena. He should be able to get to the core of the differences at the center of both systems. The solutions to these problems are developed in the two final chapters and flow smoothly from the earlier analysis. McGavran's suggestions, reduced to their simplest form, advocate that the missionary take a firm stand on the essentials of the Gospel as revealed in the Scripture and also an appreciative and high view of the local culture. As a result, the essentials of the Gospel are protected from distortion, and the local culture is protected from needless change. Flexibility is advocated in peripheral matters. The book is, of course, much richer than this bare outline suggests, and both practicing missionaries and those interested in the missionary work of the church will find time spent studying it rewarding.

Some aspects of the book seem to detract from its worthy purposes and noteworthy contributions. The book deals with weighty and serious issues in mission, which unfortunately appear in places to be almost trivialized by exaggeration and polemic. There also seems to be room for further development of both the anthropological and theological analyses presented. Closer attention to these details would make the book more useful to missionaries.

But I must not fault McGavran for a book he may not have intended to write. Perhaps he intended to be polemical and make a case for a certain approach to mission rather than dealing exhaustively with important basic problems in mission. It would seem to this reviewer that either of the above aims would be better served if they were separated from one another and the subject matter appropriate to each handled in different ways in different publications.

Morris, Leon. *Apocalyptic*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1974. 105 pp. Paperback, \$1.95.

It is always a welcome occasion when a useful tool is updated and reprinted. This new edition of Morris's handy little work on ancient apocalyptic literature is no exception. The considerable strength (and some weakness) mentioned in my review of the original edition of 1972 still remains (see *AUSS* 12 [1974]: 150).

Actually, few changes have been made in the original text other than some reorganization of the material, plus the addition of a new chapter: "Apocalyptic and the Old Testament" (pp. 75-84). This chapter fills a lacuna, and aptly treats Daniel, Isa 24-27, Ezek 38-39, Joel, and Zech 9-14. Morris takes account of differing opinions as to whether or not the aforementioned materials are truly apocalyptic, and he opts for a position which seems to place them as being somewhat intermediary between full-fledged Jewish apocalyptic and the earlier OT prophetic and wisdom literature. One might suspect that had Paul D. Hanson's recent extensive study *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia, 1975) been available to Morris, he would have found it useful for further development of his thesis; but it does seem strange that in this new chapter he has failed to mention Hanson's earlier studies that were available to him—especially the one in *Int* 25 (1971):454-479, from which he has quoted in another context (on p. 66 in both editions). Perhaps even more puzzling is the fact that Morris uses Hanson in that other context for the purpose of characterizing the historical perspective of apocalyptic as illustrated in *Daniel* (!), whereas in this new chapter Morris seems confident that Daniel's "essence" is other than apocalyptic (see pp. 80-81)!

Like its forerunner, this enlarged edition of *Apocalyptic* is indeed a useful compendium. The addition of a bibliography (pp. 102-105), lacking in the first edition, enhances further the value of the present publication. And happily, the new book comes at no increase in price!

Andrews University

KENNETH A. STRAND

Perrin, Norman. *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. 225 pp. \$10.95.

The author focuses on two major interrelated aspects of the teaching of Jesus—the kingdom of God and the parables. The whole message of Jesus is directed to the kingdom, and the major theme of the parables is the kingdom. In this work the author is not interested in the historical study of these *per se* but concentrates rather on the hermeneutical understanding of kingdom and parable. For this the method he employs is chiefly literary criticism.

Understanding myth as a complex of stories which men regard as "demonstrations of the inner meaning of the universe and of human life" (p. 22) and symbol as "a relatively stable and repeatable element of perceptual experience, standing for some larger meaning or set of meanings which cannot be given, or not fully given, in perceptual experience itself" (p. 29),

Perrin interprets the kingdom of God as a symbol which evokes the myth of a God who is creator, sustainer, and redeemer. A symbol can have a one-to-one relationship to what it represents (a steno-symbol), or it can have a set of meanings which singly or together cannot exhaust its meaning (tensive symbol). Previous interpretations of the kingdom understood it as a conception or steno-symbol representing only one meaning, but a study of Jesus' statement on the kingdom shows that it should be understood as a tensive symbol, according to Perrin. As such, no one apprehension of the reality it represents exhausts its meaning. In Jesus' teachings of the kingdom, Perrin sees a "pattern which has as its center the claim to mediate an experience of God as king, an experience of such an order that it brings [the] world to an end" (p. 54).

The second half of the book presents a history of parable interpretation dealing mainly with Jeremias, the representatives of the new hermeneutics, and the Americans Funk, Crossan, and Via, who represent the new emphasis on literary criticism. Perrin puts most of his emphasis on the last group. The inspiration in looking at the NT on the basis of literary criticism comes from Amos Wilder, who is at home both in the Bible and the world of literature. From the standpoint of hermeneutics, Perrin thinks that Robert Funk has made an important breakthrough in seeing a parable as a metaphor rather than a simile. The difference between *like* and *is* Funk sees as more than a grammatical distinction—one of essential function. "In a simile 'the less known is clarified by the better known,' but in a metaphor 'two discrete and not entirely comparable elements' are juxtaposed, and this juxtaposition 'produces an impact upon the imagination and induces a vision of that which cannot be conveyed by prosaic or discursive speech'" (p. 135). The parables as metaphors are creative of meaning; they induce imagination with its potential for new meaning depending on how the hearer hears. The hearer then becomes an important element in the understanding of the parable. Although the original meaning is important, "the interpreter of the parables must always be aware of the potentiality for new meaning; reduction of the meaning of the parable to a single idea, moral, eschatological, or Christological is therefore wrong" (p. 137).

Funk saw the parable as metaphor; Via's contribution was to discuss the parable from the point of view of an extended metaphor or narrative and to analyze it as a story with plot, protagonist, and recognition scene. However, his conclusions from the standpoint of meaning do not advance much beyond Jülicher. Crossan sees the parables as poetic metaphors which if seen as such can make an impact upon us by opening up a new world and unforeseen possibilities (*advent*), by reversing our entire past (*reversal*), and by leading to *action* in living this new way.

The SBL Parables Seminar attempted to use structuralism as a new way of understanding parables, but this approach did not prove fruitful.

The reviewer can agree that the kingdom is a tensive symbol, but feels that Perrin has left the meaning too vague and subjective. The kingdom as present and future can be considered as a tensive symbol. It can be allowed that the kingdom can have other meanings, but surely the traditional understanding need not be given up.

It is implied that a plurality of meanings is possible. I doubt whether we can allow uncontrolled imagination to run wild with new meanings. While

new applications of the meaning of a parable are possible, new meanings, e.g. of the Parable of the Good Samaritan, are difficult to come by except through new approaches and methods which may not be acceptable.

It seems to me that in understanding the parable as metaphor there is great gain, but something is lost in the meaning of words when it is stated that even if it is described in a form of a simile it is a metaphor (p. 196). It is claimed that the function rather than the form is determinative. If this is true, then it cannot be limited to the parable itself. Many other forms of literature open up new potentialities of meaning.

This detailed historical survey of modern investigations of the kingdom and the parables is to be applauded, especially since the one who directs us in the survey is one who has been intimately connected with their discussion. It is a delight to read Perrin because of his expertise and incisiveness in laying bare the issues. He is very frank in indicating where he differs from the writer under discussion and even where he feels that he himself was in error previously. The book shows some evidence of having been written in haste and suffers in some places from lack of careful organization.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Roetzel, Calvin J. *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975. viii + 114 pp. Paperback, \$4.95.

The aim of the book is to provide the beginning student with information relative to the background and setting of Paul's epistles, with particular emphasis given to the conversational character and tone of the letters. The discussion, insofar as it has to do with specific letters, is confined to those epistles "whose authenticity is not seriously questioned" (p. 82), namely, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, the Corinthian correspondence, Galatians, Romans, Philippians, and Philemon. Unfortunately, the author does not review the arguments traditionally advanced against the Pauline authorship of Ephesians, Colossians, and the Pastoral Epistles. A brief summary of the evidence would have been helpful to the beginner (see, for example, William G. Doty, *Letters in Primitive Christianity* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973], pp. 69-70).

In his introduction, Roetzel relates in capsule form and in a somewhat amusing way "contrary impressions" individuals have had of Paul. The main part of the book is divided into six chapters which treat respectively the social and cultural background of Paul and of his readers (pp. 6-16), the literary form and structure of the epistles (pp. 17-28), the traditions behind the letters (pp. 29-37), the conversational nature of Paul's writings (pp. 38-68), Paul's use of mythological language (pp. 69-80), and basic issues which governed the course of Pauline studies from the second century of the Christian era to the present (pp. 81-102).

The central questions treated in an introduction are in the main dealt with in a concise and a nontechnical way. There are a few instances, however, where the author has hedged in discussing issues of a more complex nature, and consequently has left the reader somewhat bewildered. Specifically I have in mind chap. 5, "Paul and His Myths." Roetzel makes a distinction between

myth and metaphor, and then concludes: "No definition of myth will entirely do" (p. 69). We are sympathetic with the definitional difficulties to which the author calls attention, but at the same time we are left wondering why he insists on using the word *myth* to describe Paul's language and conceptual world after having failed to define myth adequately.

In his treatment of Paul's references to demons, principalities and powers, Roetzel exhibits the same tendency to hedge or write ambiguously. We are told, for example, that science has "ostensibly freed us" from superstitious belief in the reality of demons, that "our scientific better judgments" can no longer allow us to accept the existence of a personal Devil (p. 75), and that our understanding of world reality might lead us to take offense at Paul's views of personalized evil (p. 76). At the same time, he suggests that Paul's beliefs do not arise out of fear and ignorance (pp. 75-76), but may well express a profound and highly original understanding of human existence (p. 69). What Roetzel appears to have branded as superstition (p. 75), moreover, becomes, in his thinking, comprehensible in the light of the Nazi treatment of the Jews and of the racial hatred exhibited in the world today (p. 76).

One additional example deserves attention. In the concluding paragraph of the book, the author suggests that Paul might well have opposed the canonization of his letters, but then proceeds to soften this opinion with a positive assessment of Paul's contribution. We may seriously question whether a reader, after having carefully analyzed the language and thought of the Apostle, particularly as exhibited in the letter to the Galatians, could "easily imagine that Paul would be embarrassed . . . if not horrified that his personal letters were canonized as Scripture" (p. 102). Despite Roetzel's efforts to emphasize the importance of Paul's writings, we are left in doubt as to their authoritative value for faith and practice.

These criticisms should not obscure the good features of the book. Of particular value for students are the chapters dealing with Paul's use of traditions and the conversational style of the letters.

In conclusion, we call attention to printing errors which have escaped the notice of the proofreader: p. 20, "Writing a church" should read "Writing to a church"; p. 54, "then" should be changed to "that"; p. 81, "the" should be inserted before "gospel"; and on the back cover, "fo" should read "of."

Fletcher, N.C.

JOSEPH J. BATTISTONE

Running, Leona Glidden, and Freedman, David Noel. *William Foxwell Albright—A Twentieth Century Genius*. New York: The Two Continents Publishing Group, Ltd./Morgan, 1975. xiii + 447 pp., frontispiece. \$15.00.

This biography is a work of love, produced by two of Albright's former pupils, of whom the first named was also for longer and shorter periods his scholarly assistant during the last years of his life. The life story of this greatest biblical archaeologist of modern times is based on data obtained from his voluminous published works, from numerous interviews with

relatives, colleagues and friends, and from the rich private correspondence to which the authors had access.

The book follows Albright's life from his birth in Chile as the son of poor missionaries, who learned to read at the age of two and then became physically handicapped until his death at the age of 80 as one of the most renowned scholars of our time, and on whom honors were showered like confetti—30 honorary doctor's degrees, several *Festschriften*, medals of merit, honorary citizenship in Jerusalem, and others.

After Albright's move to America we meet him as a poor boy and elementary school teacher in the Midwest, and then as a student at The Johns Hopkins University, from where he went to Palestine as a fellow of The American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. Soon he became the director of that institution, and very quickly he became known in the world of orientalists through his prolific writing in the fields of Egyptology, Assyriology, archaeology, epigraphy, Bible, and related subjects. The recent bibliography of his published works lists about 1,100 items, consisting of books, articles, contributions in other men's books, and book reviews.

During the decade that Albright lived in Jerusalem he also conducted several archaeological expeditions, especially at Gibeah of Saul, Bethel, and Tell Beit Mirsim (perhaps biblical Kiryath-sepher). In these he broke new ground in the systematic and stratigraphic excavations of ancient Palestinian mounds. He also put Palestinian pottery chronology on a secure scientific basis, on which all present pottery experts of Palestine and Jordan stand. In addition to this he was a pioneer in many other areas of archaeology and related fields, such as the vocalization of ancient Egyptian and the decipherment of the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions, and made major contributions to our understanding of Ugaritic alphabetic cuneiform texts and the Amarna tablets. Every new discovery, such as that of the Dead Sea Scrolls, drew his attention and caused him to produce major contributions to their understanding by means of articles or books. But he also created books of synthesis in the field of ancient history, archaeology and religion, most of which have been translated into many languages. Of these I shall mention only his *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (first published 1940), *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (first published 1946), *The Archaeology of Palestine* (first published 1949), and *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (1968). He even ventured into fields which others would have considered to be outside his competency, such as problems of cultural influence of the Orient on the Hellenistic world and vice versa, and the study of NT problems as evidenced by his commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, co-authored with Stephen Mann, which came out in 1971 in the *Anchor Bible* series edited by Albright and Freedman.

One aspect of Albright's life should not go unmentioned: his willingness to change his mind or views, expressed even in writing, if the evidence convinced him that such changes were warranted. Numerous examples of such changes can be cited, but the most notable of them took place in his attitude toward the Bible. When he arrived in Jerusalem he was an ultra-liberal biblical scholar, but his exploratory and archaeological work resulted in his becoming a much more conservative believer and a staunch defender of the historical parts of the OT.

The book under review presents a full and reliable picture of the great

man, who is missed by all his former students and friends, among whom also this reviewer is included.

A few inaccuracies noticed in reading the book can easily be corrected by the reader. P. 196: A. Biran was not the director of the Rockefeller Museum; he was, at the time when the book was written, the director of the Department of Antiquities of Israel, whose office was in the Rockefeller Museum (the director of the Museum was, and still is, L. Y. Rahmani). P. 261: The three Dead Sea Scrolls exhibited in the Library of Congress in October 1949 were the complete Isaiah scroll, the Commentary on Habakkuk, and the Manual of Discipline, which were at that time still in the possession of the Syrian Archbishop Athanasius Yeshue Samuel (see *BASOR*, No. 115 [Oct. 1949], p. 2). P. 266: It was not J. A. Fitzmyer who gave the name "The Genesis Apocryphon" to the fourth scroll of Cave I, but its first editors N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, while Fitzmyer would have favored rather the title "The Book of the Patriarchs," suggested first by B. Mazar (see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I* [Rome, 1966], pp. 4-5). P. 272: Nasser did not close the Suez Canal but nationalized it; this caused the 1956 war, with the result that the canal became inoperable. P. 292: Albright was not picked up by this reviewer on the morning of January 28, 1958, but rather on Sunday afternoon, January 26, 1958; the next day, on Monday morning, he presented a chapel talk at the S.D.A. Theological Seminary. P. 303: The last two lines need transposing. P. 349, line 19: Read "friend" instead of "frend."

These few minor defects in the narrative of the book do not detract from its extraordinary qualities. A wealth of material is presented in the compass of less than 450 pages, giving us not only the life story of a great orientalist, but also a glimpse of the climate prevailing during the half century in which Dr. Albright played an influential role in biblical and archaeological studies. Hence the book can be highly recommended, and for many years to come it will rank among the biographies of famous scholars.

Andrews University

SIEGFRIED H. HORN

Sanders, Jack T. *Ethics in the New Testament: Change and Development*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. xiii + 144 pp. \$6.95.

Jack Sanders is concerned with one basic issue—the relation of the NT to ethics. His work is a systematic, critical analysis of the NT documents in an endeavor to see what clues, if any, they may afford as a guide to individual and corporate behavior in modern times. The treatment is exegetical and roughly chronological: he examines in turn Jesus, the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, Paul, the later epistles in the Pauline tradition (Colossians, Ephesians, 2 Thessalonians, the Pastorals, and—interestingly—1 Peter), the Johannine literature, and the later epistles and the Apocalypse.

The results of this study are devastatingly negative. Sanders finds a parallel in Albert Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, as he concludes: "So it is with the study of New Testament ethics. The ethical positions of the New Testament are the children of their own times and places, alien and foreign to this day and age. Amidst the ethical dilemmas which

confront us, we are now at least relieved of the need or temptation to begin with Jesus, or the early church, or the New Testament, if we wish to develop coherent ethical positions" (p. 130).

Thus, Sanders rejects the teachings of Jesus as an ethical model because they are inseparably connected with his imminent eschatology; he finds that Mark sets out merely the ethics of endurance in a hostile world; Luke is no longer ruled by the closeness of the Parousia, but he presents only a vague "goodness"; Matthew intensifies ethical demands in a manner that becomes unthinkable on the non-occurrence of the Eschaton. Likewise, according to Sanders, is Paul governed by the nearness of the End: he intends *agapē* as primarily eschatological and makes frequent use of tenets of holy law. The NT "Paulinists," on the other hand, no longer find eschatology as definitive for ethics, but for them Christian behavior tends to collapse into merely good citizenship. Nor is the Johannine ethic any better: the temporal understanding of eschatology has been replaced by tension between the "in" group (believers) and the "world" outside, so that behavior is concerned only with one's fellow-believer—a way of thinking that displays "weakness and moral bankruptcy" (p. 100). The later epistles follow the general direction of the "Paulinists," while the Apocalypse, retaining the aspect of imminent eschatology but retreating from ethical responsibility, is "evil" (p. 114).

Professor Sanders' analysis gives rise to several questions. He has (correctly) pointed out the role of imminent eschatology in NT thought, but to what extent are the ethics in that thought *contingent* upon the eschatology? He assumes that the radicality of the love command is viable only on a short-term basis; a lengthened view makes it preposterous. If, however, love of neighbor rests upon a particular time view, is it not thereby qualitatively devalued? On the other hand, what if the ethics of the NT are bound up with *religion* rather than a specific eschatology (which is part of that religion)? It is in this latter regard—the relation of ethics to NT religion—that Sanders' work appears most vulnerable. He has exegeted passages of the NT which appear to take up ethical concerns, but he has overlooked the larger picture of life in the Spirit and the vitality of the new sense of community. While he has dealt with the words of Jesus, he has quite neglected the most potent factor from the life of Jesus—the cross. As John H. Yoder has argued convincingly in *The Politics of Jesus* (1972; see my review in *AUSS* 13 [1975]: 96-97), the cross-ethic colors NT behavior.

Whatever one's final estimate of *Ethics in the New Testament*, the book seems destined to influence subsequent writing in the area. While it cannot rank in scope or impact with Schweitzer's *Quest*, it will, like the *Quest*, serve as a point of reference. It is a significant work in the study of NT ethics.

Andrews University

WILLIAM G. JOHNSON

Swanson, Reuben J. *The Horizontal Line Synopsis of the Gospels*. Dillsboro, N.C.: Western Carolina Press, 1975. xx + 597 pp. \$23.95.

The unique feature of this Synopsis is its new arrangement of the gospel materials. Instead of placing the parallel accounts in vertical columns, Swanson has arranged them in parallel horizontal lines. It is evident that

the Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Western Carolina University has given careful thought to the matter of an effective format for arranging the substance of the gospels.

The book is divided into four parts: one part for each of the gospels, using the canonical order beginning with Matthew and ending with John. The text employed is the Revised Standard Version. The material is arranged in blocks of parallel lines. Swanson describes his procedure thus: "The lead gospel is almost always the gospel in bold-faced type on the top of the block of lines. Exceptions occur only when there is material in the supporting gospels not found in the lead gospel. Such material is included, since it is important to see what the other gospel writers are saying which is not repeated in the lead gospel" (p. x).

Each gospel is preceded by a table of contents and cross references. The text of each is divided into sections. Matthew has 79; Mark, 72; Luke, 106; and John, 44. Six of Matthew's sections, those containing the five discourses around which the gospel is built (5:1-7:29; 9:35-11:1; 13:1-53; 18:1-19:2; 24:1-26:2), plus the account of the Jerusalem controversies (21:23-22:46), are subdivided into from 5 to 10 subsections each. In Mark the account of the controversies in Jerusalem (11:27-12:35-37) and the Eschatological Discourse (13:1-37) are also subdivided. The same is true of the Sermon on the Plain (6:20-49) and the Controversies in Jerusalem (20:1-45).

The material is to be studied in blocks of lines. There are two kinds of parallel materials included: (1) primary, printed in bold-faced type, and (2) secondary, printed in light italics except when the text agrees exactly with the lead gospel. The account of the Last Supper, for example, in Matthew includes parallel lines from 1 Cor 11:24-27 in bold-faced type and material from Jn 13 and 6 in light italics. The horizontal-line arrangement is flexible enough to include materials outside the gospels. As further illustration the list of the 12 apostles given in Acts 1:13 is also given as a parallel to Mt 10:2,3 (p. 49) as well as to Mk 3:16-19 (pp. 213-214) and to Lk 6:14-16 (pp. 362-363).

In the Marcan section, both the "long" and the "short" ending of the gospel are included (pp. 324-326). In John the Pericope adulterae is given as a regular part of John (7:53-8:11). The work, unfortunately, contains no textual notes or variant readings.

For a convenient comparison of the wording of the parallel accounts of the gospels as rendered in the RSV it is a valuable tool. We look forward to Swanson's production of a Greek Synopsis based on the same format.

Loma Linda University
Loma Linda, Calif.

WALTER F. SPECHT

Via, Dan O., Jr. *Kerygma and Comedy in the New Testament: A Structuralist Approach to Hermeneutic*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. xii + 179 pp. \$8.95.

In recent years we have seen the NT studied by the methods of form criticism and redaction criticism, and now right on the heels of the latter the method of structuralism. While form criticism and redaction criticism are not heterogeneous to each other, structuralism is to them and therefore

is not to be built upon the results of either. Its approach is ahistorical in seeking to establish, not historical causal relationships between literature, but basic structures common to the human mind and society which would independently develop this type of literature. According to Via, "Structure properly speaking is the hidden or underlying configuration that can offer some explanation for the more or less visible or obvious pattern in the text" (p. 7). Again, "structure in one sense is the hidden and unconscious system of presuppositions which accounts for and holds together the visible, existing order, including its literary texts" (p. 13).

The hidden element that Via sees as the structure in the study of Paul (1 Cor 1:18-2:5; Rom 9:30-10:31) and Mark is the "comic genre—the rhythm of upset and recovery" seen in the death and resurrection of Christ. He points to the presence of this structure in Aristophanes' comedies, which in turn were derived from an ancient fertility rite. He sees a structural-genetic relationship rather than a causal-genetic relationship. The first question one must ask concerning this is whether in fact a structural relationship exists. How does one go about determining this? Is it sufficient to show that this motif is present in some other literature? Secondly, if we grant that this is so, what does this tell us about the kerygma? Does this mean that the kerygma of death-resurrection is so basic to human experience that it is expected that all men will sense it and accept the meaning of the Gospel for their lives? Does it mean that the tragic genre is not a basic structure of human existence?

We recognize that this is only the first foray in the application of this method to NT studies and much yet needs to be worked out. The first chapter, which presents the method and the language for this method, is rather awesome for the uninitiated. The new language includes diachrony, synchrony, syntagm, paradigm, signifier, signified, performance and competence texts, indicial, actantiel, etc. Actually Via presents much more than is relevant for his purposes, and the clarity of his presentation suffers because of this. One gets the impression that lack of clarity is also due to the fact that the subject has not had time to fully mature in the mind of the author before he placed pen to paper.

Perhaps one value in this method is that it seeks to understand a text as a whole rather than as fragments, as is the tendency in form and redaction criticism. This point which Via emphasizes is well taken. More emphasis needs to be made on the study of the text as a whole, though whether the structuralist approach is the correct one is doubtful.

Andrews University

SAKAE KURO

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea*. Translated by Gary Stansell; edited by Paul D. Hanson. *Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974. xxxii + 259 pp. \$19.95.

This is a translation of the second edition (1965) of the German original published in the famous series *Biblicher Kommentar—Altes Testament*.

Without doubt this translation will effect an even more widespread use of one of the two best commentaries (the other is by W. Rudolph [1966]) by the critical school. Each reader will greatly benefit from this full-fledged commentary.

The present translation is the first publication of the *Hermeneia* series. This commentary follows the unique pattern of organization typical of the German series with the following headings: (1) *Bibliography*. It includes special literature bearing upon the passage or unit under discussion and supplements the general bibliography at the end (pp. 242-247). (2) *Text*. This is a new English translation, based on the ancient texts and joined with extensive text-critical notes. (3) *Form*. It provides a detailed discussion of literary form (form criticism) and structure. (4) *Setting*. Here the life-setting (*Sitz im Leben*), dating, tradition history, etc., are discussed. (5) *Interpretation*. This is a detailed verse-by-verse exegesis, often interspersed with excursuses of a more technical nature such as "The Sex Cult" (p. 14), "The Baal Divinities" (pp. 38-40), "The Valley of Achor" (pp. 42-43), "Yahweh as Baal" (pp. 49-50), "Resurrection on the Third Day" (pp. 117-118), "Torah in Hosea" (p. 138), "*own* (guilt) and *h't'l* (sin)" (p. 145), "'Egypt' in Hosea" (pp. 145-146) and "Israel and Ephraim" (p. 164). (6) *Aim*. This section strives toward a theological analysis, relation to the NT, and at times suggestions concerning how Hosea speaks today.

The commentary opens with an Introduction of only 12 pages containing sections on the historical period, Hosea's life, the language of the book and its literary form, and a painfully brief discussion of the theology of Hosea. To the reader's great amazement, nothing is said about the text, its history and preservation. This lack is even highlighted by the fact that the end-papers of this volume contain reproductions of Qumran texts from Hosea: 4QX11^d with Hos 1:7-2:5 (previously unpublished), 4QpHos^a (4Q166) with Hos 2:10-14; 2:8, 9, and 4QpHos^b (4Q167) with citations from and commentary on Hos 1, 2 (?), 5, 6, and 8. This Qumran material is unfortunately also left out of consideration in the respective sections of the commentary itself.

In terms of authorship, Wolff believes that Hosea himself wrote only 2:4-17 and 3:1-5, and that disciples or followers are responsible for 1:2-9; 2:1-3, 18-25; 7:10; 8:14; 11:10. These fused Hosea's language with that of their own so that a discernment of the *ipsissima verba* Hosea is no longer possible. In Wolff's view Hosea has no part at all in 1:1, 7; 14:10. In chaps. 4-11 the matter of authorship is more complex. These chapters come largely from his disciples who formed a "prophetic-Levitic group . . . and were experts in the transmission of Hosea's words" (p. 75). Chaps. 12-14 comprise a tradition complex that is distinct from chaps. 4-11 and stand nearer to Judah (p. 234) than the earlier materials. This complex tradition history of Hosea's message has not found support among Wolff's critical peers and is open to serious questions.

Wolff believes that the material in the book is to be dated between 752 and 724 B.C. To the last years of Jeroboam II are ascribed 1:2-9; 2:4-17; 3:1-5; 4:1-3; 4:4-19; 5:1-7, aside from the glosses and later additions. The remainder is dated to the decade beginning in 733 B.C., which means that there is no material for the period between about 750 to 733 B.C. The problem here is whether we are to assume that Hosea and/or his disciples

experienced such a long period of silence. It is not unlikely that Hos 5:8-7:16 comes from the time of Menahem (552-542/1 B.C.). In any case, it is precarious to suggest an extended period of silence for Hosea.

The most debated issue in the book of Hosea is the problem of the marriage. Wolff takes the incident as a real experience and not as an allegory. He follows L. Rost in explaining that the "wife of harlotry" (1:2-9) is not a woman of weak character or a common prostitute but one who followed the rule of women of her day. She participated or indulged in the bridal initiation rite of Canaanite origin in order to assure fertility. The children born to her are "of harlotry" because their birth had been ensured in the initial act "of harlotry" in the name of a strange god. They are actually the real children of Hosea. Even though Gomer abandoned the prophet after bearing three children to him, she is taken back, as it were, on probation. Thus chaps. 1 and 3 speak of the same woman. The complex of Hos 1-3 is a real event in Hosea's life; it is nevertheless a "memorable," namely a special kind of acted prophecy. Accordingly, Hos 1 and 3 are not to be taken as offering autobiography. Autobiography or biography is incidental to the main purpose of these chapters. For a critique of Wolff's interpretation of Hosea's marriage, see W. Rudolph, "Präparierte Jungfrauen," *ZAW* 75 (1963): 65-73, whose essay is referred to a few times but whose arguments are not refuted.

This is a competent commentary from which one learns much. It has not commanded, and must not be expected to command, agreement on the part of all readers. Nevertheless, to date it is the most extensive commentary in English on this book. Indices enhance its usefulness.

Among the misspellings noted were S. V. McCasland instead of McCasland (p. 118, n. 97, and p. 255) and O. Proksch instead of Procksch (p. 256).

Andrews University

GERHARD F. HASEL

BOOKS RECEIVED

Titles of all books received which are at all related to the interests of this journal are listed in this section, unless the review of the book appears in the same issue of *AUSS*. Inclusion in this section does not preclude the subsequent review of a book. No book will be assigned for review or listed in this section which has not been submitted by the publisher. Where two prices are given, separated by a slash, the second is for the paperback edition.

- Contemporary Perspectives on Pietism: A Symposium*. Nos. 1 and 2 (Feb./May 1976) of *Covenant Quarterly* 34. Chicago: Covenant Press, 1976. 89 pp. Paperback, \$3.00. Papers presented at a Symposium held at the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the publication of Spener's *Pia Desideria*.
- Greeley, Andrew M.; McCready, William C.; and McCourt, Kathleen. *Catholic Schools in a Declining Church*. Kansas City, Kan.: Sheed and Ward, 1976. ix + 483 pp. \$15.00. This is a report on "a replication of the 1963 National Opinion Research Center study of the effectiveness of the value-oriented education carried out in the Roman Catholic Schools in the United States (Greeley and Rossi 1966)." The authors seek to find out also what influence the turbulent period in the decade since the first study was made had upon the impact of Catholic education.
- Hall, Douglas John. *Lighten Our Darkness: Toward an Indigenous Theology of the Cross*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976. 253 pp. \$10.95. In the title, "Our" and "Indigenous" refer to North America and "Darkness" refers to its failure to fully realize its expectations and dreams. What this is, then, is a theology which can deal with failure adequately, especially addressed to the North American continent.
- Hebblethwaite, Peter. *The Runaway Church: Post-Conciliar Growth or Decline*. New York: Seabury, 1975. 256 pp. \$8.95. A chronicle and interpretation of the last decade of the Roman Catholic Church.
- Kelber, Werner H., ed. *The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. xvii + 203 pp. \$10.95. A redaction-critical study of the passion narrative in Mark with contributions of seven scholars. The authors see the clue to the understanding of this passage in the theology of Mark.
- Morris, Leon. *I Believe in Revelation*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1976. 159 pp. Paperback, \$2.95. The third in the series of *I Believe* books, edited by Michael Green. Written for the general reader.
- Parker, T. H. L. *John Calvin: A Biography*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975. xviii + 190 pp. \$10.95. A fresh biography of Calvin written from the perspectives of the second half of the twentieth century. Interprets Calvin not simply as a Reformer or the first of the Calvinists but as a doctor of the Catholic Church in its broadest meaning.
- Patte, Daniel. *What Is Structural Exegesis?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. vi + 90 pp. Paperback, \$2.05. An introduction to the newest method of studying the Bible. The author sees it as supplementing the historico-critical method.
- Stivers, Robert L. *The Sustainable Society: Ethics and Economic Growth*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976. 240 pp. Paperback, \$5.25. An examination of economic growth from the ethical perspective. Suggests selective growth with the two goals of environmental concern and contribution to human welfare in mind, rather than no growth or unlimited growth.
- Stohman, Martha Lou Lemmon. *John Witherspoon: Parson, Politician, Patriot*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976. 176 pp. \$5.95/2.95. A biography of the little known Presbyterian minister who signed the Declaration of Independence.

FROM THE EDITOR

In a continuing effort to serve well our readers (and also potential authors), *AUSS* endeavors to incorporate new features that are within its scholarly parameters. For example, in 1975 the "Books Received" section (prepared by our Book Review Editor, Sakae Kubo) was instituted, in the present issue we are adding a "Brief Notes" section, and we plan to present soon the first of a series of helpful bibliographical articles on important ancient Near Eastern archaeological sites (prepared by Dennis Pardee of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago). Further new features are also under consideration. The *AUSS* editors are grateful to the colleagues and friends whose suggestions and assistance make possible this kind of expansion of *AUSS* services.

There are several items of importance to which we wish to call attention here:

The "Brief Notes" Section

The "Brief Notes" section will appear whenever appropriate materials are available for it. Normally it will contain short items of scholarly nature—varying in length from a paragraph or two up to five or six pages—in the fields indicated on the inside front cover of this journal. Potential contributors of such items should be alerted to the fact that although a "Brief Note" may not demand the range of discussion and documentation required in a longer article (indeed at times it may even take the form of a very brief statement of scholarly opinion), it must nevertheless be truly scholarly in nature and must in a competent way either speak to some *new discovery* or afford *new insights* on old matters or issues. Reprints of materials already published, mere summarizations of old or well-known data, and "off-the-cuff" undocumented general-type essays are not accepted for publication in *AUSS*, either as articles or as "Brief Notes."

Exigencies Created by the "Financial Crunch"

During the past several years the cost of printing has escalated immensely, and many editors of scholarly journals have been caught in a truly severe "financial crunch." Various approaches have been taken in an effort to reduce costs, including reduction of a journal's contents, particularly along the line of book reviews; merging related journals; publishing separately (at extra charge) certain materials once included in a journal; etc. But even such "economy steps" have not necessarily precluded a rise in subscription price.

Thus far *AUSS*, although it too has been hurt by the "financial crunch," has maintained its services intact (and, as noted above, is

even endeavoring to broaden those services). Moreover, contemplation of any price increase has been postponed, temporarily at least; but a desire to move from a biannual to a triannual publication has also had to be shelved at this time. Meanwhile, a backlog of articles has been accumulating. The editors will do their utmost to get materials into print as rapidly as possible within space available, and especially will an effort be made to keep book reviews timely (we have read of editors who have had to pursue the unfortunate expedient of severe reduction and deferral in publication of book reviews!).

However, one minor change will occur by way of abbreviating our contents: There will be no annual index in 1977; instead, the Autumn number of 1978 will contain an index for 1977-78. And henceforth the plan will be to provide *two-year indexes* in the last issue of even-numbered years.

AUSS Style Sheet

Persons planning to submit articles or brief notes for consideration for AUSS should request a copy of the AUSS Style Sheet. This is available from our editorial office: 115 Seminary Hall, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104, U.S.A. Furthermore, the abbreviations for periodicals and reference works indicated on the back cover of this journal should be used in both main text and notes, as should also the abbreviations for Bible books listed below.

In closing, the editors wish to express their sincere gratitude and thanks to both readers and writers for your kind interest and support.

Yours sincerely, in behalf of the Editorial Staff,
Kenneth A. Strand, Editor

ABBREVIATIONS FOR BIBLE BOOKS

Gen	2 Ki	Isa	Nah	Rom	Tit
Ex	1 Chr	Jer	Hab	1 Cor	Phm
Lev	2 Chr	Lam	Zeph	2 Cor	Heb
Num	Ezr	Ezek	Hag	Gal	Jas
Dt	Neh	Dan	Zech	Eph	1 Pet
Josh	Est	Hos	Mal	Php	2 Pet
Judg	Job	Joel	Mt	Col	1 Jn
Ruth	Ps	Amos	Mk	1 Th	2 Jn
1 Sam	Pr	Ob	Lk	2 Th	3 Jn
2 Sam	Eccl	Jon	Jn	1 Tim	Jude
1 Ki	Song	Mic	Acts	2 Tim	Rev

(It should be noted that names of Bible books are abbreviated *only* when specific chapter or chapter-and-verse references are given. Thus:

Parables of Jesus are recorded in Mt 13.

Parables of Jesus are recorded in Matthew.)

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW

CONSONANTS

א	=	ʾ	כ	=	ḵ	י	=	y	ס	=	s	ר	=	r
ב	=	b	ח	=	ḥ	ק	=	q	ע	=	ʿ	ש	=	š
ג	=	g	ו	=	w	ל	=	l	פ	=	p	ז	=	z
ד	=	d	ז	=	z	מ	=	m	צ	=	ṣ	ח	=	ḥ
ה	=	h	ט	=	ṭ	נ	=	n	ק	=	q	ת	=	t

MASORETIC VOWEL POINTINGS

ֿ	=	a	וּ, יְ (vocal shewa)	=	e	ׁ	=	ō
ֿֿ	=	ā	ׂ, ׃	=	ē	׃	=	o
ֿֿֿ	=	a	ֿֿֿ	=	i	ֿֿֿֿ	=	ō
ֿֿֿֿ	=	e	ֿֿֿֿֿ	=	i	ֿֿֿֿֿֿ	=	u
ֿֿֿֿֿֿ	=	ē	ֿֿֿֿֿֿֿ	=	o	ֿֿֿֿֿֿֿֿ	=	ū

ABBREVIATIONS OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

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

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