

THE THEOLOGICAL JOURNALS IN 1956

(This survey, like the last, takes account only of journals that are fairly readily accessible, and of articles in English.)

WE ARE SEEING perhaps the most exciting movements on the frontiers of biblical knowledge since that sudden Victorian flowering of modern archaeological science which set believer and sceptic groping for each other's theological throats. The caves lay bare their treasures in an Ali Baba profusion. The journals concerned with Near Eastern archaeology alone now run into dozens. The manuscript finds from the Dead Sea area continue to challenge the keenest wits and broadest erudition for their elucidation; the first of the Gnostic documents from Nag-Hammadi, — perhaps to prove almost equally important for the biblical scholar, but so strangely overlooked by the publicists, — has been published; new textual materials, like the Bodmer papyrus of John's Gospel, have appeared; a Babylonian chronicle throwing unsuspected light on the last years of the kingdom of Judah has been presented; Palestinian sites fecund of biblical allusions have been zealously attacked by the British, American, French and Israeli institutions; and the study of the documents from Alalakh, Mari, Ras Shamra and other sites in Mesopotamia and the Levant continue to offer vivid illustrations of what life was like when the Canaanite was in the land, and occasionally to illumine some dark place in the earlier books of the Old Testament: sometimes, indeed, showing that what has been taken to be due to late re-writing in fact reflects a primitive tradition, quite possibly contemporaneously recorded. These things must explain why on this occasion this survey is so largely concerned with archaeology.

The so-called Dead Sea Scrolls are now a subject on their own, and reference here will be restricted to the interesting notes in the *Biblical Archaeologist* (xix, pp. 75-96) where P. Benoit and each of the other members of the team now engaged on the scrolls report on the editing of the so far unpublished manuscript fragments. The progress of study of the Nag-Hammadi manuscripts is not yet far advanced: those interested in taking the matter beyond the essays in F. L. Cross's *The Jung Codex* may be referred to recent issues of the Dutch journal *Vigiliae Christianae* where those concerned with the discovery contribute (usually in English or French).

The Babylonian chronicles, published last year by the Trustees of the British Museum, have been attractively edited by a member of the Tyndale Fellowship, Mr. Donald J. Wiseman, under the title *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings*. Among many other interesting sidelights on biblical history, it includes an account from the Babylonian standpoint of the fall of Jerusalem in 597 B.C. and the appointment of Zedekiah. Their importance is discussed by J. P. Hyatt (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxxv, pp. 227-284), D. N. Freedman (*Biblical Archaeologist*, xix, pp. 50-60), W. F. Albright (*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 143, pp. 28-33) and, for the Chronology of *Kings*, by E. R. Thiele (*ibid.*, pp. 22-27). They provide a *Sitz im Leben* for the disputed oracles of Jeremiah xlv-xlix: and for some scholars, such as Hyatt, suggest that the Babylonians, and not the Scythians, are Jeremiah's foe from the north. F. F. Bruce, in *Evangelical Quarterly* (xxviii, pp. 195-197), modifies his former resolution of the chronological difficulty of Daniel i. 1 in the light of the Nebuchadnezzar chronicles, now dating the siege mentioned in Daniel in September 605 B.C. before the hasty return of Nebuchadnezzar reflected in the chronicle, or during the Syrian campaign of the winter 605-604 B.C.

Of the excavations of biblical sites in Palestine, Miss Kenyon's at Jericho are the best known, though we are far from a definite interpretation of her results. The American Schools of Oriental Research have published reports on work at Hazor (Y. Yadin, *Biblical Archaeology*, xix, pp. 2-11); the cities of Joshua xv. 61 (F. M. Cross, *ibid.*, pp. 12-17); Petra (W. H. Morton, *ibid.*, pp. 26-36); Bethel (J. L. Kelso, *ibid.*, pp. 36-43); Dothan (J. P. Free, *ibid.*, pp. 43-48, and *BASOR*, No. 143, pp. 11-17); Gibeon (J. B. Pritchard, *BA*, xix, pp. 66-75); Shechem (G. E. Wright, *BASOR*, No. 144, pp. 9-20); and Jazer (G. M. Landes, *ibid.*, pp. 30-37). General Yadin estimates the population of Hazor at no less than 40,000 — 'for Hazor was beforetime the head of all those kingdoms' (Jos. xi. 10). What is more he has found evidence of the destruction of the city during the period now usually allocated to Joshua's conquest (*cf.* Jos. xi. 13), whereas previous excavators had, on rather negative evidence, suggested an earlier date. At Bethel Kelso records an almost total destruction by Joshua's troops; followed by a cultural revolution — small, crude houses and poor pottery — and, even more interesting, a religious revolution: the Canaanite cult objects, commonly found previously, suddenly disappear after the Israelite victory. Apparently the graven images were abolished, as commanded. Destroyed once more by the Babylonians in their advance, Bethel and Ai together have only 223 men in Ezra's census return (Ezr. ii. 28): and their rough homes, made from stones from the ruined city wall, have been discovered. At Shechem, a large temple doubtless preserves the Temple of Ba'al Berith of Judges viii-ix. Mention may also be made of the tentative suggestion by the late J. J. Rothschild (*Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, lxxxviii, pp. 50-57) that curious ancient huts found in the Sinai peninsula and the Judean foothills are the *succoth* built by the Israelites of the Exodus (Ex. xvi. Lv. xxiii).

The texts from Ras Shamra, discovered before the war, and those from Alalakh, published a few years ago by Mr. Wiseman, yield much exegetical fruit. For instance, it has been a commonplace that I Samuel viii. 4-17, Samuel's denunciation of kingship, is a piece of Deuteronomistic interpretation of the national history, in conflict with another tradition in the same book. In *BASOR* (No. 143, pp. 17-22) I. Mendelsohn examines the passage and concludes that almost every item of Samuel's declaration can be paralleled from Ras Shamra or Alalakh. It is 'an authentic description of the semi-feudal Canaanite society as it existed prior to and during the time of Samuel . . . its author could conceivably have been the prophet himself or a spokesman of the anti-monarchical movement of that period.' In the following *Bulletin* (pp. 20-23) E. A. Speiser shows that the phrase 'all those that went in at the gate' in Genesis xxiii. 10, 18, and the converse in Genesis xxxiv. 24 represent technical terms in Mesopotamian society — 'city fathers' and 'able-bodied men'. The former passage is, of course, usually regarded as P: in this case, says Speiser, if the hand is late, the voice is ancient and genuine tradition. In the first number of the new *Journal of Semitic Studies* (pp. 60-2) D. Daube and R. Yaron suggestively study Jacob's reception by Laban in the light of Semitic law: 'when Jacob was offered a reward for his work it was degradation, not promotion: having lost his status in the family, he became a hireling.' In the same journal (pp. 322-333), Martin

Noth draws some interesting analogies between practices referred to in the David stories and the Royal Archives of Mari. Finally, modesty does not forbid us to refer to the article by K. A. Kitchen in the *Tyndale House Bulletin* (No. 2, pp. 1ff.) in which he draws attention to an important recently published Egyptian papyrus reflecting slave and prison conditions in Egypt similar to those of the Joseph narratives.

Turning to Old Testament theology, H. H. Rowley has a characteristic article on *Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets* (*JSS*, i, pp. 338-360) which has the merit of dealing appreciatively with recent studies of cultic prophecy while eschewing the speculative excesses to which the inferential game has led; and of recalling that the Law and the Prophets are not governed by irreconcilable ideas of the will of God. J. D. W. Watts, in *Expository Times* (lxvii, pp. 232-237), contributes a study of the doctrine of the People of God in the Pentateuch, which is essentially a study of a *Pentateuchal* doctrine, and not of the theological traditions of sources widely different in date.

Special attention may be drawn to two theological articles in the *Evangelical Quarterly*: Professor D. J. Theron's 'Adoption in the Pauline Corpus' (pp. 6-14), and Stephen Smalley's 'Eschatology of Ephesians' (pp. 152-157), in which no support is found in the Epistle for universalist teaching.

In the realm of criticism, M. S. Seale, *ET* (lxvii, pp. 333-5) puts forward glossing and the use of synonyms as characteristics of the style of the author of Genesis, and finds this undermines the whole JE theory as it relates to that book. In the same issue (pp. 341-2) Donald Guthrie refutes the implication sometimes drawn from Tertullian that the early church countenanced a pupil's writing in the name of his master. The December number of the same journal contains an important article by W. C. van Unnik on 'Christianity according to I Peter', where the now fashionable hypothesis that this letter is an Easter baptismal liturgy is criticised. The oft debated question of Quirinius of Luke ii is adverted to by E. C. Hudson, in the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (xv, pp. 103-107), who concludes in favour of Ramsay's (and therefore of Luke's) substantial accuracy. An interesting offshoot of the recent Tyndale Commentary on Thessalonians will be found in the note by Leon Morris on I Thessaionians ii. 18 in the new journal *Novum Testamentum* (i, pp. 205-8).

Fourah Bay College,
Sierra Leone.

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