some action when at worst it is morally neutral? Are they not often far too willing to pass judgement with only inadequate knowledge? If so, the two attitudes of evangelicals which we have examined both stand under a common condemnation. The great need today is for an informed social witness. This is rare, and far too many evangelicals have retreated into their own surroundings and have no interest in understanding the problems of their fellow men and in trying to grapple with these problems; the remainder do not always display knowledge or wisdom in their pronouncements.

THE THEOLOGICAL JOURNALS IN 1960*

By ANDREW F. WALLS, M.A., B.Litt.
Fourah Bay College, The University College of Sierra Leone

THE CHIEF EDITOR of the Oxford English Dictionary, it is said, pierced hearts with the cry, 'We must limit research!'—and he lived in days of moderate harvest. Are we to shout for joy because the pastures are clothed with flocks of journals and the valleys covered over with monographs? This annual survey swings a highly selective sickle over small corners of an enormous field. It is restricted to journals accessible in modest libraries, to articles in English, and, generally speaking, to Biblical subjects. It repudiates with horror any suggestion of omniscience or omnicompetence, and is offered—the T.S.F. Bulletin's copper scroll—rather as an invitation to treasure hunting than as a catalogue of the trove.

A further limitation is the omission of direct reference to the Nag Hammadi material (a survey of this has been commanded for a future number) and to Qumran. Let us celebrate other sacred sites and ways. The excavations at Hazor, for instance, have naturally been noticed in previous surveys: now A. Malamat (*JBL* 79, p. 12) on the basis of epigraphic material, concludes that the statement that 'Hazor *beforetime* was the head of all those kingdoms' (Jos. 11: 10) does not only or primarily refer to the immediate pre-Conquest period, but, like the title of Jabin in Judges 4, reflects a memory of the great days of Hazor by then already departed (Selah).

The *Biblical Archaeologist* for December is devoted to reports of an extensive campaign at Shechem, and economic sidelights on the Old Testament are provided by J. B. Pritchard's review of industry and trade at Gibeon (*BA* 23: p. 23) and G. W. van Beek's study of frankincense and myrrh (*ibid.*, p. 70). Lest auld acquaintance be forgot, E. F. Campbell (*ibid.*, p. 2) provides a useful summary of the whole range of The Tell el-Amarna discoveries, associated, as is usual nowadays, not with the Exodus, but with a period 150 years earlier in Canaan.

General Yigael Yadin reverts to Solomon's Megiddo (*ibid.* p. 62), commenting of 1 Kings, 9: 15, 'Hardly ever in the history of archaelogical digging has such a short verse in the Bible helped so much in identifying and dating actual remains found by the spade.' F. C. Fensham, a South African scholar who has devoted much attention to ancient law-codes (and contributed to the *New Bible Dictionary*) clears up an obscurity in the same context, Solomon's treaty with Hiram: why have the cities to be handed over when the wood has already been paid for (1 Ki., 5: 11)? Dr. Fensham illustrates the treaty from the Alalakh tablets (*JBL* 79: p. 59). The same scholar uses a widely different Semitic law source—the Mishnah—to put Matthew, 6: 12 in a striking light (*NT* 4: p. 1): credit slavery (cf. Lev. 25: 39ff.) was still practised in New Testament times, and the phrase in the Lord's Prayer implies: 'God as our creditor can take us into slavery, but Jesus has paid our debts . . . we are called on to do the same with our debtors.'

An essay in the use of archaeological material is provided by W. W. Hallo (*BA* 23: p. 34); a survey of the period from Qarqar to Carchemish written from a vantage point on top of the Assyrian-Israelite fence, commanding a view of both sides. He supports the proposition that Josiah's delaying action at Megiddo, though fatal to him, had the effect of bringing about the fall of Assyria, in that Egyptian reinforcements arrived too late.

Differences in atmosphere between the two major Old Testament histories

*For abbreviations, see the end of the article.

to appear in English lately have been frequently noted: and especially the fact that the work of Martin Noth, while it is marked by a confident use of the form-critical method, makes comparatively little use of the archaeological material in which that of John Bright (see TSF Bulletin, No. 29: p. 13) is so rich. The difference in method leads to quite contrasting assessments of the significance and value of the patriarchal narratives. The contribution to the debate by G. E. Wright, 'History and the Patriarchs (*ET* 71: p. 292) should not be missed. He denies the eligibility of form-criticism for the position of arbiter in Old Testament history afforded to it by Noth and von Rad. Form-criticism is *one* of the branches of Old Testament research, and a purely descriptive one; it is not equipped to produce historical conclusions out of literary phenomena, to assert that the fragmentary must be primary, the unified secondary and liturgical. Amid all our complacent talk about Biblical Theology, how grateful to hear words like these: 'Any Biblical interpreter who loves theology, but not in equal measure the "flesh and bones" of history, is certain to fail in his interpretative effort. Various modern forms of gnosticism or docetism can indeed hide behind the revival of Biblical theology. Biblical *heilsgeschichte* is the celebration of events which Biblical man thought really happened, and which he interpreted as the mighty work of the God of human life and history, and as well sovereign Lord of all creation. Is it not a matter of considerable importance to theology for the Biblical scholar to assert that in Scripture we are dealing, not with real history understood by faith, but instead with cultic legends elaborated through liturgy?' One even wonders whether some old-fashioned Liberals were not nearer the truth than many of their modern deriders. At least they believed in history: it is only that they did not believe enough of it.

More refreshment is provided by the late Flemming Hvidberg (*VT* 10: p. 285). Scandinavian Old Testament scholarship has been noted for its iconoclasm about 'the assured results of literary criticism', and for its dauntless assemblage of comparative material, some of it such that one is constrained to cry, 'Nay, behold the Hottentot also, and the disappearing Inca before they perish.' Professor Hvidberg's burden is that the life-or-death struggle with Canaanite Baalism lies in the background of Genesis 1: 3. Instinctive reaction from such a thesis as congenital Scandinavianism should not preclude further thought, or consideration of some aspects of the paper. Hvidberg repudiates the ideas that Genesis 1 is a simple aetiological story in which the Tiamat myth has been disinfected and YHWH replaced Baal, or a cultic recital for the New Year. Baal was in fact the arch-enemy of YHWH. and in Canaan he was associated with the cult of the serpent—symbol of potency and wisdom. In Genesis 3 the temptation by the serpent and Adam's fall are parallel to the apostasy of Israel in Canaan. The promises of life in the fertility ritual were illusory: 'when Israel offended in Baal, he died.' (Hos. 13: 1.) Whatever reservations one may have about this as an explanation of the *origin* of the stories, the exposition provided is richly suggestive of the way in which they would have come home to ancient Israelites. But Hvidberg goes further. The story is set on a universal plane: 'The fallen people are now not the people of Israel, but mankind': and this means that the story of the Fall is inseparable from that of the creation of man in Genesis 2. Further, 'the so-called first account of the creation' [*sic*], in Genesis 1, comes from the same circles as the rest—for Hvidberg, anti-Baal circles, who quietly asserted the orderly creation, by God's word, for whom the very deep was an inanimate thing which God created according to His own will. 'Modern European science is not sufficiently grateful to this ancient narrator who, in his anti-mythic work, paved the way towards a scientific way of thought'. Another much discussed (indeed, often abandoned) verse of Genesis is expounded by G. R. Castellino (*VT* 10: p. 442). He maintains that Genesis 4: 7 makes complete sense linguistically and psychologically, and interprets 'Sin will be lying in wait for you—and are you sure that you will be able to master it?'

Twenty-five years ago Professor G. R. Driver complained that 'the pages of learned journals are strewn with the unfortunate results of an unimaginative and injudicious resort to the concordance'. The tendency was to assume that textual corruption lurked behind every obscurity. Nowadays the same journals reflect the search for parallel vocabulary and idiom in the cognate languages. A useful collection of samples of rediscovered Hebrew meanings is

provided by C. S. Rodd (*ET* 71: p. 131), and new suggestions are made by D. Winton Thomas (*JTS* 11: p. 52 and *VT* 10: p. 410)—the latter, on the unpromising subject of dogs, full of Old Testament sidelights and written with delightful lightness of touch, stressing the importance of popular speech as a factor in Old Testament diction. At every word an emendation dies.

In *VT* 10 (p. 60) M. Haran rejects, on wider grounds than Dt. 33: 10, Wellhausen's axiom that incense offerings were originally idolatrous, and were legitimized only relatively late, the incense on the altar (Lev. 16) being in fact the same office as the censer offering. Haran concludes that they were very different offerings, and that, when Israelites of Nehemiah's day sought to enforce 'P', far from carrying out a ritual of quite recent composition, they found 'an anachronistic relic of sanctified literature', already removed from their immediate understanding.

Emeritus Professor Edward Robertson is celebrated for his damaging criticisms of the standard hypotheses of Pentateuchal origins, and for the outline of an interesting alternative, which never received the expected elaboration. That his views are substantially unchanged is indicated in his essay on the role of the early Hebrew prophet (*BJRL* 43: p. 273), where he declares that Samuel revised the Mosaic legislation as a national constitution, and that the revision is, in substance, our Pentateuch. He rejects any suggestion of the evolution of the prophet out of the diviner. Essentially, the early prophet was an intermediary: his call, ratified by a theophany, was to a specific task of danger or difficulty affecting the fate of the nation.

One such task, that of Elijah on Mount Carmel, is discussed by H. H. Rowley (*BJRL* 43: p. 190). He reads the incident as the battle of YHWH with Melkart for Israel, and demonstrates its complete coherence. He exposes the feebleness of the interpretations of the story which reduce it to a sort of conjuring trick (for yet another, cf. J. Morgenstern, *VT* 10: p. 138). 'To Elijah and to all who beheld it, it was supernatural in that it was uncontrolled by man and appeared at the desired place and the desired time'. Prayer alone, not sympathetic magic, is shown in 1 Kings, 18: 42ff., and in Elijah's flight after triumph there is no psychological improbability: true religion was not strong because Melkart was defeated, and Jezebel might deal with Elijah as she had dealt with Naboth. 'Few crises have been more significant for history than that in which Elijah figured. . . . Without Moses, the religion of Jahvism as it figures in the Old Testament would never have been born. Without Elijah it would have died.'

H. L. Ellison's studies in Jeremiah, mentioned in the last survey, have been continued (*EQ* 32: pp. 3, 107, 212): the theory that the foe from the north is a Scythian invasion that never came is effectively disposed of, and there is provocative and profitable theological comment for everyone. Cameron Mackay discusses the integrity of Ezekiel 40-48 in the light of recent study (*EQ* 32: p. 15) showing how certain concepts run right through the book. W. Mueller (*EQ* 32: p. 203) contributes a reverent and independent exegesis of Isaiah 7: 14 which should undermine the charge that evangelicals invariably commit themselves in advance to particular critical and exegetical positions.

Is the Son of Man in Daniel individual or collective, simply the embodiment of the saints of the Most High? James Muilenburg (*JBL* 79: p. 197) concludes that the figure is probably Messianic, and that the apparatus of the picture is theophanic. There is nothing to suggest the 'taking up' of the Son of Man. There are important implications of this view for some current interpretations of the Gospels.

The use of the term She'ol is carefully studied by D. K. Innes (*EQ* 32: p. 196) in the context of the view that progressive revelation, rightly understood, is the filling out of a picture rather than the supersession of erroneous notions. The principal revelation to the Old Testament writers was the reality of death: Christ brought immortality to light through the Gospel.

The indefatigable William Barclay has a splendid series of chapters in New Testament background, 'Hellenistic Thought in New Testament Times', running through the year's *Expository Times*. An ingenious series by Hugh Montefiore (begun *NT* 4: p. 139) deals with incidental contacts between the New Testament and Josephus (and other ancient sources), since these may preserve accounts of the same events under the influence of different traditions. Astronomical evidence noted in Babylon and China may illustrate the

quest of the Magi, 7-5 B.C., and the star 'standing over' Jerusalem like a sword (Josephus *BJ* 6: 5. 3) may be originally a remembrance of the same occurrence, associated with the Fall of Jerusalem because of Jesus' reputation as the intended destroyer of the Temple. The story of the Massacre of the Innocents is fully in accord with the later years of Herod the Great (cf. Josephus *Ant.* 17: 6. 6), and the silence of Josephus easily explained, since not more than twenty children are likely to have been involved, and Josephus had bigger and better atrocity stories about Herod. Two other notes connect a portent of supernatural light in the Temple with its cleansing on 9 Nisan (à la Jaubert), and the rending of the Temple veil with the alarming nocturnal opening of the Temple doors about 30 A.D. (Montefiore hesitates to accept the actual rending of the veil, but offers the Matthean earthquake as an explanation of the opening of the doors.)

We have received the doctrine that a parable can have only one point, and must be sharply distinguished from allegory. But, as Principal Matthew Black says in an important article (*BJRL* 43: p. 273) cannot this prove a pedantic and mechanical rule of thumb? After all, an allegorical element is discernible in Jewish and even Pauline parables, and, when we come to specific examples, great Dodd himself can admit a measure of allegory (the prophets as the rejected messengers in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, for instance), though he refuses it the name. Further, many who agree that the parable of the Sower can have only one point (and thus that the Markan exegesis of it is secondary) cannot at all agree as to what that point is. To admit, in short, that 'he who hath ears to hear' will hear more than the final words of the parable is not to surrender ourselves to seeking the allegorical significance of every straw in the lame man's mattress. As A. H. M'Neile put it, 'The principal object in the foreground of a picture is not the only object visible.'

Many whose impression of the German Neutestamentler is, as it were, of confused noise and garments rolled in blood, yet find sweet comfort in the rich and reverent erudition of Professor Joachim Jeremias. Such will not be disappointed in his study of the Lord's Prayer (*ET* 71: p. 141). Starting from the practice of the early Church of making the Lord's Prayer a privilege, reserved for full members (not the general possession of humanity as such), he stresses that 'Our Father' (*Abba*) is unique in the literature of Jewish prayer; a secular word, deliberately taken over by Jesus, a revolution which none but He could effect.

Professor A. M. Hunter's incisive bipartite article on recent Johannine studies (*ET* 71: p. 164, 219) summarizes the results of study of the strong Semitic flavour of the Greek, the accuracy of the topography (now reinforced by the appearance of Bethesda in, of all places, the Qumran copper scroll) and the theological terminology in the light of Qumran (the differences, as well as the resemblances between Johannine and Qumran dualism being well set out). Professor Hunter declares for a Palestinian origin for the author of the Fourth Gospel, and a date for his work perhaps about 80 A.D. or even 70 A.D. His second instalment treats of six places where the Fourth Gospel renders the account of the Synoptics more intelligible. If the author is not the Apostle John, his testimony still underlies it. In general accord is C. L. Mitton's article on the provenance of the Gospel (*ET* 71: p. 337), where, instead of the ethereal spirituality and hearty indifference to occurrence often attributed to the Evangelist, it is assumed that he writes 'not only to those who wish to grasp the eternal significance of Jesus Christ, but to those who wish to gain a clear insight into the historical personality of Jesus of Nazareth.'

What was the purpose of Acts? None of the stock answers fully meets the case, urges W. C. van Unnik (*NT* 4: p. 26). The book should be seen as 'a lantern lecture with slides', and as the confirmation of the Gospel in the sense of Hebrews 2: 3ff. Luke calls on history to prove the message that in these last days there is salvation for all who believe in Jesus Christ. And, lest the 'last days' should mislead, 'The primitive church', says Dr. van Unnik, 'saw the daybreak of the New Age, but instead of counting the hours they set out to proclaim the Gospel.'

F. F. Bruce's paraphrase of 1 Corinthians is concluded and that of 2 Corinthians begun (*EQ* 32: p. 30, 114, 162, 227). On the former epistle, C. F. D. Moule cautions against over-anxiety to find an invocation of the

eucharistic presence, or indeed a eucharistic reference at all, in 1 Corinthians 16: (*NTS* 8: p. 307). Two important essays discuss 2 Corinthians, 5. R. Berry (*SJT* 14: p. 60) refutes the thesis of a contradiction between this passage and 1 Corinthians, 15: Paul's attitude to death is of double aspect: as one might both welcome and dread a surgical operation. The significance of Paul's doctrine for the communion of saints is that 'our oneness with the dead in Christ resides in the fact that both they and we are joined to the same Lord, and not in their still belonging with us in the corporate solidarity of the Church. No direct dealings with them are possible; we can reach them only through our Lord'. Even if Mr. Berry's conclusion that prayer on their behalf is a proper exercise of our concern does not seem to follow, his remarks on the vanity of the invocation of saints are immensely valuable.

The same passage is dealt with by Earle Ellis, a foremost younger conservative scholar, in relation to the whole scheme of Pauline eschatology (*NTS* 6: p. 211). Dr. Ellis also contributes a brief but imposing assessment of the state of discussion on the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles (*EQ* 32: p. 151). He shows how radically opinion can change on matters like doctrinal development and the complex nature of primitive ecclesiastical organization, and plots the lines of the opposing hosts on the vexed question of linguistic tests. In his concluding paragraph he gives a not unimpressive roster of twentieth-century scholars of very various theological viewpoints who favour the authenticity of the Pastorals, and ventures the conjecture, 'It may be the future trend will be in their direction'.

And so we end with a signpost. But let it be said again that we have passed many others unnoticed on the way.

ABBREVIATIONS.

(The volume number and the first page of each article is given.)

BA—Biblical Archaeologist.
BJRL—Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.
EQ—Evangelical Quarterly.
ET—Expository Times.
JBL—Journal of Biblical Literature.
JTS — Journal of Theological Studies (new series).
NT—Novum Testamentum (Two issues bear the date 'October 1960', but one appears to belong to 1961).
NTS—New Testament Studies.
SJT—Scottish Journal of Theology.
VT—Vetus Testamentum.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE TEACH YOURSELF BIBLE ATLAS. By H. H. Rowley (English Universities Press, 1960. 8s. 6d.)

In his preface to this addition to the well-known Teach Yourself Books series, Professor Rowley says that his aim has been 'to provide what the reader has come to expect of an Atlas of the Bible—maps, text, and illustrations.' It thus follows in the tradition of the *Westminster Bible Atlas*, Grollenberg and Kraeling, with the differences that it is cheaper (though all three of the others have appeared in some style of abridgement), and smaller, being a convenient pocket size. Whether every reader has come to expect this type of book rather than a straightforward atlas, with detailed maps and gazeteer alone, is questionable. At all events this is what he is obliged to accept.

The maps, which are the most important part of the book, occupy 32 pages, and are substantially those in Philip's familiar *New Scripture Atlas* (excluding only maps 1 and 2 of this work). They have been revised and brought up to date (though the carefully reconstructed changes in the Persian Gulf coast, maps 15 and 19, may have to be altered in view of recent investigations which suggest that there has been little change for millennia), and their value much increased by an index of sites (12 pages) which gives modern identifications where possible, and indicates by asterisks those of archaeological interest, many of which can then be looked up in the 4 page index to the text. The maps are clearly and attractively printed in colour, which is mainly used to indicate political divisions, the relief appearing as woolly caterpillars. One