ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

SEMINARY STUDIES

VOLUME V JULY 1967 NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN 49104, USA

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

SEMINARY STUDIES

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

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

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

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES is published in January and July of each year. Beginning with Volume VI (1968) the annual subscription rate is $4.00. 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 Journal is indexed in the
Index to Religious Periodical Literature.

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

SEMINARY STUDIES

VOLUME V
1967

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN 49104, USA

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

BOOK REVIEWS

DIVINE FORGIVENESS AS EXPERIENCED EVENT

An Outline for a Contemporary-Conservative Doctrine of Justification

FRITZ GUY
Chicago, Illinois

Current radical theology to the contrary notwithstanding, God is not ontologically dead; and even the contention that the symbol "God" is linguistically dead has only limited validity. But the metaphorical language historically associated with the doctrine of justification is indeed close to death; it is no longer an adequate vehicle for conveying an understanding of this doctrine. There are two principal reasons for this. In the first place, the traditional vocabulary labors under the intrinsic limitation and one-sidedness of each term, as evident for example in the juridical origin and connotation of the term "justification" itself. In the second place, the terminology has been reinterpreted so often and so radically that it now carries scarcely any theological freight at all. It is our purpose, therefore, briefly to indicate what may be understood as a "Christian doctrine of justification" without employing such terminology as "justification," "sanctification," "regeneration," "reconciliation," "atonement," "redemption," "conversion," and "grace."

At the same time, however, it is hoped that this may be not simply an exercise in translation, but a constructive outline within a context of conservative, but contemporary (and therefore necessarily critical), Protestant thought. That is, the objective is an interpretative restatement of the New Testament witness to the event and experience of divine forgiveness, at the same time making use of what can be learned in dialogue with historical and contemporary Christian

thought.[1] Yet the hope of accomplishment is tempered by Barth's question: "Even when we have done our best, which of us can think that we have even approximately mastered the subject, or spoken even a penultimate word in explanation of it?"[2]

I

A preliminary clarification of "forgiveness as event" is in order. This "event" is not to be understood in the sense of a *de novo* decision, action, or attitude of God in connection with or response to human attitude or experience; for divine forgiveness is properly understood as eternal, that is, outside the created, temporal order. This is the fundamental meaning of the much-abused doctrine of election: forgiveness and acceptance is not something new and recent even in regard to individual man, but is rather a steady, constant element in the being of God; forgiveness is the way God *is* toward man as

[1] In addition to observing its primary responsibility to the data of the New Testament, any new statement of a Christian doctrine of justification must be attentive to its distinguished predecessors in the history of theology. Some of the most important of these are in Augustine, *On the Spirit and the Letter*; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I-II, qq. 109-14, "Treatise on Grace"; Luther, *Lectures on Romans*, on 3: 1-5 and 4: 1-7, *Lectures on Galatians* (1535), "Argument" and on 2: 15-21; Melanchthon, *Apology for the Augsburg Confession*, arts. 4-6; Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, bk. III, chs. 11-18; *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, Sixth Session, "Concerning Justification"; J. Wesley, *Sermons on Several Occasions*, Sermon V, "Justification by Faith"; F. Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, secs. 106-112; A. B. Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, chs. 1-3.

The most significant recent formulations are in R. Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, II, chs. 4-5; K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, IV/1, sec. 61, and IV/2, sec. 66; E. Brunner, *Dogmatics*, III, chs. 10-22; P. Tillich, *The Courage to Be* and *Systematic Theology*, III, pt. IV, sec. III-A-3; H. Küng, *Justification*, pt. 2. On the development of Seventh-day Adventist thought about justification, see N. F. Pease, *By Faith Alone* (Mountain View, Calif., 1962), pp. 107-224.

To keep the present outline as concise as possible, references to Biblical and other materials have been severely limited and in general confined to footnotes.

[2] Barth, *Church Dogmatics* (Edinburgh, 1936-), IV/2, 519.

sinner. [3] Essentially eternal, the divine forgiveness was enacted in human history in the person of Jesus Christ, [4] in whom the constant *attitude* of forgiveness expressed itself as the supreme *act* of forgiveness as God Himself participated in the catastrophic consequences of human sin. [5]

"Forgiveness as event" is therefore to be understood in the sense of a new experience of individual man, in which the divine attitude and action becomes effective in recognition, acknowledgment, and response. This is the human action of faith, and "in this action, and this action alone, [God's] pardon actually comes fully into its own." [6] Yet this event is not merely the joyous discovery of a religious fact (*e.g.*, the fact that God is not really angry after all, so that the experience of existential guilt is an illusion).[7] The event involves an actually changed relationship, analogous to the changed relationship involved in the event of human forgiveness. [8]

[3] Mt 25: 34; Eph 1: 4-5; Rom 8: 28-30.

[4] 2 Ti 1: 9-10; 1 Pe 1: 19-20. Rev 13: 8 is ambiguous; the text may mean either "whose name has not been written in the book of life of the Lamb that was slain before the foundation of the world" (cf. KJV) or "whose name has not been written before the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that was slain" (RSV). If the former was intended, the passage may be cited here; if the latter, it belongs with those cited above, n. 3.

[5] Col 1: 19-20; Rom 3: 23-24; 5: 8-9. Cf. Küng, *Justification: The Doctrine of Karl Barth and a Catholic Reflection* (New York, 1964), p. 231: "The decisive element in the sinner's justification is found not in the individual but in the death and resurrection of Christ. It was there that our situation was actually changed; there the essential thing happened." Cf. also G. Schrenk's article on δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιόω, etc., in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. G. Kittel (Grand Rapids, 1963-), II, 178-225.

[6] Rom 3 : 26; Barth, IV/1, 615. Cf. Rom 3 : 28, 30; 4 : 5; Gal 2 : 16; 3 : 8, 11, 24.

[7] Schleiermacher can easily be interpreted as being headed in this wrong direction; cf. *The Christian Faith*, (New York, 1963), pp. 270-314, 476-524.

[8] Not only does the one offended overcome all hostility and resentment in response to the offense, and offer himself to the offender in personal communion, declaring that no moral barrier exists between them; but also the offender, on his part, forgoes any attempt at self-justification and repudiates any hostility that may have prompted or

Forgiveness is *experienced*, and in the experience of divine forgiveness, the experience of divine-human reunion, God communicates Himself to individual man in a new way—a way so new that the experience is properly said to inaugurate a new mode of human being. [9]

So, although the divine forgiveness may be, and indeed must be, considered as eternal and non-temporal in the being of God, and as historically enacted in the life and death of Jesus of Nazareth, the focus of the present outline is divine forgiveness as a personal event in the life of individual man.

II

Having just explained that we are concerned with divine forgiveness as an experienced event in the life of individual man, we must immediately insist that it is by no means an independent event, and that it can be adequately understood only in the context of the divine activity in Christ which is continuous in human time and universal in human space. The relationship of the universal, continuous activity of God to the event in the life of individual man may be clarified by considering the divine activity in terms of four constituent elements, all of which are prior to the experience of forgiveness logically and chronologically, but which also continue in one way or another so that they are finally simultaneous with the experienced event. Because all four elements represent the free activity of God (free because man does nothing to earn them and because God is not under any external requirement to perform them), we shall refer to them as prior divine "gifts."

accompanied the offense, offering himself to the one offended in a renewal of the communion broken by the offense, and affirming that no moral barrier exists between them. Thus (to use the familiar Tillichian language) forgiveness is experienced as the overcoming of personal estrangement, the reunion of that which has been separated. This is much more than the discovery of a psychological fact.

[9] "New creation": 2 Cor 5 : 17; Gal 6 : 15. "New man": Eph 4 : 24; Col 3 : 10. Cf. Tillich's soteriological image, "the New Being."

First is the gift of creation, which as far as man is concerned comprises the gift of existence and the gift of humanness. Individual man, in common with all other existent entities, receives his being as a gift from God; the only answer to the ancient question, "Why is there something and not nothing?" is (in one sense) simple: "Because God wants something and not nothing to be." [10] Man also receives as a gift his humanness—the peculiar being of human being, characterized by a conscious relationship and response to the divine, which is to say, by a moral/religious freedom. [11]

Second is the gift of continued existence in spite of sin. Sin amounts to a self-determination toward non-being; for it is, negatively, a turning away from God, the only ground of being, and positively, a turning toward the human self, which has no independent being. Having exercised his fundamental freedom to choose non-being, man may appropriately expect the actualization of his decision. The only explanation for the continued existence of sinful man is the divine postponement of the inevitable consequence of sin, in order to make forgiveness possible as a human experience, and because forgiveness is already a fact in the being of God. [12]

Third is the gift of revelation—the presentation of an alternative to the experience of sin, guilt, and non-being. For individual man must know both that there is an alternative and what it is before he can apprehend it and make it his

[10] Jn 1 : 3; Col 1 : 16-17.

[11] Barth, *op. cit.*, III/1, 231: "What God created when He created the world and man was not just any place, but that which was foreordained for the establishment and the history of the covenant, nor just any subject, but that which was to become God's partner in this history, *i.e.*, the nature which God in His grace willed to address and accept and the man predestined for his service. The fact that the covenant is the goal of creation is not something which is added later to the reality of the creature, as though the history of creation might equally have been succeeded by any other history. It already characterises creation itself and as such, and therefore the being and existence of the creature."

[12] Küng, *op. cit.*, p. 179: "If sinful man were in an *absolutely graceless* state, then man would not be left like a piece of wood with no will, but rather would be cut off from the earth."

own. Therefore the gift of revelation includes a revelation of what God has done and what this means for human being. [13] God forgives: this is the meaning of human life—both because the fact of continued human life testifies to divine forgiveness, and also because the fact of forgiveness gives meaning to human life. And God has acted in a self-involvement with man in his predicament in such a way that God's involvement is man's deliverance; this is the meaning of the Incarnation and the Cross. Moreover, the gift of revelation also includes a revelation of the possibilities open to man because of what God has done—possibilities which are both immediate (*e.g.*, freedom) and ultimate (transtemporal being with God).

Fourth is the gift of continued humanness, [14] which is to say, intentionality. In spite of sin, God maintains man in the way of being that is peculiarly human; God forgives *men*, not meteorites, evergreen trees, or anthropoid apes. Now human intentionality involves comprehension and volition; thus the gift of continued humanness includes, on the one hand, comprehension of the gift of revelation, and comprehension in turn includes the intellectual capacity for cognition and for the existential apprehension of relevance (*i.e.*, that in Christ God forgives *me*). The gift of continued humanness also includes, on the other hand, volition, which is a matter of willing, wanting, weighing, preferring, choosing.

Volition presupposes awareness and motivation adequate to constitute an actually live option. [15] It is in this sense that faith is too a "gift." The "gift of faith" is not a divine and irresistible bending of the will, which would amount to

[13] Jn 1 : 14; Heb 1 : 1-3; Rom 3 : 21.

[14] Küng, *op. cit.*, p. 160: "The sinner remains man even in and despite his sin. Why? Because God does not will the destruction of the sinner, but spares him for his change of heart. And why can God spare him? Because He has chosen from eternity to take upon Himself the death of the sinner. Redemption is the reason for the sinner's continuing to exist. . . . Thus the sinner, remaining and remaining man, already participates in the grace of his redemption."

[15] This may be part of the meaning of Jn 8 : 36.

God's making the choice for (*i.e.*, really instead of) man. It is, rather, a "drawing" of man to the point where the response of faith becomes a practical possibility.[16] This drawing is ordinarily effected through the medium of some form of human communication of the Gospel (*i.e.*, of the divine revelation of what God has done and what this means for human being), but it may also perhaps be effected through the immediate operation (whatever this may mean) of the Holy Spirit.[17] In any case, this "drawing" of individual man overcomes the bias toward autonomous self-affirmation (*i.e.*, sin) prompted internally by the insecurity arising from individual man's awareness of his finitude, his guilt, and the threat of meaninglessness,[18] and externally by an environment that at worst is hostile to the Gospel and faith, and that at best distorts both.

Thus the various "gifts"—the "elements" of divine activity which merge into and complement one another—form the pre-condition for the human experience of divine forgiveness.

III

The experienced event of divine forgiveness resides in a certain volitional function, namely, a decision of faith. This too is analogous to the experienced event of human forgiveness, which also is known only through the self-disclosure of the one who forgives, and which can be received only by volition.

The decision of faith has passive and active sides. The passive side is an *acknowledgment* of reality—a decision to accept the facts of individual man's existential need and God's

[16] Thomas Aquinas' idea that God "moves" the mind in free choice (cf. *Summa Theologiae*, I-II, q. 111, a. 2; q. 112, a. 2) can perhaps be understood in terms of motivation rather than efficient cause.

[17] What I am saying here is compatible with either an affirmative or a negative answer to the vexed question of the possibility and/or actuality of a genuine response of faith apart from an encounter with the Christian gospel.

[18] Cf. Tillich, *The Courage to Be* (New Haven, 1952), pp. 40-57.

gracious activity. In regard to ontological reality, the decision of faith involves an acknowledgment of dependence on something beyond oneself. For existence, man is entirely dependent on God's activity as Creator; for meaning, which is essential to existence insofar as it is human existence, [19] man is entirely dependent on God's function as Lord. In regard to moral reality, the decision of faith involves individual man's acknowledgment of the wrongness and culpability of his own existence—an acknowledgment, in other words, that there is a standard of value outside himself, and that he has not lived appropriately in relation to it, at best ignoring it and pretending that it did not exist, and at worst consciously rebelling against it. [20]

The active side of the decision of faith is individual man's *response* to the reality of his need and God's activity. This is first of all a response of trust—that is, a reliance on the integrity of God. It is a reliance on (which means a certainty of, confidence in, and dependence upon) the divine forgiveness both as eternal in the being of God and as historical in the Cross of Christ. It is also a corresponding non-reliance on oneself as deserving forgiveness, either because of the worth of past existence or because of the value of present or future response. But the active side of the decision of faith is more than a response of trust; it is also a response of self-commitment—that is, a reliance on the practical relevance of God in the life of individual man. (As the response of trust, which is one aspect of the active side of the decision of faith, corresponds to the acknowledgment of guilt as one aspect of the passive side, so also self-commitment, which is the other aspect of the active side, corresponds to the acknowledgment of ontological dependence as the other aspect of the passive side.)

Self-commitment is a willingness to obey, and thus presup-

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 51: "The threat to [man's] spiritual being is a threat to his whole being."

[20] A particularly strong emphasis on the acknowledgment of guilt marks Luther's early *Lectures on Romans*.

poses the moral/ethical relevance of the self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ. The covenant relationship, expressed in the reiterated formula "I am your God and you are my people," [21] involves a divine sovereignty over and claim to the lives of those people who would, on their part, experience the covenant relationship. [22] On the other hand, however, the response of self-commitment is not an anticipation of perfect obedience,

[21] Gen 17 : 8; Ex 6 : 7; 19 : 5; Lev 26 : 12; Dt 26 : 17-19; Jer 7 : 23; 11 : 4; 31 : 33; Eze 11 : 20; 14 : 11; Rev 21 : 3. Cf. the idea of "peculiar people" (KJV) in Tit 2 : 14; 1 Pe 2 : 9.

[22] This aspect of faith as self-commitment has received insufficient attention in theological formulations. Certainly the Reformation's neglect of it is understandable (albeit unfortunate) in view of the acute fear of every form of legalism. The modern period on the other hand has in general been skeptical of anything that has seemed remotely "heteronomous." To be sure, R. Bultmann has made a great deal of the idea of "radical obedience"; cf. *Jesus and the Word* (New York, 1958), pp. 72-86, and *Theology of the New Testament* (New York, 1951), I, 314-24. But this existentialist ethic is quite different from what I have in mind here as "obedience." Somewhat closer is the early Bonhöffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (New York, 1963), pp. 45-94, exposing the comfortable and complacent "cheap grace" that is not at the same time a call to self-giving obedience. But even here the effective emphasis is on the horizontal, ethical claim upon a Christian obediently to *serve*, without a corresponding emphasis on the vertical, purely religious claim upon him obediently to *worship*. In other, rather Calvinistic terms: there is a tendency for the first table of the Law to be obscured, or even swallowed up, by the second. The same tendency appears in Brunner, *Dogmatics* (London, 1949-62), III, 290-313: although he notes that "in the bestowal of the gift of faith there is always directly implicit the summons to obedience" (p. 297), he dissociates this obedience from any "general rules of obligation," which he sees as a "reintroduction of the law by the back door of the so-called third use of the law" (p. 300). Finally, Küng's omission of the idea of self-commitment from his explanation of justification may be significant here, although it is perhaps to be explained by his specific methodology, namely, a development of parallels between Barth and authentic Tridentine theology.

In short, whether understood religiously or ethically, prescriptively or contextually, obedience has been regularly viewed as a concomitant or consequence of faith, whereas I am here suggesting that a "commitment to obey" or at least a "willingness to obey" is constitutive of faith itself. Barth, indeed, suggests this idea; cf. *op. cit.*, IV/1, 620: "Faith is the humility of obedience." But he does not develop it.

for it is aware that life remains ambiguous, that individual man's pride is not annihilated, and that his ability to control his own reactions is limited. [23] Furthermore, even to the extent that it is actualized, obedience is never intended to become a claim on God's forgiveness. It is always a consequence of the divine activity; the very willingness to obey is, like the response of trust, grounded in God's prior attitude and act of forgiveness. Finally, obedience is not intended to be a "proof" of righteousness; [24] it may be an evidence of the response of faith, but the whole point of faith is its total disavowal of one's own righteousness.

So the decision of faith, always an act of human volition grounded in God's prior activity, is both an acknowledgment of individual man's ontological dependence and moral guilt, and a response of trust and self-commitment.

IV

What happens *to* individual man in the experienced event of divine forgiveness? Certainly such an existentially crucial event makes a difference, but how is that difference best understood and described? Just as certainly, a forgiven sinner is still a *sinner*; yet it seems clear that when he is forgiven something is basically changed in the way in which he *is* as a

[23] Barth, *op. cit.*, IV/1, 596: "There is no moment in his life in which [the justified man] does not have to look for and await and with outstretched hands request both forgiveness and therefore freedom from his sins." The whole sub-section, "The Pardon of Man," pp. 568-698 is an exposition of the tension of *simul justus et peccator*. Brunner, *op. cit.*, III, 293: a man "filled by God's Holy Spirit" is "precisely the person who perceives with an exceptional clarity the infinite distance that still separates him from his goal." Cf. also R. Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (New York, 1941-43), II, 127-56.

[24] Luther, *Lectures on Romans*, tr. W. Pauck (Philadelphia, 1961), p. 123: " 'Without works' must be understood . . . to refer to works by the performance of which one thinks he has obtained righteousness, as if one were righteous by virtue of such works or as if God regarded and accepted him as righteous because he did them. . . . It is not so much works, as such, as the interpretation and foolish estimation one applies to them that are disapproved."

sinner. [25] This change may be understood under three aspects.

Forgiven man has a changed status: still a sinner, he is nevertheless now *forgiven* as sinner. This is the "forensic" aspect of the change wrought in the experience of forgiveness. It does not, however, ignore the real facts of sinful man's existence. It does not pretend that sin has not happened and will not continue to happen. It does not amount to a declaring righteous (by God) of someone whom everybody (God, the man himself, and the world) knows is *not* righteous. Hence forgiveness cannot be simply "acquittal" in the sense of declaring "not guilty," (*i.e.*, declaring that the man had not sinned). [26] This would be a denial of reality, a deception unthinkable on the part of God. Forgiveness is therefore a deliberate "in spite of" or "notwithstanding"—a "taking into account" of sin, but not letting it be determinative of the relationship between God and man. Forgiveness has no meaning apart from a mutual recognition of the fact of sin, past and present.

Yet it must be emphasized that forgiveness in its forensic aspect is not "merely verbal." In many areas of life, words do more than "say"; they commit, they purchase, they betray. In short, they "perform." [27] As an event, a wedding is essentially a verbal event; yet the minister's formula, "I pronounce you husband and wife" is not simply a description. These words (together with the expressed vows) in a profound sense

[25] With this different mode of being evidently in mind, Küng, *op. cit.*, pp. 69, 85, 260-61, and 268, characterizes the change as "ontological."

[26] Because "acquit" may mean "discharge from a debt or obligation," the RSV reading of Rom 5 : 18 is technically correct: "As one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men." But because the more common understanding of "acquit" is "declare not guilty," this reading tends to be misleading.

[27] On the "performative" function of language, cf. J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (New York, 1965); also D. Evans, *The Logic of Self-Involvement* (London, 1963), pp. 27-78. Another example of the theological use of this idea is James W. McClendon, "Baptism as a Performative Sign," *ThT*, XXIII (1966-67), 403-16.

change the being of a man and a woman, who now *are* in a new way, *i.e.*, as husband and as wife. Likewise the words "I forgive" are not a description of what one is now doing (cf. "I am listening to the radio"); they are the means of changing the way in which the one who forgives and the one forgiven *are* toward each other. Thus the experienced event of divine forgiveness is a creative event, the inauguration of a new way of being.[28] And this brings us to the second aspect of the "change by forgiveness."

Forgiven man is reoriented man; this is the "religious" aspect of the change. There is now a new center of meaning—what God has done and is doing in creation and forgiveness. No longer does human existence derive its meaning from individual man's own self and its accomplishments—or from those apparently-noble but actually-limited extensions of the self: the family, the church, the nation. No longer is life characterized by sequential polytheism.[29] For there is (to change the metaphor) a new direction—new goals, aims, and values by which life is guided. This does not necessarily mean a vocational change; what is involved is not so much the content of individual existence and responsibility-in-life as its intention and context,[30] not so much *what* is done professionally, but *how* and *why*. (Of course, the reorientation effected by forgiveness may involve a change in vocation; it

[28] Barth, *op. cit.*, IV/1, 570: "This pardon does not mean only that something is said concerning us, or, as it were, pasted on us, but that a fact is created, a human situation which is basically altered." Brunner, *op. cit.*, III, 197: as justified, the sinner "receives a new personal being, a new person as his own."

[29] H. R. Niebuhr, *The Meaning of Revelation* (New York, 1960), p. 77: "As a rule men are polytheists, referring now to this and now to that valued being as the source of life's meaning. Sometimes they live for Jesus' God, sometimes for country and sometimes for Yale. For the most part they make gods out of themselves or out of the work of their own hands, living for their own glory as persons and as communities."

[30] Luther's doctrine of the "two realms" says something important about the being of forgiven man even if the dichotomy cannot finally be maintained in the terms Luther uses.

is probably impossible for forgiven man to function with integrity in some vocations.)

Finally, forgiven man is a newly free man; this is the "psychological" aspect of forgiveness. Here the dialectic of existence-as-forgiven is particularly apparent. Man is free in respect to God; yet this does not mean that he has forgotten his sin and guilt. On the contrary, he is more aware of it than ever; yet he is not crushed or dominated by it. He can now act even *coram Deo* with a certain boldness; for although he is aware that he is still a creature and a sinner, he is also aware that he is a creature and sinner whose nature and sin God has taken into himself and overcome. [31] Forgiven man is also newly free in regard to his fellow men. While he is more aware than ever of human interrelationships and of the impossibility of independent existence, he is not threatened by the possibility of hostility, disregard, or contempt (at least he *need* not be so threatened), for the center of meaning cannot be affected crucially by any man outside himself. On the positive side, forgiven man can accept his unacceptable fellow man without pretending that he is really acceptable, because he is profoundly aware that he himself has been so accepted by God. He can now relate to fellow men without using them. And forgiven man is newly free in respect to himself. More aware than ever of his own ambiguities, he has no longer a need defensively to deny their reality; for his inner security as individual man does not depend on his achievements professionally, socially, or personally. He can now even *begin* to be truly righteous without having to use his righteousness as ego-support. [32]

[31] As Barth emphasizes, the divine Yes underlies, interpenetrates, and finally overcomes the divine No.

[32] Brunner, *op. cit.*, III, 200: "Self-justification is no longer *possible* for the man for whom Christ was nailed on the Cross. It is not *necessary* for the man to whom God says 'You are my son.' " It is to the potentialities of this freedom that Jesus pointed in the sayings of Mt 5-7; cf. J. Jeremias, *The Sermon on the Mount*, N. Perrin, tr. (London, 1961), pp. 32-33: "These sayings of Jesus delineate the lived faith. They say: You are forgiven; you are the child of God; you belong to His kingdom.

Thus what happens in the experience of forgiveness is a fundamental change in the way of being of individual man.

V

The content of this paper may be summarized very briefly: (1) Forgiveness is eternal in the being of God, historically enacted in the life and death of Jesus of Nazareth and experienced in the existence of individual man. (2) Forgiveness is predicated on the prior divine gifts of creation, continued existence and humanness in spite of sin, and revelation. (3) Forgiveness is experienced in a decision of faith which comprises an acknowledgment of dependence and guilt and a response of trust and commitment. (4) Forgiveness effects a fundamental change in the way of human being, seen as change of status, reorientation of existence, and new freedom toward God, fellow man, and oneself. And all of this is involved in the meaning of "justification."

. . . You no longer belong to yourself; rather you belong to the city of God, the light of which shines in the darkness. Now you may also experience it: out of the thankfulness of a redeemed child of God a new life is growing."

SABBATARIAN ANABAPTISTS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

GERHARD F. HASEL
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

PART I

Sabbatarian Anabaptism has received little attention from scholars apparently because of a lack of source materials. [1] Within the last eighty-five years a rediscovery of important Anabaptist primary sources has taken place. These source materials also enlighten the almost unknown origin, rise, and development of Sabbatarian Anabaptism within the framework of the radical Reformation.

This study will proceed to discuss first the evidence of Sabbatarian Anabaptists from without the left wing of the Reformation; then attention will be turned to the testimony, history, and teachings of Sabbatarian Anabaptism which comes from the radical Reformation itself.

I. *Lists of Sects*

There have come down to us four lists of so-called sects which enable us to receive a deeper insight into the complex

[1] The term "Sabbatarian" is used throughout this article to refer to observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, rather than of Sunday as it is frequently employed in the Puritan tradition; cf. p. 117, n. 97. The only treatment of Sabbatarian Anabaptists as such is a short one-column article by William Klassen, "Sabbatarian Anabaptists," *Mennonite Encyclopedia* (Scottsdale, Penna., 1959), IV, 396, which appeared in German by Klassen and G. Hein, "Sabbatarier," *Mennonitisches Lexikon* (Karlsruhe, 1959), IV, 3-4. Sabbatarians are also briefly treated by D. Zscharnack, "Sabbatharier," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (2d ed.; Tübingen, 1931), V, cols. 8-9; and again by O. Eggenberger, "Sabbatarier," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (3d ed.; Tübingen, 1961), V, cols. 1260-61. The former does not identify the Sabbatarians of the sixteenth century as Anabaptists while the latter states that they are *Täufer* (Anabaptists).

nature of the radical Reformation. Some of these lists originated with radical champions of the Counter-Reformation.

The first list under discussion is from Georg Eder (1523-1586), a learned Catholic jurist and humanist and one of the most radical champions of the Counter-Reformation in Austria and Bavaria. [2] Eder enumerated not less than forty so-called "Anabaptist" sects in a chapter entitled "Ketzertanz" (Dance of Heretics) in a polemical book which he published in 1573. [3] He does not confine any sect to a specific location but adds to each notice a short description as to that sect's peculiarity. The fourth "Anabaptist" sect of the forty listed is "Sabbatarians" with the description that they observe the Sabbath and accept only the Father of the Trinity. [4]

The second catalog is from Christopher Erhard, a Catholic parish priest at Nikolsburg, Moravia, during the years 1583-1589. [5] He too was an aggressive representative of the Counter-Reformation and a polemical writer who produced four books. In Nikolsburg he had the special task of reestablishing the Roman Catholic faith and suppressing the "Anabaptist heresy" under the support of the local ruler Adam von Dietrichstein. [6] In a violent book printed in the year 1589 [7] Erhard also listed some forty sects, expressly

[2] On Eder see the article by Christian Neff, "Eder, Georg," *Mennonitisches Lexikon* (Frankfurt, 1913), I, 504-507.

[3] Georg Eder, *Evangelische Inquisition wahrer und falscher Religion, wider das gemeine unchristliche Klaggeschrei, dass schier niemand mehr wissen könnt wie oder was er glauben sollt* (1573, 2d ed. 1580), pp. 57-60. The list is reprinted by Henry A. DeWind, "A Sixteenth Century Description of Religious Sects in Austerlitz, Moravia," *MQR*, XXIX (1955), 48, 49.

[4] In this condensation of the description of the Sabbatarians the present writer has followed DeWind, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

[5] On Erhard see articles by Johann Loserth, "Erhard, Christoph," *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, I, 606-608; and R. Friedmann, "Erhard, Christoph," *Mennonite Encyclopedia* (Scottsdale, Penna., 1956), II, 243, 244.

[6] Loserth, *op. cit.*, pp. 607, 608; cf. "Catholicism and Anabaptism," *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, I, 532-534.

[7] Christopher Erhard, *Gründliche kurtz verfaste Historia. Von Münsterischen Widertauffern: vnd wie die Hutterischen Brüder so auch*

locating them in the southern part of Moravia. Thirty-five of these names were taken *verbatim* from Eder's list, and he added five more [8] of whom he apparently knew personally at Nikolsburg. "Sabbatarians" are again listed as fourth. Erhard gives, however, no description of any sect.

A third enumeration, from 1600, comes from Stredovsky of Bohemia, listing eleven sects. [9] Stredovsky appears to list other Protestants as well as Anabaptists. [10] "Sabbatarians" take the third place after Lutherans and Calvinists.

The fourth and earliest list is given by a Venetian weaver of taffetas and painter of battle standards, Marcantonio Varotto (or Barotto), [11] who in May, 1564, began a series of journeys that took him to Lyons, Geneva, Vienna, and subsequently to Austerlitz, Moravia, where he arrived in August, 1567, and listened to Anabaptist teachings. One year later he returned to Venice and decided again to join the Roman Catholic Church. He made a vivid deposition on his geographic and spiritual peregrination. He tells us:

> I left Moravia because during the two months I spent there I saw so many faiths and so many sects, the one contrary to the others and the one condemning the other, all drawing up catechisms, all desiring to be ministers, all pulling this way and that, all wishing to be the true church. In one place alone, and that small enough, called Austerlitz, there are thirteen or fourteen kinds of sects. [12]

He continues a little further on:

> In Moravia are the following [sects]: the Picards [Bohemian Brethren], the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Austerlitzians, the

billich Widertauffer genent werden (München, 1589). The only copy in the United States is found in the Mennonite Historical Library at Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana.

[8] *Ibid.*, fol. Bij.

[9] Reprinted by Josef Beck, ed. *Die Geschichts-Bücher der Widertäufer in Österreich-Ungarn* ("Fontes Rerum Austriacarum," XLIII, 2te Abth.; Wien, 1883), p. 74, n.c.

[10] This becomes obvious since he includes Lutherans, Calvinists, Hussites, Zwinglians, Cornelians, Adamits, Picards in his list.

[11] Varotto Marcantonio in S. Uffizio, Busta, No. 22, Venetian State Archive, Venice, Italy, cited by DeWind, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-53.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

> Cornelians, the Cappellarians [Hutterians], the Josephines, the Sabbatarians, the Arians, the Samosatians, the Swiss (whose minister is one Vidal, a Savoyard), and three others whose names I do not know because they have few followers and are excommunicated by the other eleven sects. . . . All these sects agree together on many things, but each has some particular article different from the others and they all have different catechisms. [13]

Varotto adds no explanations to his list of sects. He does, however, give one highly significant piece of information:

> The Picards [Bohemian Brethren], Lutherans, and Austerlitzians accept infant baptism; the other sects do not accept it but baptize adults only. . . . [14]

This statement offers the key for the grouping of the Protestants in Austerlitz in 1567. With the exception of the Lutherans, Picards, and Austerlitzians all other sects belonged to the Anabaptist movement because of the adult baptism which they practiced. Thus Varotto places the Sabbatarians among the Anabaptists. This is very significant for the identification of the Sabbatarians in Austerlitz.

At this point we need to discuss the reliability of the lists of sects. How reliable are the lists of the two champions of the Counter-Reformation, Eder and Erhard? First of all we must keep in mind that Eder had no personal experience whatever with the sectarians whom he lists and describes. He relied on other Catholic sources, some of which he acknowledged. [15] Erhard, in turn, drew the bulk of his list from Eder [16] and, thereby, must be judged on a similar basis.

Secondly, the portions of the lists which Eder and Erhard

[13] *Loc. cit.*

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[15] The following three sources are mentioned by Eder: (1) Dr. Johann Eck (the well-known opponent of Martin Luther), *Contra Confess. Zwinglii* (1530); (2) Friedrich Staphylus (1521-1564); Eder quoted this book as *Genealogia Lutheranismi*, and *De concordantia Lutheranorum*; (3) Wilhelm D. Lindanus (1525-1588), Catholic bishop of Roermund, Holland. Of his numerous works Eder quotes *Dubitantius de vera* . . . . (Cologne, 1565), and *Antilutheranorum* (date unknown).

[16] Erhard, *op. cit.*, fol. Bij.

have in common [17] supply an example of the methods used by the Counter-Reformation. Eder and Erhard, for example, group together without discrimination the names of sects which existed neither at the same time nor at the same place. A few examples of some sects listed will illustrate this point. The David Georgians (Jorists) existed only in the Netherlands, [18] the Hofmannites (Melchiorites) were active in Holland and around Strassburg up to about 1545, [19] the Münsterites were active only around Münster (1533-1535) and the adjacent parts of the Low Countries, [20] the Adamites or Naked Runners existed only in the Netherlands around 1530-1550, [21] etc. This shows that Eder and Erhard must be

[17] Erhard took verbatim all names of Eder's list with the exception of Nos. 33 (a, b, c), 36, and 37, then adding five new ones in their place.

[18] See articles on Joris by Christian Neff, "Joris, David," *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, I, 235-236; and Gerhard Hein, "Joris, David," *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, I, 17-19; and the biography by Roland H. Bainton, *David Joris: Wiedertäufer und Kämpfer für Toleranz im 16. Jahrhundert* (*ARG*, Ergänzungsband IV; Leipzig, 1937).

[19] Melchior Hofmann worked mainly in Holland and Strassburg, but preached also in Denmark and Sweden. In 1530 he formally joined the Anabaptists by baptism; see W. Neff, "Hofmann, Melchior," *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, II, 778-785. Hofmann had a large following in Holland; he himself, however, was arrested in Strassburg in 1533 and died there in prison in 1543. The majority of the Dutch "Melchiorites" joined the Münster movement (1534/5); after the tragic fiasco of Münster (1535) the "quiet" Dutch Melchiorites followed the path of Northern Mennonitism. See especially A. L. E. Verhayden, *Anabaptism in Flanders 1530-1650: A Century of Struggle* ("Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History," IX, Scottsdale, Penna., 1961), pp. 15-20; of importance are also F. O. zur Linden, *Melchior Hofmann, ein Prophet der Wiedertäufer* (Haarlem, 1885); B. N. Krohn, *Geschichte der fanatischen und enthusiastischen Wiedertäufer, Melchior Hofmann und die Secte der Hofmannianer* (Leipzig, 1758); Peter Kawerau, *Melchior Hofmann als religiöser Denker* (Haarlem, 1954).

[20] Verheyden, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-23; H. Schiedung, *Die Münsterischen Wiedertäufer* (Münster, 1934).

[21] F. Cohrs, "Pastor, Adam," *PRE*, XIV (Leipzig, 1904), 759, 760; K. Vos, "Pastor, Adam," *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* (1909), pp. 104-126; A. H. Newmann, "Adam Pastor, Antitrinitarian, Antipaedo-Baptist," *Papers of the American Society of Church History*, V (1917), 75-99; S. Cramer and F. Pijper, ed., *Bibliotheca Neerlandica Reformatoria* (Den Haag, 1903-14), V, 317-359; DeWind, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

read with caution. The purpose of their catalogs is clearly polemical. The authors wish to show the disorganization of the Anabaptist movement and to discredit the sober and pious groups by listing them with eccentric or immoral sects. [22]

On the other hand, Varotto's list seems to be relatively credible. [23] He has no reason to distort the situation at Austerlitz; he enumerates the sects as they existed at this particular time (1567) at this place. The very fact that at least five names of Varotto's list are found also in Stredovsky's compilation seems to point to a high degree of reliability of the latter in at least these instances.

The information found in these four lists of sects is highly significant for the present investigation concerning Sabbatarian Anabaptists. Taking Varotto's statement in which he distinguished between those who do "accept infant baptism" and those who "do not accept it, but baptize adults only" [24] as a key with which he implies that the latter ones are Anabaptists, supported by Eder's compilation of "Anabaptists," [25] we may conclude that the Sabbatarians mentioned in these four lists constitute Sabbatarian Anabaptists, possibly having many followers. [26]

Secondly, Varotto's list locates Sabbatarian Anabaptists in Austerlitz, Moravia, [27] in the year 1567.

II. *Erasmus' and Luther's Testimonies Concerning Sabbatarians*

Erasmus (1466-1536) reported on Sabbatarians in Bohemia:

[22] DeWind, *op. cit.*, p. 51; cf. George H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (Philadelphia, 1962), p. 676.

[23] This is the view of Williams, *loc. cit.*

[24] Varotto cited by DeWind, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

[25] Eder, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-60.

[26] Stredovsky gives Sabbatarians the third place in his list of eleven sects, preceeded only by obviously large groups such as Lutherans and Calvinists; Eder and Erhard place Sabbatarians as No. 4 out of forty different so-called "Anabaptists." These early enumerations seem to indicate that Sabbatarian Anabaptists were considered to be an important and strong group.

[27] Varotto in DeWind, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

> Now I hear that among the Bohemians a new kind of Jews are springing up, whom they call Sabbatarii, who serve the Sabbath with great superstition. . . . [28]

Because of this simple and short reference it is difficult to identify these Bohemian Sabbatarians with Sabbatarian Anabaptists, although it is a possibility.

Martin Luther (1483-1546) reported on Sabbatarian groups in Moravia and Austria:

> In our time is found in Moravia a foolish group of people, who call themselves Sabbatarians [Sabbather] and say one should keep the Sabbath according to Jewish manner and custom. [29]

Luther remarked further, "Recently the Sabbatarians [Sabbather] have been arising in Austria." [30] Most important, however, is Luther's *Brief wider die Sabbather* (1538) [31] in which he attempts to refute the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath, of which he had already known since 1532; [32] he argues his point from the Bible and tries to convert the Sabbatarians from their error.

It seems unlikely that Luther had Sabbatarian Anabaptists in mind in his letter against Sabbatarians, [33] but definite judgment must be suspended until conclusive evidence may be adduced.

III. *Oswald Glait*

The most famous representative of Sabbatarian Anabaptists was Oswald Glait [34] (Glayt, Glaidt, sometimes also called

[28] Desiderius Erasmus, "Amabili ecclesiae concordia," *Opera Omnia*, V, cols. 505, 506.

[29] *D. Martin Luthers Werke* (Weimar ed.), XLII, 520; cf. p. 603; *Tischreden*, III, 600.

[30] *Ibid.*, XLIV, 411.

[31] Joh. Georg Walch, ed., *Dr. Martin Luthers sämmtliche Schriften* (St. Louis, 1910), XX, cols. 1828 ff.

[32] Zscharnack, *op. cit.*, V, col. 8.

[33] Zscharnack, *loc. cit.*, seems to imply that Sabbatarian Anabaptists are meant, which view is held by Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 410. It seems however that this letter was written by Luther against proselytizing Jews who also demanded circumcision.

[34] On Glait see articles by Christian Loserth, "Glait, Oswald,"

Oswald von Jamnitz after his last place of sojourn), who was born in Cham, Upper Palatinate, Germany. Formerly, he was a priest or monk. In the 1520's he joined the Lutherans in Austria and became a Lutheran minister in Löben, Styria, but was expelled from "all of Austria for the sake of the Word of God." [35] He turned to Nikolsburg, Moravia, in the year 1525, and became the assistant minister of the Lutheran congregation which was led there by Hans Spittelmaier.

The important position of Glait in Nikolsburg may be seen by the fact that he attended and participated in the important "synod" [36] which the Moravian nobleman Johann Dubčansky [37] called to convene in Austerlitz, Moravia, on March 14, 1526, [38] to unite the evangelical parties of Moravia and Bohemia. Glait printed a report which contains seven articles agreed upon. [39]

In July of 1526, Balthasar Hübmaier, [40] theologian and able

Mennonitisches Lexikon, (Weiherhof/Pfalz, 1937), II, 117-119; R. F. Loserth, "Glait, Oswald," *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, I, 522-523; W. Wiswedel, "Oswald Glait von Jamnitz," *ZKG*, LVI (1937), 550-564; Samuel Geiser, "Ein Lied des Märtyrers Oswald Glait," and J. P. Classen, "Zur Melodie des Liedes," *Mennonitische Geschichtsblätter*, XVII (1960), 10-14. The Hutterian Chronicle gives important pieces of evidence on the life of Glait, see R. Wolkan, ed., *Geschicht-Buch der Hutterischen Brüder* (Ft. Macleod, Alta., 1923), pp. 37, 43, 125, 154, 201, 202.

[35] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 550.

[36] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 551; Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

[37] J. T. Müller, *Die Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder* (Herrnhut, 1922), I, 447.

[38] On March 19, 1526, every participant added his signature to the agreement which was finally reached between the two sides of more than one hundred "Utraquist" ministers and the Lutherans, who were even more. See R. F. Loserth, *op. cit.*, p. 522.

[39] The title of this report is, *Handlung, yetz den XIV. tag Marcij dis XXVI jars so zu Osterlitz in Merhern durch erforderte Versammlung viler pfarrer und priesterschaften, auch etlicher des Adels und andrer, in Christlicher lieb und ainigkeyt beschehen und in syben artickeln beschlossen, mit sambt derselben artickel erklärung. I Cor.* 1. The only known copy is in the National Library in Vienna, Austria.

[40] On Hübmaier, see articles by Christian Loserth, "Hübmaier, Balthasar," *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, II, 353-363; A. Hegler, "Hub-

writer, who had joined the Anabaptists in the previous year (1525), [41] arrived as a refugee in Nikolsburg and changed the newly organized Lutheran congregation (1524) there into an Anabaptist brotherhood, [42] with the approval of Lord Leonhard von Lichtenstein who was himself converted to Anabaptism. [43] Oswald Glait, one of the ministers of the Lutherans, was won over to Anabaptism by Hübmaier. [44] The Anabaptist congregation at Nikolsburg grew rapidly and had for a short time a membership of some 6,000 to 12,000. [45]

Glait was assistant minister of this young Anabaptist congregation, [46] and on July 21, 1526, in his room Hübmaier finished his baptismal tract, *Der uralten und neuen Lehrer Urteil, dass man die jungen Kinder nit taufen soll, bis sie im Glauben unterrichtet sind.* [47] (This tract was published in 1527 at Nikolsburg by Simprecht Sorg, called "Froschauer," who had followed Hübmaier and published all his books.) This stimulated Glait to do more writing. In 1527 he published his second work, *Entschuldigung Osbaldi Glaidt von Chamb. . . etlicher Artickel Verklärung so ihnen von Misgönnern falschlich*

maier, Balthasar," *PRE*, VIII, 418-424; Johann Loserth, *Doctor Balthasar Hübmaier und die Anfänge der Wiedertaufe in Mähren* (Brünn, 1893); Wilhelm Mau, *Balthasar Hübmaier* (Berlin, 1912); Carl Sachsse, *D. Balthasar Hübmaier als Theologe* (Berlin, 1914); F. Westin, *Der Weg der freien christlichen Gemeinden durch die Jahrhunderte* (Kassel, 1956), pp. 63 ff. The most recent evaluation is by Wilhelm Schulze, "Neuere Forschungen über Balthasar Hubmaier," *Alemannisches Jahrbuch* (1959), pp. 224-272.

[41] Hegler, *op. cit.*, p. 420.

[42] J. Loserth, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-129; Wiswedel, *op. cit.* p. 555.

[43] Josef Beck, ed., *Die Geschichts-Bücher der Wiedertäufer in Oesterreich-Ungarn* ("Fontes Rerum Austriacarum," XLIII, 2te Abth.; Wien, 1883), p. 48. Wolkan, *op. cit.*, p. 37; cf. Hegler, *op. cit.*, p. 422; Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 205, 218, 219.

[44] Beck, *op. cit.*, pp. 160 f.; cf. R. F. Loserth, *op. cit.*, p. 523; Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

[45] J. Loserth, *op. cit.*, p. 149; cf. J. Loserth, "Nikolsburg I," *Mennonitisches Lexikon* (Karlsruhe, 1958), III, 256.

[46] Wolkan, *op. cit.*, p. 37; cf. R. F. Loserth, *op. cit.*, p. 523.

[47] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 555; R. F. Loserth, *op. cit.*, p. 522; Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

verkehrt und also nachgeredt worden ist. [48] In this tract Glait defends himself against attacks from the Barefoot Friars of near-by Felsberg and their charge that he taught heresy. The booklet is directed to "all believers in Christ" and discusses fourteen points of faith. [49] From this booklet we gain information on two pertinent points for our discussion: (1) Glait was already won over to Anabaptism, since he defends the baptism of adults and rejects infant baptism as unscriptural. [50] (2) Glait was at this time, January, 1527, not yet a Sabbatarian, [51] because in point seven he explains that "all days are a holiday of the Spirit" and "thus Sunday, Monday, Tuesday is all the same, since we honor and praise God in our hearts on all days." [52]

In March, 1527, a dispute broke out in Nikolsburg, mainly concerning the use of the sword, which was defended by Hübmaier with Hans Spittelmaier and rejected by Hans Hut with Jacob Wiedemann and Philip Jäger. [53] Glait sided with the latter. [54] Leonhard von Lichtenstein decided for the use of the sword on the side of Hübmaier. [55] The latter, however, was imprisoned this very year by the Austrian authorities and he offered to "stand still" as regards the practice of baptism and the Lord's Supper, [56] points which were also disputed. The "stand still" caused the congregation of Nikolsburg to split [57] with the result that the rest of this large Anabaptist

[48] This tract was published at Nikolsburg by Simprecht Sorg, called "Froschauer" and is dated January 26, 1527. See Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 556, n. 10; R. F. Loserth, *loc. cit.*

[49] These fourteen points are discussed by Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, pp. 557-561 and summarized by R. F. Loserth, *op. cit.*, p. 523.

[50] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 561.

[51] Klassen, *op. cit.*, p. 396.

[52] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 559.

[53] P. Dedic, "Nikolsburg," *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, III, 883-886; Wolkan, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

[54] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 562; R. F. Loserth, *op. cit.*, p. 523.

[55] Ch. Loserth *op. cit.*, pp. 117, 118; Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

[56] John Horsch, *The Hutterian Brethren 1528-1931* (Goshen, Ind., 1931), p. 5.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 6; Beck, *op. cit.*, pp. 49, 50.

community united with the later Sabbatarians of this city. [58]

Glait had to leave Nikolsburg sometime before Pentecost, 1527, because of his stand for non-resistance, and went with Hans Hut [59] to Vienna, Austria, where he preached and baptized. [60] In the same year we find Glait in Regensburg, Bavaria, [61] with the former priests Wolfgang Brandhuber and Hans Schlaffer. [62] They possibly went to the Martyrs' Synod [63] in Augsburg, Bavaria, which met there beginning on August 20, 1527. [64] Hans Schlaffer testifies to Glait's devout Christ-like life. [65] The latter apparently returned to Nikolsburg, [66] and it may be here that he for the first time began to promulgate Sabbatarian teachings among Anabaptists.

Andreas Fischer, [67] a learned Anabaptist and former priest, who is reported to have known Greek, Hebrew, and Latin, [68]

[58] The record states, "Aber die zu Nikolsburg behielten das Schwert, daher sy: die Schwertler genannt werden, ietz aber Sabather heissen . . ." in Beck, *op. cit.*, p. 73; cf. Horsch, *op. cit.*, p. 6, n. 8; Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

[59] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 562.

[60] There Glait baptized at Pentecost, 1527, the former Franciscan Friar, Leonhard Schiemer, who soon thereafter died a martyr's death. Wolkan, *op. cit.*, p. 43; cf. Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 562; Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

[61] Wiswedel, *loc. cit.*

[62] R. Friedmann, "Leonhard Schiemer," *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, IV, 452-459; see also R. Friedmann, "Leonhard Schiemer and Hans Schlaffer: Two Anabaptist Martyr-Apostles of 1528," *MQR* XXXIII (1959), 31-41.

[63] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 562.

[64] F. H. Littell, *The Origins of Sectarian Protestantism: A Study of the Anabaptist View of the Church* (New York and London, 1964), pp. 19, 122; Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-180.

[65] Hermann Nestler, *Die Wiedertäuferbewegung in Regensburg* (Regensburg, 1926), p. 14.

[66] Klassen, *loc. cit.*

[67] The fullest recent treatment on Fischer is by Petr Ratkoš, "Die Anfänge des Wiedertäufertums in der Slowakei," *Aus 500 Jahren deutsch-tschechoslowakischer Geschichte*, edited by Karl Obermann (Berlin, 1958), pp. 41-59; see also articles on Glait by Ch. Loserth, *op. cit.*, p. 117-119; R. F. Loserth, *op. cit.*, pp. 523-524; and the one by Klassen, *op. cit.*, p. 396.

[68] This is the testimony of Valentine Crautwald in his book, *Bericht vnd anzeigen/ wie gar one Kunst vnd guotten verstandt/ andreas Fischer.*

appeared in Nikolsburg in 1527/28, where he adopted the Sabbatarian beliefs of Glait, [69] and became his intimate collaborer.

Glait appeared, along with his co-worker Fischer, in 1528 in Liegnitz, Silesia, promulgating the idea of Sabbath-keeping successfully in Liegnitz and the surrounding villages. [70] Here Glait met Caspar Schwenckfeld and his co-worker Valentine Crautwald, [71] and engaged with the former in a debate on the Sabbath. [72] The result of this encounter was the publication of a small book by Glait with the title, *Buchlenn vom Sabbath* (about 1530). [73] With this treatise a book-war broke out between Glait and Fischer on the one side and Capito, Schwenckfeld, and Crautwald on the other. The book's far-reaching influence is further seen by the reaction of Lord Leonhard von Lichtenstein at Nikolsburg who was greatly concerned about the new movement and success of its Sabbath teaching so that he wrote a letter to Capito (dated 1531) sending with it a manuscript copy of Glait's book on the Sabbath and asking for a criticism of the same. Capito, being overburdened with work, turned to his friend Schwenckfeld, who was acquainted with Glait and his teaching through the debate on the Sabbath in Liegnitz, [74] asking

vom Sabbat geschriben / auch Das er Inen wider alles rechten sucht / noch als noettig Im Christenthum zuohalten Hab moegen schuetzen (1532), pp. 2, 3.

[69] S. D. Hartranft and E. E. Johnson, eds., *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum* (Norristown, Penn., 1907-), IV, 450. (Hereafter cited as *CS*); Klassen, *op. cit.*, p. 396.

[70] *CS*, IV, 450-451; cf. Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 562; R. F. Loserth, *op. cit.*, p. 523; Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 410.

[71] Schwenckfeld's words are reprinted in *CS*. See also G. H. Williams and A. M. Mergal, eds., *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers* (Philadelphia, 1957), pp. 65, 161; and R. H. Grützmacher, "Schwenckfeld, Caspar," *PRE*, XVIII, 74.

[72] Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 410, 411.

[73] No copy of this significant work is known to exist; the title is given by Schwenckfeld, *CS*, IV, 453. Wiswedel is probably quite right in suggesting that Glait had finished his manuscript already some time before its publication, *op. cit.*, p. 562.

[74] *CS*, IV, 454.

Schwenckfeld to make a reply, [75] which he produced shortly thereafter. [76]

Capito, however, later wrote his own reply which indeed was the first one printed. His first refutation is entitled, *Über das Buch vom Sabbath* (December, 1531); [77] he later issued a second one in Latin, whose title in English would be *Capito's Critical Remarks to Oswald's Booklet on the Sabbath.* [78] A few weeks after Capito's refutation Schwenckfeld gave his criticism of Glait's work in *Vom Christlichen Sabbath vnd vnderscheid dess alten vnd newen Testaments* (dated January 1, 1532).[79] At the suggestion of Duke Friedrich II, and probably also of Schwenckfeld, Crautwald also composed a critique of the book of Glait, [80] which, however, is not extant. Glait then delegated his co-worker Fischer to reply to Crautwald. Fischer's reply to Crautwald is not extant either, but Crautwald's second treatise is preserved and is titled *Bericht vnd anzeigen / wie gar one Kunst vnd guotten verstandt / andreas*

[75] *CS*, IV, 454, 451.

[76] Williams *op. cit.*, p. 410, says that "Schwenckfeld was requested by Lord Leonhard of Lichtenstein in Nicolsburg to refute Glait on his Sabbatarianism"; however according to Schwenckfeld's own testimony it was Capito who sought his help; he writes, "Therefore I let your Honor know that I received from W. Capito, my dear friend and brother. the letter and copy [of Glait's book] and since he is at this time overloaded with big and important things . . . he has considered to ask me to give my judgment." *CS*, IV, 454.

[77] The full heading is, *Capito an [den Prediger] des Leonhard von Lichtenstein. — Über das Buch vom Sabbath [von Oswald Glait]*. It was published before the middle of December, 1531, *i.e.*, before Dec. 21. The work is incomplete, but that which is extant is reprinted by M. Krebs and H. G. Rott, eds., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer, VII: Elsass, I. Teil* ("Quellen und Forschungen der Reformationsgeschichte," XXVI; Gütersloh, 1959), pp. 363-385.

[78] Reprinted in German by Krebs and Rott, *op. cit.*, pp. 386-393.

[79] Reprinted in *CS*, IV, 452-518. The only publication known is the print of 1589. This work was originally sent to Leonhard von Lichtenstein in the form of a letter dated New Year's Day, 1532. No trace of this letter has been found, but Schwenckfeld's original handwritten manuscript with his own corrections and additions is preserved in the Königliche Landes-Bibliothek at Stuttgart, Codex, theol. et philos. 4°, No. 18 and is the basis of this reprint.

[80] *CS*, IV, 450; cf. Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 562.

Fischer. vom Sabbat geschriben / auch Das er Inen wider alles rechten sucht / noch als noettig Im Christentum zuohalten Hab moegen schuetzen (1532). [81] The Sabbatarian teachings of Glait and Fischer as they are found in these refutations will be discussed later in this study.

In the year 1532 the Duke of Silesia ordered Glait out of his territory. [82] Glait planned then to enter Prussia to work there for his faith, but he met the Anabaptists Johann Spittelmaier, formerly of Moravia, Oswald von Griesskirch, just come from Liegnitz, Silesia, and Johann Bünderlin, who were expelled from Prussia through a mandate of Duke Albrecht under date of August 16, 1532. [83] It is supposed that Glait now turned to the Falkenau territory in Bohemia, and that he founded a Sabbatarian Anabaptist congregation in Falkenau, for we find there Sabbatarians as late as 1538. [84] Not much is known of Glait's later apostolate.

Andreas Fischer is believed to have gone to Nikolsburg, [85] most likely in 1532, [86] where he promulgated his and Glait's Sabbatarianism. Some time in 1532 he turned to Slovakia, but in 1534 was back again in the territory of Lord Leonhard von Lichtenstein, and stayed there till 1536. [87]

Later Glait must have become the leader of an Anabaptist congregation around the city of Jamnitz, Moravia. [88] The Hutterian Chronicle gives this account of his last days:

> In 1545 Brother Oswald Glait lay in prison in Vienna for the sake of his faith. . . . Two brethren also came to him, Antoni Keim and Hans Staudach, who comforted him. To them he commended his

[81] The only extant original copy is kept in the Staatsbücherei of Berlin; but in the United States the Schwenckfelder Library in Pennsburg, Penna., contains a handwritten manuscript copy, which was available to the present writer.

[82] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 562.

[83] *CS*, IV, 450.

[84] *CS*, IV, *loc. cit.*

[85] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 563.

[86] Ratkoš, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

[87] *Ibid.*, pp. 54-55.

[88] R. F. Loserth, *op. cit.*, p. 523.

wife and child in Jamnitz. After he had been in prison a year and six weeks, they took him out of the city at midnight, that the people might not see and hear him, and drowned him in the Danube. [89]

Thus in the year 1546 ended the life of the most prominent leader of the Sabbatarian Anabaptists. Glait was honored in song after his death; his services to the Brethren were willingly recognized during his life. Balthasar Hübmaier in his *Ainfeltiger Unterricht* (1526) gives him the praise that he "proclaimed the light of the holy Gospel so bravely and comfortingly, the like of which I know of no other person." [90]

Still another record of Sabbatarian Anabaptists comes from Hans von Ölbronn, an Anabaptist from Württemberg. He made the following statement in the court at Strassburg on August 23, 1536:

He states, too, that many of them are of different opinons, namely the Schwertler who carry the sword, use it and swear, the Sabbatarians, who have established the Sabbath again, and the Münsterites. [91]

Hans von Ölbronn does not inform us where these Sabbatarians were located, but the time of his testimony and the mention of Sabbatarians adds one more bit of evidence to Sabbatarian Anabaptists.

The cumulative evidence of Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Anabaptists leads to the conclusion that Sabbatarian Anabaptists existed early in the sixteenth century. The date of birth of Sabbatarian Anabaptism seems to have been in the year 1527 or 1528. Its place of birth appears to have been Nikolsburg, Moravia, which was a temporary haven of refuge

[89] A. J. F. Zieglschmid, ed., *Die älteste Chronik der Hutterischen Brüder* (Philadelphia, 1943), pp. 259, 260, 266; cf. Wolkan, *op. cit.*, pp. 201, 202.

[90] Balthasar Hübmaier, *Ainfeltiger Unterricht* (1526) cited by R. F. Loserth, *loc. cit.*

[91] Hans von Ölbronn quoted in Gustav Bossert, ed., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer: Markgrafentum Brandenburg* ("Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte," XIII; Leipzig, 1930), p. 52. "Er erklärte auch, dass ihrer viel anderer Meinung seien, nämlich die Schwertler, die das Schwert tragen und schwören, die Sabbather, die den Sabbath wieder aufgerichtet haben und die Münsterischen."

for persecuted Anabaptists. The most prominent leader of the Sabbatarian Anabaptists was Oswald Glait, who was supported by his convert, the learned Andreas Fischer. Glait promulgated his Sabbatarian Anabaptist teachings with a considerable degree of success [92] as the concern of the local rulers in this matter shows. Sabbatarian Anabaptist congregations soon flourished in Moravia in the cities of Nikolsburg and Austerlitz, in Bohemia at Falkenau and possibly at Jamnitz, in Silesia probably in the area of Liegnitz. Glait sealed his faith with a martyr's death in 1546, but the work he began continued.

IV. *Glait's Sabbatarian Teaching*

Glait's own book entitled *Buchlenn vom Sabbath* is not extant. In order to learn what Glait taught, we must turn to his opponents and investigate their refutations of his influential work and teaching.

Wolfgang Capito, who published his German refutation shortly before December 21, 1531, under the title, *Über das Buch vom Sabbath*, [93] does not yield much information on Glait's Sabbatarian teaching. The outline of his refutation as stated in his book is to show "firstly, the difference of the law of Moses and our Gospel; secondly, what or how far the entire Moses pertains to us who are now under the glorified Lord Jesus Christ, and thirdly, to open the main argument of the booklet [of Glait] and to exhibit its fault." [94] The last part of Capito's book, which presumably would yield the most important information for our investigation, is missing.

Caspar Schwenckfeld's critique of Glait's book and teaching provides sufficient evidence to give a relatively representative picture of the latter's Sabbatarianism. Schwenckfeld was not only acquainted with Glait and his Sabbath teachings through

[92] Wiswedel, *op. cit.*, p. 563, thinks that Glait's Sabbatarianism did not find entrance in Moravia and that Glait soon gave it up. In view, however, of the evidence of the sources this can not be accepted.

[93] *Supra*, n. 77.

[94] Krebs and Rott, *op. cit.*, p. 367.

this book but also through a "friendly debate" [95] which he had with Glait on his teaching at Liegnitz, Silesia, about 1528. Thus it is mainly through Schwenckfeld's critique [96] that we learn of Glait's Sabbatarian teachings.

Schwenckfeld considered Glait as the founder and "teacher" of Sabbatarian Anabaptists in Moravia. [97] His book gives the impression that he advances a relatively fair and comprehensive treatment of Glait's arguments for the Sabbath. This is supported by Schwenckfeld's own statement in which he says that he wishes to "examine" Glait's "reasons or arguments wherewith he tries to introduce the Sabbath," [98] and by the fact of the many references to Glait and his "booklet." [99]

There is ample evidence that Glait understood the Sabbath to be celebrated on the "seventh day" of the week, that is, Saturday. [100]

At this point it is important to state the basic presupposition of Glait's Sabbatarianism. Glait based the "arguments" for his Sabbath teaching solely on the authority of "Scripture" and its "literal" interpretation. He firmly believed in the validity of the Old Testament and its law; only those parts of the Old Testament and its law which "refer to the priesthood are a shadow . . . and have ceased in Christ as the letter of the New Testament witnesses about the entire Old Testament, both law and covenant." [101] Glait, as appears, maintained the unity of Old and New Testaments, believing the former to be relevant and valid as pertains to the Decalogue.

[95] *CS*, IV, 454.

[96] *CS*, IV, 451 ff.

[97] This is especially evident from the fact that Schwenckfeld substituted the term "Sabbatarian(s)" for the personal name "Osswald [Glait]" in his original manuscript when he submitted it for publication. See *CS*, IV, 455, 457, 458 ff.

[98] *CS*, IV, 479.

[99] There are over sixty instances in which "Osswald [Glait]" is mentioned by name in Schwenckfeld's book.

[100] *CS*, IV, 457, 467, 483, 485, 491, 492, 500, 506, 507, 512, 518; also Capito in Krebs and Rott, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

[101] *CS*, IV, 485; cf. pp. 456, 499.

Glait's chief argument for the necessity of keeping the Sabbath was the Decalogue.

> The strongest argument of Osswald [Glait] is the number of the Ten Commandments, of which we have heard before. He holds irrevocable that God did not give eight or nine but ten commandments, which he wants to have kept by everyone. . . . Herewith he [Glait] wants to make understood that either the Sabbath must be kept too or all the other nine commandments must also be rejected. [102]

Glait expressed the same thought this way: "If the Sabbath [commandment] is free, then all the other [commandments] are free." [103]

This view of the validity of the Decalogue was supported by Glait with the observation that "neither Christ nor his apostles have attempted to change and have never annulled" [104] the Ten Commandments. Christ is not the end of the law. Glait went so far as to say that if Jesus of Nazareth "had abolished the Ten Commandments that he would not believe that he is the truly promised Messiah and Christ." [105] But on the contrary, Christ stressed the keeping of the law by his "word, 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep God's commandments,' with which he intends to preserve the Sabbath as the Jewish Young Ruler himself understood with whom the Lord spoke. Matt. 19: 17." [106] Glait further taught that Christ "has never broken or abolished the Sabbath, but instead he has established, indeed founded, and adorned it with miracles." Christ, in his Sabbath miracles, attempted "to confirm and to adorn the Sabbath," but not to "break or abolish" it. [107] Furthermore, the apostles kept the Sabbath, and even the apostle Paul, who rejected circumcision.

Glait did not accept the charge of his opponents that the Sabbath commandment is a ceremonial law and done away

[102] *CS*, IV, 479; cf. pp. 468, 484.
[103] *CS*, IV, 480.
[104] *CS*, IV, 479.
[105] *CS*, IV, 490.
[106] *CS*, IV, 468, 469.
[107] *CS*, IV, 508, 509.

with as is circumcision. Circumcision had its origin with Abraham, but the Sabbath existed long before there were any Jews in existence: "Oswalt [Glait] maintains that the external Sabbath is commanded and kept from the beginning of creation." [108] God commanded "Adam in paradise to celebrate the Sabbath." [109] Thus "the Sabbath and other laws" were not first given through Moses but "were given orally at the beginning of the world." [110] Therefore "the Sabbath and other laws" are "an eternal sign of hope and a memorial of creation," [111] "and an eternal covenant ... and that God wants the Sabbath to be kept as long as the world stands." [112]

> Osswald [Glait] is teaching one is obligated to celebrate the eternal Sabbath, which is Saturday, because such is God's word, will and commandment. Because it is written in Exodus 20 : 8, 'Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy,' and again, 'The children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is an eternal sign between me and the children of Israel.' Exod. 31 : 16, 17. Here is God's word, he says, from which one sees that God wants the Sabbath to be kept as long as the world stands. [113]

Glait rejected the argument that the Sabbath originated with Moses on Mt. Sinai by pointing out that the Sabbath "was not first given through Moses, but was given orally at the beginning of the world and was celebrated and sanctified by Abraham." According to Gn 26: 5 Abraham obeyed God's voice, commandments, statutes, and laws which included the Sabbath. Likewise, the children of Israel kept the Sabbath in the wilderness as Ex 16 testifies, and this they did "before the other commandments were given in written form." [114]

The Old Testament, however, was not the only basis for Glait's teaching on the Sabbath. It has already been pointed out above in what sense Glait understood Christ to have

[108] *CS*, IV, 458; cf. pp. 460-467.
[109] *CS*, IV, 491.
[110] *Ibid.*
[111] *CS*, IV, 458; cf. Capito in Krebs and Rott, *op. cit.*, p. 365.
[112] *CS*, IV, 457.
[113] *Ibid.*
[114] *CS*, IV, 491.

established the Sabbath. He took a further argument from Heb 4: 3, 9: "Osswald [Glait] says, Since we did not yet enter completely into the eternal rest, we still have to keep the Sabbath." [115] This thought is further pursued:

> Osswald [Glait] now says, Paul speaks in this text [Heb 4 : 3] about the eternal Sabbath which is to come, which is not yet come in any other way but in hope. [116]

In this sense Glait understood the observance of the literal or typical Sabbath as not yet fulfilled but as pointing forward as a "shadow and sign of the eternal Sabbath," [117] which is going to be realized when "the sign [Sabbath] becomes fulfilled at the Second Coming of Christ." [118] Glait held firmly to the *literal* obligation of keeping the Sabbath against the *spiritual* keeping of the Sabbath of Schwenckfeld, who considered the Sabbath to be kept on every day of one's life. Glait argued that ". . . the Sabbath must also be kept by oxen and asses and they could not celebrate it spiritually," [119] and therefore must be kept literally. In this sense "the Sabbath is for us that which it was for the ancient Jew." [120]

The book of Glait also contained instruction on the preparation for the celebration of the Sabbath and as to the "how, where, and when" [121] of the celebration of the Sabbath.

Glait taught that it is an absolute necessity that Christians keep the weekly Sabbath, because it is a requirement of the law and "whoever offends it in one point becomes a transgressor of the law. James 2: 11. He will not enter paradise which Jesus Christ obtained for us." [122] Only punishment awaits the transgressor of the commandments: "No one remains unpunished who disobeys the divine commandments." [123]

[115] *CS*, IV, 501.
[116] *CS*, IV, 503.
[117] *CS*, IV, 500; cf. p. 489.
[118] *CS*, IV, 504.
[119] *CS*, IV, 502.
[120] *CS*, IV, 501.
[121] *CS*, IV, 511.
[122] *CS*, IV, 492.
[123] *CS*, IV, 457.

As to the origin of Sunday, only one short reference is found: ". . . Sunday is the pope's invention. . . ." and the abrogation of the Sabbath is "the Devil's work." [124]

Glait, as we gather mainly through Schwenckfeld's refutation in corroboration of Capito's sparse information, based his Sabbath teaching solely on the literal interpretation of Scripture. The following points of Glait's teaching emerge: (1) The Sabbath as one of the commandments of the Decalogue must still be kept by Christians. (2) The Sabbath is a memorial of creation and an eternal covenant. (3) The Sabbath was kept from the beginning of the world by Adam, Abraham, and the children of Israel, even before the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai. (4) The Sabbath was not changed, annulled, or broken by Christ, but He Himself established, confirmed, and adorned it. (5) The Sabbath was observed by the Apostles and by Paul. (6) The Sabbath must be observed on the seventh day of the week which is Saturday. (7) The Sabbath is a sign of the eternal Sabbath and must be kept literally as long as the world stands, until we enter the eternal rest at the Parousia. (8) The keeping of the Sabbath is a necessity for the Christian who wants to enter the heavenly paradise. (9) Those who do not observe the literal Sabbath will be punished by God. (10) The Pope invented Sunday.

(To be concluded)

[124] *CS*, IV, 513.

TWO UNPUBLISHED LETTERS REGARDING TREGELLES' *CANON MURATORIANUS*

EARLE HILGERT
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

The James White Library of Andrews University [1] contains two manuscript letters regarding Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (1813-1875). The first of these is from Samuel Davidson (1807-1898), then of the University of London, to Benjamin Jowett (1817-1893), professor of Greek at Oxford, and is dated May 16, 1868. The second is from Jowett to Henry George Liddell (1811-1898), dean of Christ Church, and is undated. As far as I have been able to ascertain, neither letter has previously been published. [2] Reflecting an incident that apparently was soon forgotten and is never mentioned in the memoirs of any of the participants, [3] these letters are nevertheless of interest for their reflection of tensions created by critical theological studies in England a century ago. Thus they are worthy of at least a footnote in the history of New Testament scholarship.

[1] Thanks are due Mrs. Robert H. Mitchell, Librarian of Andrews University, for permission to publish these letters.

[2] Davidson's correspondence was never published, and Jowett's letter does not appear in his collected correspondence: E. Abbott and L. Campbell, *Letters of Benjamin Jowett, M.A.* (New York, 1899). Jowett directed on his death that all letters written him should be destroyed; apparently the letter from Davidson escaped because it had been forwarded to Liddell. The writer has not seen the recently published work, John M. Prest, *Robert Scott and Benjamin Jowett* (Oxford, 1966), which contains letters of these two men.

[3] No indication of the incident is found in either Abbott and Campbell, *op. cit.*, Geoffrey Faber, *Jowett, a Portrait with Background* (London, 1957), Davidson's *Autobiography and Diary* (Edinburgh, 1899), or H. L. Thompson, *Memoir of Henry George Liddell* (London, 1899). By the kindness of Mr. Dennis S. Porter of the Department of Western Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library (letter of August 12, 1966), I am informed that the Librarian of Balliol College has looked into the Jowett Papers but has found no reference to the incident, nor are there any indications in the manuscript collections at the Bodleian. No biography of Tregelles exists.

I

Samuel Davidson, examiner in Scripture at London University, must have felt a certain satisfaction when he opened his copy of *The Athenaeum* for Saturday, May 16, 1868, and saw his unsigned review of Tregelles' edition of the *Canon Muratorianus* (Oxford, 1867). Davidson had written:

> The Canon, or list of the New Testament books, originally published by Muratori is an interesting historical fragment of the second century. Unfortunately, however, its text is corrupt; so that conjecture has often to be applied in order to elicit a probable meaning. It is not an important document; nor does it cast much light on the difficulties connected with the formation of the New Testament canon. Many critics have investigated the document with minute skill; and we certainly thought that Bunson and Westcott had done enough to bring out its meaning, believing that nothing of value could be added to what they have written with the help of their predecessors, especially of Credner. A perusal of the present treatise has not dispelled this idea. A quarto volume was not needed to discuss the list over again. The author has done little if anything to justify another book about it. What Westcott has written in the second edition of his "History of the Canon of the New Testament" amply satisfies every reasonable requirement, superseding the necessity for a new volume. No addition of value is here made to the information which we had before. The only new thing it contains is a facsimile. We observe, also, that the author is unacquainted with some of the most recent critics who treat of the Muratorian Canon more or less fully; with Scholten, Van Heyst, Niermeyer, and Lomann, whose remarks might have modified some of his statements. But the treatise shows laborious and minute diligence in reading and interpreting the text.
>
> The first three parts adhere pretty closely to the subject, though they exhibit here and there personal details interesting to nobody but the writer himself, and show an excess of the *ego*. In the fourth and fifth parts the dogmatic advocate appears, who makes strong statements, and even imputes motives to men as honest at least as himself. Thus we meet with the following: "It is, however, vain to overlook the fact that the fourth Gospel is distasteful on account of the doctrines which it sets forth with such plainness. The testimony of John the Baptist to our Lord is that to which the real objection is made." "Modern scepticism" is hated by our author with a perfect hatred. Not a few incorrect assertions are made in these fourth and fifth parts, which can only mislead the unlearned, such as, "It stands as an admitted fact that, in the last quarter of the second century, the reception and use of the four Gospels, *and of these alone*, was as unquestionable throughout the church as it is now at the

present time"; whereas Serapion, bishop at Antioch in the second century, finding the Gospel of Peter used by the Christians at Rhossus, in Cilicia, allowed it after he had himself examined the work. Equally inadmissible is the allegation, "Basileides expressly quotes St. John's Gospel." Is the critic ignorant of the fact that the verb "he says" in Hippolytus has no definite subject; that it is employed vaguely by that writer even where a plural goes before; and that in the 'Philosophumena' the opinions of the adherents of a sect are transferred to the founder? It is impossible to show that Basilides quotes John's Gospel.

The author argues that Justin Martyr used the fourth Gospel,—an assumption which has been disproved most effectually by Zeller, Hilgenfeld, and Scholten. He also argues for the authenticity of second Peter, which Calvin abandoned. But we cannot enter on such discussions. It is sufficient to remark that the field of higher criticism is not the place for Dr. Tregelles's powers. His partisan zeal gets the better of him; and the range of his knowledge soon contracts.

The delegates of the Clarendon Press should not allow one-sided criticism in their publications. Dogmatic prepossessions ought to be excluded. They are out of place in a publication professing to be scholarly and critical. Here they are dragged in unnecessarily, swelling the size of the volume in proportion as they detract from its worth. [4]

Behind Davidson's biting criticism lay a sorry story of deep personal injury growing out of a theological conflict with Tregelles a decade earlier. To understand this we must first consider the latter scholar. Born into a pious Quaker family (his uncle was the prominent engineer and Quaker leader, Edwin Octavius Tregelles), he entered the employment of a relative in the Neath Abbey Iron Works in Glamorganshire at an early age and never attended a university. Also he soon joined the Plymouth Brethren.[5] Thus both by a lack of formal

[4] *The Athenaeum*, London, Saturday, May 16, 1868 (No. 2116), p. 694.

[5] Tregelles' religious affiliation in the latter part of his life is variously described. *The Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 1959-60), XIX, 1097, says he became a Presbyterian; F. H. A. Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (4th ed., London, 1894), II, 241, in a short sketch of Tregelles' life, says his last years were spent "as a humble lay member of the Church of England, a fact he very earnestly begged me to keep in mind," and then adds in a footnote: "He gave the same assurance to A. Earle, D.D., Bishop of Marlborough, assigning as his reason the results of the study of the

education and by religious affiliation he was cut off from the main stream of theological scholarship and from many of the personal associations it would have provided. At the same time his natural inclinations and unquestioned genius for minute and critical study of manuscript texts soon led him to devote his life to Biblical research. His contact with the Codex Vaticanus at Rome in 1845 is well known, and his great critical edition of the Greek New Testament (1851-1872) was surpassed only by that of Tischendorf.

In 1854 the publishing firm of Longman requested Tregelles to undertake the revision of the New Testament section of Thomas Hartwell Horne's *An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, first published in 1818 and now much in need of revision in view of a generation of critical scholarship. Tregelles' name had been proposed for the assignment by Davidson, at that time a professor in the Congregationalists' Lancashire Independent College at Manchester, and one of the leading representatives of German Biblical criticism in England. At the same time Davidson had agreed to undertake the Old Testament section on the understanding that he would be free to rewrite it fully.

When the new edition of the Old Testament section appeared in 1856, it was clear that Davidson was in accord with many critical views then dominant in Germany. In October of that year Tregelles wrote letters to the *Record* and to other religious papers expressing his concern lest the association of his name with Davidson's in the revision of the *Introduction*

Greek N.T." Commenting on this statement, T. C. F. Stunt, of Lincoln, England, who has investigated Tregelles' correspondence carefully, writes me (Letter of November 24, 1966): "I find it very hard to believe that Scrivener's account is absolutely true. It is impossible to square with his [Tregelles'] letters and writings." He goes on to explain that Tregelles accepted the Thirty-nine Articles, but not certain aspects of Anglican teaching such as infant baptism. The Compton Street congregation in Plymouth, with which Tregelles was associated, moved away from the Brethren and, while maintaining its independence, gradually adopted an organization similar to that of the Presbyterians.

be taken to mean that he shared the latter's opinions. He wrote:

> In writing on the subject of the Holy Scripture, I trust that I have ever sought to uphold its plenary authority as inspired by the Holy Ghost; and thus it has been with sorrow as well as surprise, that I have observed that Dr. Davidson has used this work as the occasion for avowing and bringing into notice many sentiments and theories with regard to Scripture which his former works would not have intimated that he held, and his adoption of which was wholly unknown to Mr. Horne and myself. [6]

As a result of Tregelles' letter, a number of Congregationalist ministers were aroused against Davidson to the point that a committee was called to investigate the matter. After protracted and acrimonious discussion, Davidson was asked to defend himself in writing, which he did with a statement published in May, 1857, entitled *Facts, Statements, and Explanations*. In it he refers, to quote Picton, "with not unnatural warmth to the action of the former [Tregelles] and his communications to Church papers." [7]

The controversy was finally settled to the satisfaction of Davidson's critics in the summer of 1857 when he resigned from his chair. Writing of this many years later, he speaks of having been "turned out of house and home, with a name tainted and maligned," [8] and it is obvious from his *Autobiography* that he considered this the great crisis of his career. His negative attitude toward Tregelles continued throughout his life, as is evidenced by the following entry in his diary on January 17, 1889 (the only reference to Tregelles in his published diaries):

> My esteemed friend Mr. Call, whose fine scholarship and extensive reading have often assisted me in coming to a decision on different

[6] Quoted by J. A. Picton, "The College Crisis," in Davidson, *op. cit.*, p. 42. (Picton's narrative was written at Davidson's request and included in his autobiography.) Picton states that the publishers had regularly sent proof sheets of Davidson's revision to both Horne and Tregelles and that no protest was registered until after the publication of the book (*ibid.*, pp. 41, 43).

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

questions, for his judgement is usually sound . . . has come across the lucubrations of Dr. Tregelles, whose English translation of Gesenius' *Lexicon* always tends to raise the anger of scholars because of remarks interposed to correct the great Hebraist's heresies. In all cases of Old Testament interpretation, in critical and grammatical questions, it need not be said that Gesenius is right and his corrector wrong. [9]

II

Such were some of the incidents which lay in the background of Davidson's review of the *Canon Muratorianus*. [10] Clipping

[9] *Ibid.* pp. 215, 216. The translation of Gesenius was published by Bagster in 1846 and contains hundreds of instances in which Tregelles adds his own opinions in brackets, frequently to combat Gesenius' more liberal views; *e.g.*, art. אֵל (p. XLV), where Gesenius suggests for Dan 11 : 36, אֵל אֱלֹהִים "whose tutelar deity God is," Tregelles remarks, "This is heathenish: rather, whose God, God really is"; under אֱלוֹהַּ (p. XLIX), he interpolates Gesenius as follows: "Perhaps retained from polytheism [an idea which is not to be entertained for a moment], in which אֱלֹהִים may be taken in a plural sense and understood of higher powers. [This is not the way in which the Scripture speaks of *God*]"; regarding עַלְמָה (p. DCXXXIV), he declares, "The object in view in seeking to undermine the opinion which would assign the signification of *virgin* to this word, is clearly to raise a discrepancy between Isa. 7 : 14, and Matt. 1 : 23: nothing which has been stated does, however, really give us any ground for assigning another meaning. . . . The absolute authority of the New Testament is . . . quite sufficient to settle the question to a Christian"; on שְׁמוּאֵל (p. DCCCXXXIII), where on linguistic grounds Gesenius suggests an alternative to the Biblical definition of "Samuel" (1 Sam 1 : 20), Tregelles breaks in to declare, "The Scripture definition of a name must always be the true one." Cf. Tregelles' obituary notice in *The Academy* (No. 157, N. 5), VII, 475.

[10] Scrivener, *op. cit.* II, 239, n. 1, reports: "Burgon, however, on comparing Tregelles' book with the document itself at Milan, cannot overmuch laud his minute correctness [*Guardian*, Feb. 5, 1873]. Isaac H. Hall made the same comparison at Milan and confirms Burgon's judgment. The custodian of the Ambrosian Library at Milan, the famous Ceriani, had nothing to do with the work or with the lithograph facsimile." The inaccuracies in question are probably to be explained in part, at least, by Tregelles' own account in a letter to his cousin, B. W. Newton (March 13, 1868, kindness of T. C. F. Stunt). He says that in the initial preparation of the lithographed facsimile, "every doubtful letter was sent to Milan for recomparison; and as this was done in 1859 when the war was going on between the French and Austrians it was rather a work of time." Before the book was completed, the facsimile was destroyed on the stone and had to be redone.

out the review, he addressed to Jowett the first of the two letters with which we are here concerned. He wrote:

4 Ormonde Terrace
Regents Park
London, N. W.
May 16th 1868

My dear Sir,

Though I hope to see you when you come to preach for Mr. Haweis [11] I think it better to write in the mean time and call your attention to a recent work published by the Clarendon Press, the Codex Muratorianus edited by Tregelles. I have no fault to find with the first three parts of the work, but it strikes me that it is beyond the legitimate province of the Delegates to allow of such parts as the fourth and fifth to be published under their sanction. You will see my objection to them from the enclosed review in the Athenaeum of this day. Dean Liddell who has most to do with the Clarendon Press ought to look more closely at the character of the books issued.

Will you be good enough to inform me as to the exact time of the coming annual commemoration in Oxford. A lady in whom I am interested wishes to know in what week it is to take place.

My long meditated Introduction to the New Testament has been at length issued, but I anticipate for it little approval except from the few who have devoted themselves to N.T. studies. I could not help going to a certain extent with the Tübingen School, but like yourself, I was unable to adopt their opinion respecting several of St. Paul's epistles.

I am yours ever sincerely
Samuel Davidson

Revd. Prof. Jowett

It was natural that under these circumstances Davidson should have written to Jowett. The latter had himself been under fire for his theological views, particularly since he had participated in the publication of *Essays and Reviews* in 1860; for some years he had not been welcome to preach at St.

Then, "when . . . I received the book as completed I was vexed at finding that the new lithograph had been seriously altered *after* I had returned the last revise. I had to speak about the matter very decidedly and the lithographer found it needful to do his work over again. I received the proper facsimile yesterday. . . ."

[11] Hugh Reginald Haweis (1831-1901), perpetual curate of St. James's, Marylebone, a widely-heard lecturer on both sides of the Atlantic and writer on violins.

Mary's, the university church, though as reflected in this letter, London pulpits were open to him. In 1864 he had appeared before a committee of the House of Lords to testify regarding the question of abolishing religious tests from the universities, and in his testimony had criticized the ouster of Davidson from the Lancashire Independent College. [12]

On receipt of Davidson's letter, Jowett addressed the following lines (our second letter) to Liddell, since 1861 a delegate of the Clarendon Press, and one of its leading members:

My dear Dean

I will send you the enclosed thinking perhaps that you had better see it and will excuse the mention of your name in it. I am far from blaming the Clarendon Press though I suspect that the work is in this instance unworthy of them. I find that the Author is wanting to have a D.C.L. [13] to which he has no claim at all:

May I suggest to you one or two names for that honour: 1st Dr. Joseph Hooker [14] who is the President of the British Association for this year: (if he has not had one) He is a man of science of the real sort: I know him and would gladly entertain him.

2. W. B. Grove [15] is a man of real and great merit 3. Paget [16] the eminent Surgeon who is a most excellent man. 4. Monro [17] the Editor of Lucretius.

It will not be an honour to any of these men if Dr. Tregelles (who is a well meaning man enough) is associated with them:

I am glad to hear that you are coming to us on Sunday.

Ever yours
B. Jowett

[12] Abbott and Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 32; "Benjamin Jowett," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th ed., 1910), XV, 528.

[13] Porter, *loc. cit.*, reports that the minutes of the Hebdomadal Council, which initiates recommendations for honorary degrees, give no indication that a proposal of a degree for Tregelles ever went that far.

[14] Sir Joseph Dalton Hooker (1817-1911), botanist and traveller to the Antarctic, the Himalayas and elsewhere; director of the Kew Gardens, 1865-1885. He was an early friend of Darwin and his address as president of the British Association in 1868, at Norwich, was notable for his defense of Darwin's theories.

[15] Sir William Robert Grove (1811-1896), jurist and physicist, noted especially for his early researches on electric batteries, as well as for his work as a criminal lawyer.

[16] Sir James Paget (1814-1899), pioneer in pathology.

[17] David Binning Monro (1836-1905), distinguished as a Homeric scholar. From 1882, provost of Oriel; vice-chancellor of Oxford.

Presumably this was the end of the incident. Hooker had already been given a D.C.L. by Oxford in 1866, and Jowett's other nominees all sooner or later received the same honor (Monro waited until 1904); Tregelles never attained such recognition. The fact that the two letters and the clipping of Davidson's review in *The Athenaeum* have been preserved together (they are pasted inside our copy of Tregelles' *Canon Muratorianus*) suggests that all three were kept by Liddell as an interesting sidelight on this publication of the Clarendon Press. [18]

[18] We must not conclude, however, that Tregelles was without friends at Oxford. By a number of the Evangelicals there he seems to have been well received, as is reflected in letters to his cousin, B. W. Newton. For excerpts from these I am indebted to T. C. F. Stunt. On August 13, 1863, Tregelles reported a conversation with John David Macbride (1778-1868), since 1813 principal of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and a staunch Evangelical, who appears to have been his friend: "Dr. M[acbride] spoke a good deal about the state of Oxford . . . indeed as to Prof. [Arthur Penrhyn] Stanley he very much accords with you; he regards his influence to be in Oxford a moral and spiritual gangrene, eating out the vitality of all Christianity. . . ." Stanley was a friend and supporter of Jowett. On October 28, 1865, Tregelles wrote again, "I gave your message to the vice-chancellor [John Prideaux Lightfoot] who was very glad to receive it: he amusingly introduced me to people as his 'cousin' ": he and Mrs Lightfoot are both of them very kind." Tregelles had gone to Oxford at this time to collate a manuscript, and he says, "The Master of Balliol [Robert Scott] kindly arranged for me all that I wanted to do here." According to still another letter from Tregelles to Newton, of March 13, 1868 (see above, n. 10), Scott had urged the former to publish the *Canon Muratorianus*. Scott had been Jowett's rival ever since 1854 when to Jowett's disappointment he had been preferred over him for the mastership.

THE NATURE AND QUALITY OF THE TEXT OF THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE

SAKAE KUBO
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

There are many factors that go together to make a good Bible translation. The combination of accuracy and clarity is one of the most important and if this is done with a fine literary style, the excellency of the translation will be assured. But more basic to the task of translation itself is the selection of the original text for translation. Translation only begins after the text has been selected.

While the selection of a text does not affect the total quality of a translation, since the area of differences in the text is comparatively small, its usefulness can be limited if the text is poor. A serious disadvantage of the Authorized Version is not only its archaic language but also the quality of its text. Catholic Versions including that of Ronald Knox even with his excellent English have suffered from the handicap of a text which is a translation from the original. [1] However, there are several Catholic versions which are based on the original Greek and, if we interpret the signs of the times rightly, all Catholic versions will hereafter be translations from the original languages. Moffatt was right up-to-date when he used von Soden's text but unfortunately that text had no enduring value because of weaknesses in von Soden's method. This miscalculation, however, does not seem to have affected the acceptance of Moffatt's version. More serious is the decision

[1] Even when he is quite sure that his Vulgate text is wrong, he doggedly follows it as in Acts 17 : 6, where a bad copyist had written *urbem* instead of *orbem*. "So I have rendered, 'who turn the state upside down'; that is how the thing stands in every Vulgate in the world nowadays, and it is no part of the translator's business to alter, on however good grounds, his original." R. Knox, *Trials of a Translator* (New York, 1949), p. 2.

by G. Verkuyl to incorporate into the Berkeley Version many of the secondary interpolations of the Textus Receptus. [2]

Some evaluation of the text of the New English Bible [3] has been made on the basis of the English text but now that the Greek text [4] has been published the nature and quality of its text can be more precisely assessed. These two elements can be best seen when compared with the text of previous translations. These comparisons are made on the basis of the footnotes in the versions compared and the differences that arose on the basis of a collation of the Greek text of the NEB with the Greek text of the RV as published by Souter. [5] Since there are no Greek texts for the AV and RSV, their readings based on the English translation were checked where the Greek texts of RV and NEB differed. What is important for our purposes are those variants which would be seen even in translation so that it would be possible to determine in such cases the reading of the Versions where no Greek text is available. There are

[2] In Mt they are found in 5 : 22; 6 : 13; 15 : 14; 17 : 21; 18 : 11; 21 : 44; 23 : 14; 24 : 36; and 26 : 20. These are usually enclosed in parentheses but none is found around the words included in 21 : 44. Mk 16 : 9-20; Jn 7 : 53-8 : 11 (placed at the traditional position), Acts 8 : 37, and 1 Jn 5 : 7, 8 are also included in the text with parentheses. Some of these are accompanied by explanatory notes but there is no consistency.

In an explanation of his version in *The Bible Translator*, II (April, 1951), 80-85, G. Verkuyl seeks to justify his procedure in retaining these words, clauses and passages which were not found in the original from which he translated. "If the only readers were new converts . . . no great harm might be done; but to these accustomed to the KJV, the gaps come with a shock, which to me seems happily avoidable. Our Lord has a tender feeling toward 'these little ones,' and we do well not to offend them."

[3] Hereafter cited as NEB. The following abbreviations will also be used: KJV for the King James Version of 1611, RV for the Revised Version of 1881, RSV for the Revised Standard Version of 1946, N for Nestle's Greek text, ABS for the American Bible Society Greek text of 1966.

[4] R. V. G. Tasker, ed., *The Greek New Testament Being the Text Translated in The New English Bible, 1961* (Oxford and Cambridge, 1964).

[5] Alexander Souter, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Oxford, 1910).

many variants in the Greek such as the presence and absence of the article, the use of synonyms, differences in orthography, and the order of words which do not usually show up in translation. In a translation these types of variants often disappear and are in most cases as if they never existed. Our major concern shall be a comparison of the text of the NEB with the previous "authorized" versions at those places where differences in translation result from differences in text.

The area of comparison shall be limited to the Gospel of Mt. The reasons for this are its relatively large size and its usefulness in indicating variants of harmonization. The latter is seen especially in the first section compared.

It would be expected that the text of the NEB would agree more with that of the RSV, less with the RV, and still less with the KJV. While this is true, the results were not as uniform or predictable as one would have expected.

This first section came out as expected, for the type of readings included are of poor quality and would be unanimously rejected today. There were twenty-nine such readings which are found in the KJV but are dropped in the NEB in agreement with the RV and RSV. Many of these are harmonizing variants. Readings from the other Synoptic Gospels have been interpolated into Mt. Of the KJV readings below N has placed 15 : 14; 21 : 44; and 26 : 20 in its text, the last two, however, in brackets. ABS has 13 : 22 in single brackets and 21 : 44 in double brackets, the first indicating a dubious reading while the latter a later insertion of "evident antiquity and importance." The first reading is that of the KJV.

5 : 22 εικη) omitted
5 : 44 ευλογειτε τους καταρωμενους υμας, καλως ποιειτε τοις μισουσιν υμας) omitted
5 : 44 επηρεαζοντων υμας και) omitted
6 : 1 ελεημοσυνην) δικαιοσυνην
6 : 4 εν τω φανερω) omitted
6 : 6 εν τω φανερω) omitted

6 : 13 οτι σου εστιν η βασιλεια και η δυναμις και η δοξα εις τους αιωνας. αμην) omitted
8 : 28 Γερασηνων) Γαδαρηνων
10 : 10 ραβδους) ραβδον
11 : 19 τεκνων) εργων
13 : 9 ακουειν) omitted
13 : 22 τουτου) omitted
13 : 43 ακουειν) omitted
15 : 6 την εντολην) τον λογον
15 : 14 τυφλων) omitted
16 : 13 με) omitted
17 : 21 τουτο δε το γενος ουκ εκπορευεται ει μη εν προσευχη και νηστεια) omitted
18 : 11 ηλθεν γαρ ο υιος του ανθρωπου σωσαι το απολωλος) omitted
19 : 3 οι) omitted
19 : 16 αγαθε) omitted
19 : 17 τι με λεγεις αγαθον· ουδεις αγαθος ει μη εις ο θεος) τι με ερωτας περι του αγαθου; εις εστιν ο αγαθος
19 : 29 η γυναικα) omitted
21 : 44 και πεσων επι τον λιθον τουτον συνθλασθησεται· εφ'ον δ'αν πεση, λικμησει αυτον) omitted
22 : 30 του θεου) omitted
23 : 14 ουαι υμιν γραμματεις και Φαρισαιοι υποκριται, οτι κατεσθιετε τας οικιας των χηρων και προφασει μακρα προσευχομενοι· δια τουτο λημψεσθε περισσοτερον κριμα) omitted
24 : 36 ουρανων) + ουδε ο υιος
26 : 20 μαθητων) omitted
26 : 27 το) omitted
26 : 28 καινης) omitted

It is interesting to note that NEB translates τον λογον in 15 : 6 as "law" instead of "word," *i.e.*, if its Greek text is correct at this point (there is a Greek variant τον νομον which one would have expected to be its Greek base).

There are twenty-one readings which are found in KJV and RV which are dropped from both the RSV and NEB in favor of another reading. The first reading is that of the former.

3 : 7 αυτου) omitted
3 : 16 αυτω) omitted
4 : 23 ο Ιησους) omitted
5 : 25 σε παραδω) omitted
5 : 39 σου) omitted
9 : 14 πολλα) omitted
14 : 22 ευθεως) omitted
14 : 24 μεσον της θαλασσης ην) σταδιους πολλους απο της γης απειχεν
14 : 27 ο Ιησους) omitted
14 : 29 ελθειν) και ηλθεν
17 : 10 αυτου) omitted
17 : 22 αναστρεφομενων) συστρεφομενων
18 : 7 εκεινω) omitted
19 : 9 και ο απολελυμενην λαλησας μοιχαται) omitted
19 : 22 λογον) τουτον
20 : 30 κυριε) omitted
22 : 10 γαμος) νυμφων
22 : 20 αυτοις) + ο Ιησους
22 : 21 αυτω) omitted
27 : 24 του δικαιου) omitted
28 : 6 ο κυριος) omitted

Of the KJV, RV readings N supports 5 : 39; 14 : 22; 14 : 27; 20 : 30; and 22 : 20, but the first three are in brackets, while ABS supports 3 : 7, 16; 5 : 39; 9 : 14; 14 : 22, 27; 20 : 30; 22 : 10, 20, 21. Of these 3 : 16; 5 : 39; 14 : 27; and 20 : 30 are in brackets and, therefore, of dubious validity, 14 : 27 having a D rating and 20 : 30 a C rating. The others which have ratings are 14 : 22, C, and 22 : 10, B. On the other hand while N and ABS support the reading of NEB in 19 : 22, they place the reading in brackets.

The non-bracketed readings in N and ABS which support

the KJV, RV readings need to be examined. It is very difficult to follow ABS in its addition of αυτου in 3 : 7. There is every reason to expect such an addition which is also a characteristic of the Koine and Western readings. In 9 : 14 we would expect harmonization to take place with Lk 5 : 33 and this is what has happened. Some manuscripts add πυκνα as in Luke but many manuscripts have made the harmonization with the more common πολλα. It would be difficult to explain its omission if original. The ABS reading at 14 : 22 is also questionable since the inclusion of ευθεως is easily accountable as harmonization with Mk 6 : 45 while its omission would be more difficult to explain. The N reading in 20 : 30 likewise is an easier reading and the fluctuation of its position would add to its suspicion of being a later insertion. The ABS reading γαμος in 22 : 10 is easily accounted for. Five times previously it was used in the parable and it would be natural for a scribe to change νυμφων to γαμος here. At 22 : 20 we have the only reading which has unquestioned support by both N and ABS. The textual evidence is also in their favor. Is it not expected that scribes would tend to add ο Ιησους in such situations? Even for the sake of harmonization it is difficult to see why the omission of ο Ιησους would be made. In 22 : 21 the αυτω was probably added in Mt to harmonize with Mk, or independently, simply to complete the verb λεγουσιν. Thus the NEB readings generally appear to stand the test of close scrutiny.

There are thirty-nine readings where the KJV, RV, and RSV agree against the NEB. Nothing reveals so much concerning the nature and quality of the text of the NEB as its readings in this section. Its differences from the KVJ and the RV are not significant, especially when it agrees with the RSV text, but when it differs also with the latter they are quite significant. The RV agreements with the KJV can easily be explained as reluctance on the part of the translators of the former to embrace so quickly the results of the work of Westcott and Hort. But this cannot be said when the three earlier

versions agree. Why then does the NEB text deviate from all three earlier versions?

The revisers of the RV were guided in their decisions mainly by "the authority of documentary evidence," [6] or external evidence, while the RSV translators, Frederick Grant [7] informs us, were guided by the eclectic principle in the selection of its text. Actually the results are frequently the same. The NEB translators follow the same principle as the RSV by considering "variant readings on their merits, and, having weighed the evidence for themselves, select for translation in each passage the reading which to the best of their judgment seemed most likely to represent what the author wrote." [8] In weighing the internal evidence against the external evidence more often than not the RSV translators seem to have placed more weight on the latter, while the NEB translators have placed more value on the former.

Because of the importance of this section in evaluating the text of the NEB it is necessary to discuss these variants individually and to cite their manuscript evidence. [9] A few of these are discussed in the "Appendix" of the NEB. In such cases, an asterisk before the verse will indicate this. In each case, the first reading represents the reading of the three versions and the second, the reading of NEB.

1 : 4, 5 Σαλμων all evidence
Σαλμα no evidence

The NEB reading (the Hebrew form of the name) is not even indicated in Tischendorf, Nestle, or Legg. It is a surprising reading and it would be interesting to discover

[6] "The Revisers' Preface to the New Testament," of the RV, p. viii.

[7] F. C. Grant, "The Greek Text of the New Testament," p. 41, in *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament* prepared by Members of the Revision Committee (n.p., 1946).

[8] The "Introduction" of NEB, p. vii.

[9] The manuscript evidence is given in abbreviated form almost entirely from S. C. E. Legg, *Novum Testamentum Graece, Evangelium Secundum Matthaeum* (Oxford, 1940).

how this reading found its way into the text of the NEB. N and ABS agree with the first reading.

1 : 18 Ιησου Χριστου *P*[1] Uncs. pler. Minus. pler. Sy[p.h.pal] Cop[sa.bo] Arm Aeth Geo Ir[pt]
Χριστου 71 latt Sy[c.s] Ir[pt]

The textual evidence lies heavy on the side of the first reading. Legg lists one minuscule supporting the second reading, but all other witnesses are versions and one patristic writer, Irenaeus, who is divided. Besides these two readings there are Χριστου Ιησου of B and Ιησου of W. These have very little textual support. In favor of the first reading is the fact that it is the same as that found in 1 : 1, which seems to be a parallel construction. The expression is found nowhere else in Mt without doubt. The only other place it is found is in 16 : 21, where several variants exist. The NEB translators no doubt reasoned that it would be easier to change Χριστου to Ιησου Χριστου than vice versa. They may have felt also that it was harmonized to 1 : 1, although one can speak of harmonization to 1 : 17 as well. All in all, Χριστου is the harder reading and is perhaps original. N chooses the first reading as well as ABS and the latter rates it as a C reading.

1 : 19 ο ανηρ αυτης δικαιος rell.
δικαιος ανηρ Sy[c] Ephr

The textual support again for the first reading is overwhelming in its favor while it is very poor for the NEB reading. The tendency might be to omit ο ανηρ, although it could not have been very strong. At any rate it would be very unwise in this case to follow the reading of a version unsupported by any Greek manuscripts. N and ABS both follow the first reading.

3 : 16 και ℵ[c]CDKLPW Δ fam 1, 13. 28 33 565 700 892 Byz d f l Vg[cl] Sy [c.s.p.h.(pal)] Arm Aeth Geo
omitted after περιστεραν ℵ*B a b c ff[1] g[1] h aur Vg[ww] Cop[bo] Ir Hil Aug

Clearly the first reading is the easier reading here. It is awkward with two participles coming together and therefore the tendency would be to insert the και. It is hard to see why anyone would omit it. ABS follows the first reading and N the second.

5 : 11 ψευδομενοι ℵBCKWΔΘΠ 0196 fam 1, 13. 28 33 565 Byz aur f ff^{1} l q Vg Sy$^{c.p.h.pal}$ Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Arm Aeth Diat Chry Aug Cyr Ps-Chry
omitted D b c d h g^{1} k Sy^{s} Lucif Hil Tert Or Aug

The first reading looks very much like an explanatory gloss to point out that the reproach and calumny were unjustified. There may also have been a tendency to harmonize with Lk 6 : 22. On the other hand, the omission can be explained as an attempt to remove a redundancy, especially since it is supported predominantly by translations. Nevertheless, it is difficult to see how anyone would omit ψευδομενοι if it were originally present since it does make explicit the unjustified nature of these reproaches.

N and ABS support the first reading; the latter, however, gives it a C rating.

5 : 45 οτι rell.
ος it (exc. d k) Vg Sy^{omn} Eus Cyp Hil Cass

The second reading is supported by the Latin and Syriac versions and patristic citations. In such a case as we have here it is easy to understand why the evidence falls this way. The οτι is the harder reading and would almost inevitably have been changed to ος.

N and ABS also support the first reading.

6 : 15 τα παραπτωματα αυτων (1) BKLWΔΘΠ fam 13. 28 33 565 700 Byz (b) f q Sy$^{c.h.pal}$ Cop$^{sa.\ bo(pler.)}$ Goth Arm Aeth Geo Ps-Chry
omitted ℵD fam 1. 892^{txt} a c ff^{1} g^{1} h k l aur Vg Sy^{p} Cop$^{bo(aliq.)}$ Diat Eus Aug

The omission can be accounted for as due to a desire to remove the repetitious expression which is found in the previous verse as well as the latter part of the same verse. But it is easier to explain the first reading as a harmonization with these two places.

N supports the omission while ABS places these words in the text with square brackets.

9 : 27 αυτω Uncs. rell. Minus. pler. VSS rell.
omitted BD 892 d k^{vid}

The interpolation of αυτω can be explained as a stylistic alteration because of ηκολουθησαν which at the same time brought this verse into harmonization with Mk 20 : 29. It would be difficult to explain the omission.

N supports the omission while ABS supports the first reading but includes it in square brackets.

*9 : 34 οι δε Φαρισαιοι ελεγον· εν τω αρχοντι των δαιμονιων εκβαλλει τα δαιμονια ℵBCKLWXΔΘΠ fam 1, 13. 28 33 al. pl. Byz aur b c f ff^{1} g^{1} h l q Vg Sy$^{p.h.pal}$ Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Goth Arm Aeth Geo
omitted D a d k Sy^{s} Diat Juv Hil

The NEB translators [10] consider the first reading as an assimilation to 12 : 24 and its parallel Lk 11 : 15. McNeile [11] gives the same reasons for rejecting this reading but adds further that it was possibly added here "to form an antecedent to x. 25." It is also difficult to find reasons for omitting this verse, if it were original.

An interesting error (?) [12] has been found in the NEB. While its Greek text omits the entire verse, the English translation has omitted only the words "But the Pharisees

[10] Tasker, *op. cit.*, "Appendix: Notes on Variant Readings," p. 412.
[11] A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London, 1961), p. 128.
[12] If this is not an error, it is an unjustifiable tampering with the text. All of verse 34 should be either omitted or kept. No manuscript supports the NEB translation.

said" resulting in the inclusion of the words, "He casts out devils by the prince of devils," into the quotation closing 9 : 33. Thus verses 33b and 34 read, "Filled with amazement the onlookers said, 'Nothing like this has ever been seen in Israel. He casts out devils by the prince of devils.' "

N and ABS support the first reading, while the latter rates it as a C reading.

10 : 19 πως η rell.
omitted a b ff^{1} k Sy$^{s.h}$ Epiph Cyp Aug

The first reading can easily be regarded as a harmonization to Lk 12 : 11, but if it were it would be difficult to account for the fact that there is no Greek manuscript support for its omission. Actually the harmonization goes the other way. Since the word here is λαλησητε the scribes harmonized by omitting πως η before τι λαλησητε to make it agree with τι ειπητε. Besides, it is easy to see how a translation could easily gloss over the expression to τι since the verb was λαλησητε, and the same thing apparently happened in Lk 12 : 11, where the word απολογησησθε caused the same expression πως η τι to become πως in D, the versions, and some patristic writers where frequently the same free tendency is manifested as seen in versions. The NEB reading is difficult to accept.

Both N and ABS support the first reading.

10 : 25 Βεελζεβουλ (ℵB) C(DL)W(X) Minus. pler. (a b d) f (g^{1} h) l q (aur) Sy^{h} Cop^{sa} Aeth Arm Geo^{B} Epiph Cyp
Βεελζεβουβ c g^{2} m ff^{1} Vg Sy$^{s.p}$ Aug

While there are orthographical variants for the first reading, these are not important for our purposes, and will be disregarded. The external evidence for the latter is very poor. It has no Greek manuscript support whatsoever. The second reading seems to be an assimilation to 2 Ki 1 : 2, 3, 6 and may be due in the Vulgate to Jerome's knowledge of Hebrew. Its conclusion in the Syriac version can also be explained in the same way. The NEB can hardly be right here.

Both N and ABS follow the first reading.

11 : 15 ακουειν Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. VSS rell. Jus Or Clem
omitted BD 700 d k Sy^s

The interpolation of the first reading is probably a harmonization with passages where the word was included, such as Mk 4 : 9, 23 and Lk 8 : 8.

Both N and ABS follow the second reading, although the latter gives it a C rating.

11 : 16 εταιροις GSUVΠ^2 565 700 al. pler. ff^1 l m aur Vg $Sy^{c.s.p.h}$ Cop^{sa} Aeth Arm
ετεροις ℵBCDEFKLMNWΔΘΠ* fam 13. 33 892 d g^2 k Goth

Because of itacism this variant in this context was bound to arise. But which reading caused the other? Was the first reading changed to the second to bring it more in line with Lk's αλληλοις or does Lk's αλληλοις show that the first reading must have been ετεροις which later became εταιροις through itacism? The second seems more likely, since at this point both Mt and Lk seem to be following Q. The manuscript evidence for the first is on the one hand late and on the other hand versional.

Both N and ABS support the second reading.

12 : 24, 27 Βεελζεβουλ
Βεελζεβουβ

See above under 10 : 25.

13 : 1 απο της οικιας (ℵBΘ)CLWXΔΠ Minusc. pler. c h l q aur Vg ($Sy^{c.p.h}$ $Cop^{sa.bo}$ Or)
omitted D a b d e f ff$^{1.2}$ g^1 k Sy^s

Other variants read εκ της οικιας and simply της οικιας. Though the manuscript evidence is poor, the first reading is probably an explanatory gloss to connect the εξελθων with the

previous pericope. The omission would be difficult to explain.

N and ABS support the first reading without the preposition.

13 : 11 αυτοις Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. it (pler.) Vg Sy^{omn} Cop^{sa} Arm Geo
omitted ℵCZ 21 892 k Cop^{bo} Aeth Eus

One can say that αυτοις was added to harmonize with Mk 4 : 11 or that it was omitted to harmonize with Lk 8 : 10. Actually it is easier to see an interpolation here than an omission. The tendency would definitely be to add and with this kind of variant it is less likely that even for the sake of harmonization an omission would be made.

N supports the second reading, while ABS has the first reading but in square brackets in the text.

*13 : 35 δια Uncs. pler. Minusc. pler. it Vg Sy^{omn} Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Aeth (cdd) Arm
+ Ησαιου ℵ*Θ fam 13. 28 33 Aeth (cdd) Ps-Clem

NEB has chosen the second reading "on the assumption that the maxim *ardua lectio portior* is here relevant, the following quotation being from Ps. 78.2." [13] It is difficult to fault the reasoning here. The textual evidence in this instance is just what one would expect, heavily in favor of the reading which removes the difficulty.

N and ABS favor the first reading, while the latter gives it the rating of C.

14 : 16 Ιησους rell.
omitted ℵ*D 517 659 d k Sy$^{c.s.p}$ Cop $^{sa.bo}$ Aeth

One can explain the omission as an attempt to harmonize with Mk and Lk, but in verse 14 a similar addition took place which did not harmonize. Actually it is difficult to explain why anyone would omit Ιησους if it were originally present in the text, and this kind of interpolation is common.

[13] Tasker, *op. cit.*, p. 412.

N favors the first reading but ABS places it in the text with brackets.

*16 : 2b, 3 οψιας γενομενος λεγετε· ευδια, πυρραζει γαρ ο ουρανος· και πρωι· σημερον χειμων, πυρραζει γαρ στυγναζων ο ουρανος. το μεν προσωπον του ουρανου γινωσκετε διακρινειν, τα δε σημεια των καιρων ου δυνασθε; CDWΘ fam 1 pm. Byz latt
omitted ℵBX fam 13. 1216 Sy$^{c.s}$ Cop$^{sa.bo}$ (aliq.) Arm Or

The NEB translators omitted this reading because they considered it to be "probably a later insertion from a source parallel to Lk. 12.54-56." [14] It would be unquestionably a case of harmonization if the Matthaean passage was identical with that of Lk, but this is not the case. That is why a source parallel to Lk must be posited. But why would the scribes resort to this source when Lk was near at hand? This is difficult to answer.

The manuscript evidence is strong on the side of omission. The argument for its omission is also strengthened by the fact that there is no apparent reason why anyone would remove it from the text if it were originally present. It may be, however, that harmonization took place here with Mk 12 : 38, 39; Mk 8 : 11-13; and Lk 11 : 29; Lk 12 : 54-56 not being in the mind of the scribe at this point. But this is difficult to accept since one would hardly expect an omission in Mt of such a long passage for the sake of harmonization.

N and ABS place this reading in brackets, while the latter gives it a C rating.

16 : 4 και μοιχαλις rell.
omitted D a d e ff^{1,2}

The NEB translators no doubt omitted because they regarded the addition as a harmonization with Mk 12 : 39, although

[14] *Ibid.*

it may have harmonized by omission to agree with Mk 8 : 12 and Lk 11 : 29. The first reading is probably not original since the tendency in such cases would be to harmonize by conflation rather than omission.

N and ABS follow the first reading.

*18 : 15 εις σε Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. VSS rell. Cyp Hil Lucif Bas^{pt} Chrys
omitted B fam 1 Cop$^{sa.bo(aliq.)}$ Or Bas^{pt} Cyr

The addition of the words εις σε was considered by the NEB translators as an early interpretation of the original text, and so it seems. It is difficult to see how anyone would omit these words if they were original.

ABS has the first reading in brackets while N agrees with NEB in the omission of the words.

18 : 26 κυριε Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. ff^{2} g^{1} q aur Sy$^{p.h.pal}$ Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Aeth
omitted BDΘ 700 a c d e ff^{1} l Vg Sy$^{s.c}$ Arm Geo Lucif Or Chry

The κυριε was probably added for effect. There would be no reason to omit if it were already present.

N and ABS agree with NEB in supporting the second reading.

19 : 14 ειπεν ΒΔΘΠ 078 Minusc. pler. a b c e ff$^{1.2}$ q r^{1} Cop^{sa} Arm
+ αυτοις ℵCDLMN 892 1241 d f g$^{1.2}$ l h aur Vg Sy^{omn} Cop^{bo} Aeth Geo

There is every reason to expect the addition of the αυτοις. The verb ειπεν in this context would suggest it and the parallel in Mk (10 : 14) contains it. It may be that it was omitted to remove the too frequent repetition of this pronoun since it was already used twice in the previous verse, but it still seems easier to accept the first reading as original.

Both N and ABS follow the first reading.

19 : 29 εκατονταπλασιονα Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. VSS rell.
πολλαπλασιονα BL 1010 Sy^{h} Cop^{sa} Aeth (cod) Diat Or Cyr

The first reading could be a harmonization to Mk 10 : 30 while the second could be a harmonization to Lk 18 : 30. The former possibility is more likely since a few manuscripts have harmonized Lk to Mk.

N agrees with NEB while ABS follows the first reading.

20 : 8 αυτοις Uncs. rell. Minusc. $^{omn.\ vid.}$ VSS rell.
omitted ℵCLZ 085 Geo$^{1.B}$ Or

The first reading seems very much like a stylistic addition following a verb which was used absolutely. There would be no reason to omit if originally present.

N agrees with NEB while ABS follows the first reading.

20 : 17 μαθητας BCW fam 13. 118 209 pm Byz b f ff$^{1.2}$ h l q Vg Sy^{h} Cop^{sa}
omitted ℵDLΘ fam 1, 13. 892* d Sy$^{c.s}$ Cop^{bo} Arm Geo^{1} Or Hil

The second reading can be explained as an attempt to harmonize with Mk 10 : 32 and Lk 18 : 31. The tendency to omit is also strengthened by the fact that δωδεκα is never used with μαθηται in the rest of the Gospels, though in Mt it is used two other times with μαθηται where no variant is present. From this standpoint it is easier to account for its omission. It must have been originally present.

N follows NEB while ABS places μαθητας in the text with brackets.

21 : 12 του θεου Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. it (pler.) Vg Sy$^{c.p.(pler.)h}$ Geo^{A} Aug
omitted ℵBLΘ fam 13. 33 700 892 1009 1010 b Sy^{h} Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Aeth Arm Geo$^{1.B}$ Diat Or^{pt} Meth Chry

Was the first reading omitted to harmonize with Mk 11 : 15 or was it added to heighten "the horror of the abuses practiced there"? [15] The words του θεου are never found with ιερον in Mt or in the other Gospels. The words probably were not in the original.

N and ABS omit them.

21 : 23 διδασκοντι rell.
omitted 7 a b c e ff^{1} g^{2} h l r$^{1.2}$ Sy$^{c.s}$

Apparently the NEB translators felt that διδασκοντι was added to harmonize with Lk 20 : 1. But its omission can be accounted for as a desire to remove the awkwardness of having two participles, ελθοντος and διδασκοντι, referring to the same person, and also to remove any doubts that the question which follows refers to the cleansing of the temple rather than to his teaching. The textual evidence bears this out since the versions would tend to remove this kind of awkwardness.

Both N and ABS take the first reading in their text.

21 : 28 και Uncs. rell. Minusc. omn. it. Vg Sy$^{p.h}$ Arm Geo
omitted after δυο ℵ*LZ e Sy$^{c.s}$ Aeth Or

The NEB translators decided on the second reading probably because they felt it was the harder reading. The tendency at this place would be to add and its omission is difficult to explain if it were originally present.

N follows NEB but ABS takes the first reading.

21 : 29-31 ου θελω, υστερον μεταμεληθεις απηλθεν et εγω κυριε, και ουκ απηλθεν et ο πρωτος ℵ*C*KWXΔΠ Minusc. pler. c f q Vg Sy$^{c.p.h}$ Cop$^{sa\ mss}$ Ir Or Eus Hil Cyr
εγω κυριε, και ουκ απηλθεν et ου θελω, υστερον μεταμεληθεις απηλθεν et ο υστερος B(Θ fam 13) al. Sy^{h} Cop$^{sa(pler.)bo}$ Aeth (2 cdd) Arm Geo

These three units of variants are directly related to one

[15] McNeile, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

another, as is evident from the pattern of the manuscript evidence. The change from one set of variants to the other apparently has to do with the application of the parable in verses 31 and 32. John the Baptist came to the high priests and elders but they did not believe nor did they repent later, but the publicans and harlots believed. The high priests and the elders, then, are like the son who did not repent later. Therefore, if the first set of readings of these three units with the repentant son first is accepted as original, the tendency would be to change to the other since the order would then be that of the application—first, chief priests and elders and second, publicans and harlots. But if the second set is accepted as original, this reason for change would no longer be present. [16]

N follows the reading of NEB but ABS takes the first reading and gives it a C rating.

22 : 23 οι ℵ^{c}KLΔΘΠ^{2} 0197 700 Byz it (pler.) Vg Sy$^{h.pal}$ Cop^{bo} Arm Hil
omitted ℵ*BDWΠ* 047 fam 1. 28 33 d (ff^{1}) (Sy$^{c.s.p}$) Or Meth (Ephr)

The NEB translators probably felt that the article was added to harmonize with Mk 12 : 18 and Lk 20 : 27. It is difficult to account for its omission if it were original.

N and ABS agree with NEB.

*22 : 35 νομικος ℵBDKLWΔΘΠ fam 13. 28 33 565 700 Byz it (pler.) Vg Sy$^{c.p.h.pal}$ Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Aeth
omitted fam 1. 1582 e Sy^{s} Arm Or^{lat}

The second reading has hardly any Greek manuscript sup-

[16] W. C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* ("International Critical Commentary"; Edinburgh, 1912), p. 229, thinks that the transposition of order in B and others was caused by a text in which "the last" (the reading of D latt) had already been adopted. The reading "the last" was due to antipharisaic motives but these were not understood by the scribes who, therefore, corrected the order to make the Pharisees return the obvious answer.

port but the editors felt that it was added later to harmonize with Lk 10 : 25. It would be difficult to see why anyone would omit the word if it were originally present. Allen indicates that the word, though used seven times by Lk, is never found in Mk or elsewhere in Mt. [17]

N follows the first reading while ABS places the word in brackets in the text.

23 : 4 και δυσβαστακτα B(D*)D^{c}KWΔΘΠ fam 13. 28 33 565 Byz aur c d f ff^{1} g^{1} l q Vg Sy$^{h.pal}$
omitted (ℵ)L fam 1. 892 a b e ff^{2} h Sy$^{c.s.p}$ Cop^{bo} Ir^{lat} Or^{lat}

Apparently the first reading was considered as a harmonization with Lk 11 : 46. This is confirmed by the fact that a few manuscripts read δυσβαστακτα in the place of βαρεα. The latter could hardly have arisen from the former since it is in perfect agreement with Lk's φορτια δυσβαστακτα, nor also from the first reading above since a scribe would tend to drop βαρεα rather than δυσβαστακτα, as is witnessed to by the few manuscripts noted above.

N and ABS agree with NEB.

23 : 26 και της παροψιδος ℵBCKLWΔΠ fam 13. 33 565 Byz aur c f ff^{1} g h l Vg Sy$^{p.(h).pal}$ Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Arm
omitted DΘ fam 1. 700 a e ff^{2} r^{1} Sy^{s} Ir^{lat} Clem

The first reading looks very much like a harmonization with verse 25. There would be no reason for its omission.

Both N and ABS agree with NEB, though ABS gives it a D rating.

*23 : 38 ερημος Uncs. rell. Minusc. omn.^{vid} it (pler.) Vg Sy$^{p.h.pal}$ Aeth Arm Geo Clem Eus Or aliq. Cyp
omitted BL ff^{2} Sy^{s} Cop$^{sa.bo\ mss}$ Or aliq. Cyr

The first reading was rejected by the NEB translators because they felt that it was a later insertion made to har-

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 242.

monize more closely with Jer 22 : 5. The same thing has happened at Lk 13 : 35. Here again it is difficult to account for the omission.

N agrees with NEB but ABS follows the first reading.

24 : 48 εκεινος Uncs. pler. Minusc. pler. it Vg Sy$^{p.h.pal}$ Cop^{bo} Aeth Geo
omitted ℵ*Θ 56 58 Sy^{s} Cop^{sa} Arm Ir Hip Aug

The NEB translators probably decided that the first reading was a harmonization with Lk 12 : 45. But the omission can be accounted for because the presence of κακος with the εκεινος confused the relationship between this evil servant and the good servant mentioned in verse 46. The form with εκεινος is definitely the harder reading and it seems less likely that harmonization would take place in this kind of situation.

Both N and ABS disagree with the NEB reading.

26 : 25 αυτω Uncs. pler. Minusc. pler. d ff^{1} g^{1} l aur Vg Sy$^{s.h.pal}$ Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Aeth Arm Geo^{1}
+ ο Ιησους P^{45}ℵ 13 440 a b c f ff^{2} h q r^{1} Sy^{p} Geo^{2} Or

It is difficult to see why the NEB translators have chosen the second reading. It is a very frequent type of interpolation and there would be no reason to omit it if it were originally present.

Both N and ABS disagree with NEB.

26 : 33 αυτω a d f ff^{1} g^{1} h l q aur Vg Sy$^{p.h}$ Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Aeth Arm Geo^{A}
omitted P^{37} 700 1675 b c ff^{2} Sy^{s} Geo$^{1.B}$

Here again is a frequent type of interpolation. Besides, the first reading also is harmonized with Mk 14 : 29 and Lk 22 : 33. There is every reason to consider the first reading as secondary.

N and ABS disagree with NEB.

27 : 16 Βαραββαν ℵABDKLWΔΠ fam. 13. 33 565 Byz latt Sy$^{p.h.pal\ ms}$ Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Goth Aeth Geo^{1} Or^{lat}

Ιησουν Βαραββαν Θ fam 1. 700* Sy$^{s.pal\ mss}$ Arm Geo^{2} Or

17 Βαραββαν ℵA(B)DKLWΔΠ fam 13. 565 700^{c} Byz latt Sy$^{p.h}$ Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Goth Aeth Geo^{1} Or
Ιησουν τον Βαραββαν (Θ) fam 1. 700* Sy$^{s.pal}$ Arm Geo^{2} Or^{lat}

The NEB translators have chosen the interesting variant Ιησουν for the following reasons: "(a) it has the serious attestation of Θ fam. 1, Syr. sin. and pal., the Georgian version, and Origen; (b) it adds considerable point to the passage; (c) Ιησουν may well have been omitted from reverential motives." [18] There is no doubt that they have selected the harder reading. It is difficult to see why anyone would add Ιησουν at this place. It could have arisen through apocryphal fancy and imagination, but no such evidence is seen in the apocryphal gospels.

The analysis of the differences above show that twenty-six out of thirty-nine times the NEB translators seem to have chosen correctly in this section. The quality of the NEB text shows forth clearly in this important section but it could be more consistent. The translators did not allow the external evidence to determine the readings but looked for internal factors to help them decide. They seem, therefore, to be more in line with the methods of textual criticism today than were the translators of the RSV.

Another comparison which brought out interesting elements had to do with readings where KJV, RV, and NEB agree against the RSV. There were three such readings, in all of which the RSV followed the text of Westcott and Hort. The first reading represents the text of KJV, RV, and NEB.

1 : 10 Αμων KLWΠ^{2} fam 13. 28 565 (700) Byz (aur) a (f) Vg Sy$^{c.s.p.h.pal}$ Geo
Αμως ℵBCΔΘΠ* fam 1. 33 157 c ff^{1} g^{1} k q Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Aeth Arm Epiph

[18] Tasker, *op. cit.*, p. 413.

12 : 47 ειπεν δε τις αυτω· ιδου η μητηρ σου και οι αδελφοι σου εξω εστηκασιν ζητουντες σοι λαλησαι $\aleph^a$CDKWX ΔΘΠ fam 1, 13. Byz lat $Sy^{p.h}$ Cop^{bo} Arm Aeth Geo Diat Or^{lat} Chry
omitted $\aleph^*$BL 1009 ff^1 k $Sy^{c.s}$ Cop^{sa}

18 : 14 υμων $\aleph D^cKLWX\Delta\Pi$ fam 1. 28 565^{vid} Byz it (pler.) Vg $Sy^{c.p.h^{mg}}$ Aug
μου BΘ 078 fam 13. 33 700 892 $Sy^{s.h}$ $Cop^{sa.bo}$ Aeth Arm Geo Or

Unfortunately, these verses are not discussed in the NEB "Notes on Variant Readings" so that we cannot know the reasons that guided the translators in their selection here. As we have mentioned above, the RSV follows the text of Westcott and Hort in these three passages. The external evidence in 1 : 10 strongly favors the reading of RSV but NEB ignores this in its reading and falls on the side of KJV and RV. The NEB reading can be explained as a later correction to the LXX form of the name. The omission of 12 : 47 can be explained as an attempt to remove the awkward connection of this verse with the verse which follows, in which the answer of Jesus is directed not to the one in verse 47 who announces the presence of the family of Jesus outside but to the one who asks who his mother and his brothers are. In both Mk and Lk, Jesus' answer is directed to those who announced the presence of his family. This is more likely what has happened rather than the possibility that a scribe has interpolated this verse by assimilating Mk and Lk.[19] The textual support for the RSV reading in 18 : 14 is strong, but apparently here the NEB translators selected the harder reading, since 18 : 10 has πατρος μου.

N and ABS agree with RSV at 1 : 10 and this one reading is considered by the ABS editors as a B class decision, *i.e.*, as having only some degree of doubt. In 18 : 14, however, N and ABS agree with NEB but the ABS considers it a C class de-

[19] Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

cision, while 12 : 47 is placed in square brackets in N and ABS. Here again the independent nature of the NEB manifests itself, although its quality is not consistent.

In five passages NEB agrees with KJV and in one instance (10 : 3) it takes a reading unsupported by the other three versions. The first reading is the KJV, NEB reading except in 10 : 3, where the NEB reading is placed second.

8 : 25 ημας Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. VSS pler.
omitted ℵBC fam 1, 13. 33 892 Sy^{h} Geo^{2}

10 : 3 Λεββαιος ο επικληθεις Θαδδαιος Uncs. rell. fam 1. 28 33 157 700 al. pler. f Sy$^{p.h}$ Aeth Arm Geo
Λεββαιος D k Or^{lat}
Θαδδαιος ℵB 124 174 788 892 c ff^{1} g^{2} l aur Vg Cop$^{sa.bo}$

14 : 30 ανεμον ισχυρον Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. latt Sy^{omn} Aeth Arm Geo
ανεμον ℵB 073 33 Cop$^{sa.bo}$

15 : 6 αυτου η την μητερα αυτου Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. lat Sy$^{s.p.h}$ Cop^{bo} Aeth Arm Geo^{2}
αυτου ℵBD a d e Sy^{c} Cop^{sa} Geo^{1}

21 : 9 προαγοντες NWXΔΘΠ Minusc. pler. it (rell.) Vg Arm Geo
+ αυτον ℵBCDL 1 1582 69 33 157 892 1010 d ff^{1} Sy^{omn} Cop$^{sa.bo}$ Aeth

24 : 38 ημεραις Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. a e ff^{1} g$^{1.2}$ q r^{1c} Vg
+ εκειναις BD 472 1295 1515 b c d f ff^{2} h l m r^{1*} aur Sy$^{h.pal}$ Arm Geo

In 8 : 25 ημας is clearly a stylistic interpolation. It would be difficult to see how anyone would wish to omit it if originally present. The predominant support for its inclusion from the versions is expected. Both N and ABS oppose NEB.

The textual support for the NEB reading in 14 : 30 is good, being early and from a wide geographical area, while the RSV reading is supported only by Alexandrian witnesses which have

a tendency to abbreviate. The omission of ισχυρον may be accounted for by its similar ending with ανεμον. The scribe may have accidentally omitted it, thinking that he had already written it. On the other hand, it is easy to see why an interpolation of this sort would take place. It was obviously added to give due cause for Peter's fear. It is hard to understand the choice of the NEB here on the basis of the principles used by its translators. Both N and ABS oppose NEB here.

The NEB reading in 15 : 6 is also difficult to account for. The weightier manuscripts support the other reading. But more important, it is easier to account for the inclusion than the omission since the previous verse has τω πατρι η τη μητρι. The omission can be accounted for by homoeoteleuton but the various combinations of the variant readings can be explained better on the assumption that, independently, these additions were made to harmonize this verse with the previous verse. Everything opposes the NEB reading. N agrees with NEB but ABS opposes it.

The late manuscript support for the omission of αυτον in 21 : 9 seems to indicate that this was done to harmonize with Mk 11 : 9. Ordinarily one would suspect a stylistic addition here. N and ABS oppose NEB.

In 24 : 38, it is easier to explain the omission than the addition of εκειναις. It could have been dropped because of the similar endings of ημεραις and ταις, but also in order to remove the redundancy of εκειναις created by the explanatory words "which were before the flood." ABS agrees with NEB and N has εκειναις in the text within brackets.

The textual support for Λεββαιος in 10 : 3 is weak, although when the two conflated readings, which presuppose this reading Λεββαιος ο επικληθεις Θαδδαιος and Θαδδαιος ο επικληθεις Λεββαιος, are taken into consideration, it is somewhat strengthened. The justification of the translators of the NEB for its reading is that "Θαδδαιος may have been an assimilation to Mk. 3.18." [20] The name Λεββαιος is the more difficult

[20] Tasker, *op. cit.*, p. 412.

reading and its presence is harder to explain than Θαδδαιος. N and ABS support the latter reading.

These point up again the nature of the text of the NEB. The translators were not afraid to select Koine readings if they could justify them even in the face of very strong textual evidence against them. However, as we have seen in the foregoing discussion, their selections here must be evaluated as poor. And this says something concerning the quality of the text of NEB; it is erratic. In many cases its translators have brilliantly justified a reading previously considered secondary, but in other cases they seem to have failed badly to discern on the basis of their own principles what appear to be clearly secondary readings.

Another interesting set of variants includes readings in which the NEB in agreement with KJV and RSV opposes the reading of RV. The first reading represents the RV.

11 : 23 καταβηση BDW 372 579
καταβιβασθηση Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler.

The first reading can be understood as a substitution of a common word for a less common word. This could be done because they are similar in meaning and the context allowed this change. On the other hand, the second reading being passive could be an assimilation with υψωθηση or a scribe may have been influenced by Eze 31 : 10-18.[21] It seems, however, that if a scribe was influenced by Eze 31 and Is 14 : 15, he would have been influenced more toward καταβηση rather than καταβιβασθηση since, though both words are used, the former is more prominent. Therefore, the second variant is the harder reading and probably original.

N and ABS support the first reading.

19 : 3 εξεστιν ℵ*BL 28 125* 301 475 517
+ ανθρωπω Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. VSS omn Or Hil

The second reading appears very much like a harmonization with Mk 10 : 2. However, there the word is ανδρι. If harmoni-

[21] McNeile, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

zation took place it was not identical. It seems it was less a case of harmonization than a necessary correction independent of Mk. The omission would be difficult to explain.

N follows the first reading but ABS agrees with NEB on the second reading.

23 : 5 κρασπεδα ℵBDΘ fam 1. 22 a d e ff^{1} g^{1} l m r^{2} aur Vg + των ιματιων αυτων Uncs. rell. Minusc. pler. f ff^{2} h q Sy^{omn} Cop^{bo} Arm Geo

The second reading seems like an explanatory gloss. It would be difficult to see why anyone would have omitted it if it were original.

N and ABS disagree with NEB here.

Conclusion

The various combinations in which NEB agrees or disagrees with the previous translations tell us something concerning the nature of its text; it is highly eclectic. The translators apparently did not feel bound by the external evidence no matter how overwhelming it might be. If some reason or reasons of an internal nature could be found to support a poorly supported reading, this was more important than all the external evidence. What Tasker lays out as the aim of the translators is borne out by our investigation:

> The present translators regarded it, therefore as their duty, in the search for 'the best ascertainable text,' not only to consider the antiquity and the geographical nature of the manuscript evidence (Greek, Latin, Coptic, and Syriac), but also to bring into play in the discussion of various readings of individual passages all the exegetical and philological scholarship of which they were capable.... The questions that were constantly being asked were 'Which reading best accounts for the rise of the variants? Which is most likely to have suffered change at the hands of early copyists? And which seems most in keeping with

the author's style and thought, and makes the best sense in the context?' [22]

Based on the standards of textual criticism as it is practiced today with emphasis upon internal evidence and the acceptance of the principle that the best text is that which has been determined on the basis of the best individual readings rather than the best group of manuscripts, we would expect the text of the NEB, therefore, to be of excellent quality. And in most cases its text has stood the test of close scrutiny. However, on its own standards it is very difficult to account for some of its readings. The quality of the text is not consistent so that our judgment of it must be somewhat qualified.

[22] Tasker, *op. cit.*, p. viii.

'ZB IN NEHEMIAH 3:8

A Reconsideration of Maximalist and Minimalist Views

C. G. TULAND
Chicago, Illinois

Introduction: Problems and Views

This article is concerned with the size of ancient Jerusalem. The city is mentioned in Egyptian texts as early as the 19th century B.C., then in cuneiform records from Palestine, the Amarna Letters of the 14th century. Later its name appears in Assyrian and Babylonian documents, but nowhere do these records contain any information about its topography, size, or the course of its walls. In these respects Biblical statements are our only sources, and even they are often either too general to give us specific information or too ambiguous for a clear understanding.

To fill this gap in our knowledge of the size of ancient Jerusalem archaeological information has become available through excavations carried out there during the last hundred years. Among the major archaeological expeditions may be mentioned the following: C. Wilson and C. Warren, 1864-65, M. Parker, 1909-11, R. Weill, 1913-14, R. A. S. Macalister, 1923-25, and J. W. Crowfoot and G. M. Fitzgerald, 1927. However, the identification of archaeological material found in the past has often been inexact. Although remains of walls and gates were discovered, some of them were not easy to assign to definite historical periods. Consequently, to determine the exact boundaries of the city during the pre-Christian periods of its history was difficult.

During the first decades of this century Albrecht Alt voiced the view that the oldest pre-Israelite Jerusalem had a maximum expansion of only 320 meters in length and 60 to

80 meters in width. [1] Similar views were held by Weill and G. Dalman. [2] Alt also suggested that before the Amarna age, the city had grown by 25 meters toward the north, as indicated by a trench filled with sherds and fill from the MB period. [3]

In the story of the conquest of Jebus (*i.e.*, Jerusalem) by David, who established it as the capital of Israel, mention is made of the צִנּוֹר, a shaft as part of an underground tunneling system which provided the city with water from the Gihon spring. This point will be discussed later. During the reign of Solomon the area of Jerusalem was enlarged but no details or data are given as to the extent of its boundaries. [4] From the time of King Jehoash we learn that 400 cubits of the city's wall were destroyed between 790 and 780. This destruction was followed by periods of repair and by the building of new walls and towers under the following kings: Uzziah (790-739), Jotham (750-731), Hezekiah (729-686), and Manasseh (696-642). These activities also will be discussed below. However, it must be said that the new city limits which were thus eventually created have not been established. [5]

Nehemiah's memoirs provide numerous details concerning the walls of post-exilic Jerusalem in Neh 3, his "restoration-text," and in Neh 12, the "procession-text," but scholars have been able only to assume the approximate location of the towers and gates mentioned in his records. Several details of Josephus' extensive topographical data about the city during different stages of its history and at the time of its conquest by the Romans in A.D. 70 are also uncertain.[6] If to all this are added the inadequate dating of archaeological material during the early excavations, the obliteration of excavated areas since they were opened up, and the incomplete recording of

[1] Albrecht Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, III (München, 1953), 249.
[2] J. Simons, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament* (Leiden, 1953), p. 50.
[3] Alt, *op. cit.*, p. 251.
[4] 1 Ki 9 : 15, 19, 24.
[5] 2 Ki 14 : 13; 2 Chr 26 : 9; 32 : 5; 33 : 14.
[6] Josephus, *The Jewish War*, v. 1-3; iv. 1-3 (§§ 136-171).

what was found, it is evident that both the archaeologist and the Biblical scholar are faced with extraordinary problems. J. Simons in discussing the reports of the various archaeological expeditions and their manifold interpretations, calls the extent of Biblical Jerusalem in the pre-exilic period "the most refractory problem of ancient Jerusalem and at the same time the most urgently in need of a final solution." [7] That dictum may equally well be applied to the post-exilic period.

The specific purpose of this investigation is to establish the extent of ancient Jerusalem or the area covered during the days of Nehemiah on the basis of the available Biblical data and archaeological findings. Recent excavations on the slopes of the South Hill in the Kidron Valley, and elsewhere, by Kathleen Kenyon of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem seem to justify a re-appraisal of former views. How justified such a reorientation is can be illustrated by the discovery that the tower found some 40 years ago and attributed to David was actually built during the Maccabean period *ca.* 800 years after David's reign.

With regard to Nehemiah's building activity the consensus among Biblical scholars seems to have been that the restoration of Jerusalem's walls was a simple rebuilding of the pre-exilic city walls which Nebuchadnezzar had destroyed in 586 B.C. This view is expressed by Simons: "With regard to the restoration text of Nehemiah as a whole it must always be kept in mind, that it describes the course of the pre-exilic city walls." [8] Such was also Alt's opinion [9] and that of Avi-Yonah, who strongly champions the "minimalist" position. [10] However, Nehemiah pictures Jerusalem as long as 100 years after the return of the *gôlāh* to be a place with but few inhabitants and even fewer houses. [11]

We hope to show that the recent excavations and the plain

[7] Simons, *op. cit.*, pp. 33, 34.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 231, note 2.
[9] Alt, *op. cit.*, pp. 322, 338.
[10] M. Avi-Yonah, "The Walls of Nehemiah," *IEJ*, IV (1954), 241.
[11] Neh 4 : 7; 11 : 1, 2.

meaning of the Hebrew text of Neh 3: 8 will solve to a large extent the problems of the course of the walls in Nehemiah's time.

Jerusalem's Walls—and the City as Nehemiah Found it

According to the well-balanced judgment of Alt, Jerusalem during the time of the monarchy occupied an area only slightly larger than the nineteen acres of Samaria, [12] although he assumed that during the later period of the monarchy some additional areas were incorporated into the city proper. [13]

David, the first king of the United Kingdom, obviously limited his building activities to providing quarters for himself, his court, the palace guard, and his court officials. This activity is described in the somewhat ambiguous Biblical statement that he "built the city round about from the Millo inward." [14] After him Solomon added to Jerusalem the Temple area north of the City of David and probably surrounded the new quarter by a wall. [15] Jehoash of Israel took Jerusalem by conquest between *ca.* 790 and 780 B.C. and broke down 400 cubits of the wall, namely from the Ephraim Gate to the Corner Gate. [16] This constitutes possibly, but not necessarily, the distance between the two gates.

Not many years later Uzziah (790-739) apparently repaired at least part of that wall and fortified exposed sectors by building "towers in Jerusalem at the Corner Gate and at the Valley Gate (שַׁעַר־הַגַּיְא) and at the Angle, and fortified them." [17] Simons maintains that the *gay'* or valley must be identified with the Hinnom Valley in contrast to the *naḥal* or the Kidron Valley. [18] This limited identification of *gay'* with the Hinnom Valley is difficult to defend, as it presupposes

[12] Alt, *op. cit.*, pp. 323-324, note 1.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 323.
[14] 2 Sa 5 : 9.
[15] 1 Ki 9 : 15.
[16] 2 Ki 14 : 13.
[17] 2 Chr 26 : 9.
[18] Simons, *op. cit.*, p. 11, note 1.

that the Southwestern and/or Western Hill was part of the walled-in city of Jerusalem during the monarchy, a theory which until now has had very scant—if any—archaeological support. The position of Alt, Robertson Smith, and other scholars who associate the *gay'* of 2 Chr 26: 9 with the Central Valley between the Southeastern Hill and the Promontory of the Southwestern Hill, avoids this and other difficulties resulting from Simons' theory. [19] There can hardly be any doubt that this *gay'*—the Central Valley, identical with the Tyropoeon Valley of Josephus, and with Alt's *Stadttal*—was the result of erosion and in the early period was probably as steep as the slopes on the Kidron side. [20] The Valley Gate, therefore, should not be sought in the Hinnom Valley, on the far-west side of the Western Hill, but in the Central Valley. It is probably identical with the Gate which Crowfoot discovered in 1927.

Jotham (750-731), Uzziah's son, "did much building on the wall of the Ophel," a fortified area on the east side of the South Hill, which later, in the days of Nehemiah, was assigned to the Temple servants as living quarters. [21] When Hezekiah (729-686) became king of Judah, "he set to work resolutely and built up the wall that was broken down, and raised towers upon it, and outside it he built another wall; and he strengthened the Millo in the city of David." [22] His son Manasseh (696-642) completed what seems to have been an extensive building program, for "he built an outer wall to the city of David west of Gihon, in the valley [נַחַל meaning the Kidron Valley], to the entrance by the Fishgate, and carried it round Ophel; and raised it to a very great height." [23]

The last two reports seem to complement each other. Hezekiah rebuilt "the wall that was broken down," which

[19] W. Robertson Smith, "Jerusalem," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (9th ed.; 1875-1889), XIII, 640.
[20] Simons, *op. cit.*, p. 20; Alt, *op. cit.*, p. 328.
[21] 2 Chr 27 : 3; Neh 3 : 26, 27.
[22] 2 Chr 32 : 5.
[23] 2 Chr 33 : 14.

refers doubtless to the one destroyed by Jehoash. The Chronicler is specific about the location of that wall, by saying that it lay "between the Ephraim Gate and the Corner Gate." Accordingly, Hezekiah fortified the defenses in the northwestern part of the city, where those two gates were situated. [24] One purpose of the new or "other wall," then, must have been the incorporation of the populated area outside or west of the older wall in that section of the city which according to all evidence was the Mishneh, or "Second City." Thus the text furnishes important details concerning the continuation of Hezekiah's large-scale building program by Manasseh. The information is specific. Manasseh built an outer (*i.e.*, a *new*) wall (1) to the city of David, (2) *west* of Gihon, (3) to the entrance of the Fishgate, and (4) carried it around *Ophel*. This explicit statement establishes that the new wall began with the city of David, or at the southern end of the Southeast Hill. It also says that it reached to or ended at the Fishgate, in the northeast of the city. Since the wall was built *west* of the Gihon Spring it is evident that it followed the Kidron Valley. Finally, it included Ophel, also on the Kidron side. The narrative establishes that Manasseh's building activities comprised the eastern and northeastern part of the city wall, while his father Hezekiah had expanded and fortified the northwestern and western part of Jerusalem. These, then, were the walls which Nebuchadnezzar destroyed in 586. They obviously enclosed a larger area than the older walls, but it is also clear that this expansion was limited to the immediate zone or belt around the South Hill in the Kidron Valley while in the northwest sector of the city it probably included a more extensive tract.

It seems natural to assume that the *gôlāh*, the 42,360 Jews who returned after 538 from Babylon, were too few in number to repopulate the entire province of Judah with its hamlets, villages and large capital. [25] Several years prior to Nehemiah's

[24] Wilhelm Rudolph, *Chronikbücher* (Tübingen, 1955), p. 285.
[25] Ezr 2 : 64.

governorship and shortly after the arrival of Ezra's group, the *gôlāh* had started rebuilding the city's wall, evidently without authorization by Artaxerxes I. This caused a protest by the Samaritans through the Persian commander to the king. By royal decree the Jews were then forced to desist from fortifying their capital city. [26] There is no record as to the amount of work the Jews had been able to complete until that moment, and it seems that the interference by Rehum and the Samaritans meant no destruction of what had been repaired. However, from Nehemiah's memoirs it is evident that already before his arrival the Jews were constantly harrassed by their hostile neighbors, Samaritans, Arabs, Ashdodites, and possibly others. [27] In fact, the raids upon the province and Jerusalem became so serious that many Jews had been killed or taken into captivity, while the wall of the city had been broken down and its gates destroyed by fire. These developments caused Nehemiah to ask permission from the king to rebuild the city and its walls. [28] The Liḥyanite Arabs who in the middle of the 5th century B.C. displaced the Edomites and took possession of the southern part of Judah, may have greatly contributed to the plight of the people. These events also explain why in 457 B.C. Jerusalem obviously had a larger population than it had thirteen years later in 444 when Nehemiah tried to gather the remnants in order to rebuild the city of his fathers. Even after the first objective—the rebuilding of the wall—was achieved, the record states, "The city was wide and large, but the people within it were few and no houses had been built." [29] In order to remedy this situation Nehemiah ordered the people to cast lots "to bring one out of ten to live in Jerusalem, the holy city, while nine tenths remained in the other towns." [30] Even this one tenth of the entire population of the province including the leaders of the people was ob-

[26] Ezr 4 : 11-23.
[27] Neh 4 : 7.
[28] Neh 1 : 1-3; 2 : 2-8.
[29] Neh 7 : 4.
[30] Neh 11 : 1.

viously not enough to repopulate the city, and there was no logical reason for rebuilding the walls of the large pre-exilic city. This was evidently Nehemiah's justification for limiting his reconstruction program to the smallest possible walled-in area, a fact which, we believe, can now be demonstrated.

Archaeology Charts a New Course

As has been stated in the introduction, the interpretation of both literary sources and archaeological material has resulted in a wide variety of opinions. The majority of scholars, some possibly under the influence of the poetic beauty of the Psalms, their descriptions of the grandeur of the Holy City and the religious significance of the Temple, have envisioned Jerusalem as a city impressive in size, splendor, and the number of its inhabitants. But archaeology has demonstrated that the ancient cities of Palestine were disappointingly small. Theories which include the Southwestern and/or the Western Hill during subsequent periods presuppose Jerusalem to have been an ancient Near Eastern megalopolis of up to 85 or even 218 acres, as compared with Samaria's 19, Lachish's 21, and Megiddo's 13 acres. [31]

In the opinion of some scholars Jebusite Jerusalem was limited to the ridge of the Southeast Hill, an area estimated by Weill and Dalman at 3 or 2.17 hectares (approx. 5.5 to 7.5 acres) respectively. [32] Those scholars assume that the Western Hill was not included in the walled area of the city till the Hellenistic period. [33]

As a result of the recent excavations by Kenyon the conclusions of former excavators of Jerusalem and scholars who have dealt with its size in ancient times have been radically

[31] Simons, *op. cit.*, pp. 50, 51; *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, III (Washington, D.C., 1954), 407.

[32] R. Weill, *La Cité de David, Compte rendu des fouilles exécutées à Jérusalem sur le site de la ville primitive, Campagne de* 1913-14 (Paris, 1947) p. 17; G. Dalman, "Zion, die Burg Jerusalems," *PJB*, XI (1915), 65.

[33] Avi-Yonah, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

revised. The situation is best explained by one of Kenyon's references to former expeditions. Speaking about the work done by Warren, Bliss and Dickie, she says: "At that stage stratigraphical methods and pottery chronology had not been developed to assist in dating strata, so ascriptions of structures to periods could only be theories, and these theories have since been proved to be wrong." [34]

This statement applies to all, to the Jebusite, pre-Israelite, and pre-exilic periods during which Alt and others believed that the city occupied exclusively the ridge of the Southeast Hill. [35] But, according to Kenyon, present excavations show that possibly in the 13th century B.C. "a complicated system of terraces was built outside of the Jebusite town wall, evidence of a major town planning development." [36] She also concludes that "the town wall of the Jebusite period and the time of the Israelite monarchy is thus well outside of the line hitherto accepted." This discovery also illuminates the incident in the days of David when Joab entered the city through the צִנּוֹר, a shaft by means of which the local population drew water that was channeled from the Gihon Spring into a cave lying at the bottom of the shaft. [37] Since the spring was about 110 yards outside of the eastern wall—as located until recently—and 95 yards below it, and the shaft itself still some eight feet outside that wall on the crest, it follows that the area below at that time had to be protected by fortifications. Kenyon found beneath the tower ruins of houses as well as part of a massive, nine-foot-wide MB wall, some 49 meters from the face of the tower, the deposits showing that it had been in use from the 18th century B.C. down to its

[34] Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land* (2d rev. ed; London, 1965), p. 316. (Since there are discrepancies between the 2d revised edition printed in London, 1965, and the 3d printing published in New York, 1964, quotations from this work are from the 1965 London edition.)

[35] Alt, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

[36] Kenyon, "Excavations in Jerusalem 1961-1963," *BA*, XXVII (1964), 43.

[37] 2 Sa 5 : 6-9.

destruction by Nebuchadnezzar in 586, which ended the occupation of the eastern slope. [38]

From these facts it must be concluded that Jerusalem, even if limited to the East Hill during the monarchy and the entire pre-exilic period, was somewhat larger than the minimalist view assumed. This has been stated by Weill and is now confirmed by Kenyon. [39] According to Simons, these terraces were part of the defensive system of the city. [40]

A second and even more important point derives from the fact that these outside walls were not rebuilt after the conflagration of 586. Kenyon observes: "The walls, however, were not rebuilt until the governorship of Nehemiah, probably 445-433 B.C." [41] Furthermore, Nehemiah's restoration did not include the outer walls, *i.e.*, those in the Kidron and Tyropoeon Valleys: "In his rebuilding, the lower slopes of the eastern ridge were abandoned, and the wall followed the crest." [42] This had already been stated by Kenyon in earlier reports: "The boundary of Jerusalem in post-exilic Judah receded to the crest of the ridge." [43] The restoration on the west side of the southern hill appears to have followed the same principle: "The position of the west wall at this period, just below the western crest of the eastern ridge, is indicated by the gate found in 1927." [44] These statements show that post-exilic Jerusalem did not cover the whole area occupied prior to 586 B.C., since it covered only a narrow strip on the summit of the eastern ridge. [45] Post-exilic Jerusalem under Nehemiah had become a smaller city.

Thus Kenyon's excavations have led her to a number of conclusions which contradict former views held by many

[38] Kenyon, *BA*, XXVII (1964), 38, 39, 45.
[39] Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land*, p. 318.
[40] Weill, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-118; Simons, *op. cit.*, p. 83.
[41] Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land*, p. 318.
[42] *Ibid.*
[43] Kenyon, "Excavations in Jerusalem, 1962," *PEQ*, XCV (1963), 16.
[44] Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land*, p. 318.
[45] Kenyon, *BA*, XXVII, (1964), 46.

scholars. One concerns the expansion of the pre-exilic city. "As far as present evidence goes, the city was limited to the eastern ridge throughout the period of the Monarchy." [46] However, it is also certain that it included the slopes of the hills. Another deals with the question whether the West Hill was at any period part of the pre-exilic city. Referring to excavations between 1934 and 1948 Kenyon mentions certain facts that have been reported by the Department of Antiquities of Palestine. "Mr. C. N. Johns was able to date stratigraphically the older lines of wall there (at the north-west corner of the early city) and to show that the earliest line of wall crossing the Tyropoeon Valley and connecting the points of the western and eastern ridges was not earlier than the Hellenistic period." [47] Only a few years ago Simons, against all probability, defended the maximalist position, pitting hope against facts:

> We have stated at the beginning of this chapter that the contribution of archaeology to the problem of the S.W. Hill is a limited one. It would not have been an exaggeration to have used a stronger expression and to have said that archaeology has here created an awkward *impasse*. Indeed, while the preceding arguments and considerations make, as we believe, a very early incorporation of the S.W. Hill into the walled city-area and a real unity of the settlement on this hill with that on the S.E. Hill even in pre-Israelite age highly probable, all underground researches so far undertaken on the S.W. Hill have failed to confirm this conclusion and in some cases rather point in the opposite direction. [48]

This indication has proved to be correct. While the earliest line in the northwest corner, crossing the Tyropoeon Valley, was not earlier than the Hellenistic period, the ones in the south are even more recent, as stated by Kenyon: "Evidence was provided that the southern end of the Tyropoeon Valley dividing Ophel from the western ridge was not occupied until that [*i.e.*, Maccabean] period." [49]

[46] Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land*, p. 318.
[47] *Ibid.*, p. 317.
[48] Simons, *op. cit.*, pp. 251, 252.
[49] Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land*, p. 317.

Our present archaeological knowledge, therefore, seems definitely to establish that pre-exilic Jerusalem was limited to the East Hill only. Although we have not yet discussed the problem of the Mishneh, or Second City, excavations seem to eliminate the maximalist view that envisioned the city as including the Western Hill. [50]

Philological Considerations

Before the recent excavations by Kenyon the extent of Nehemiah's Jerusalem was—in absence of clear archaeological evidence—largely an academic question, subject to interpretation by individual scholars. The situation has changed since it now seems to be certain that Nehemiah did not include the total area of the pre-exilic city in his program of restoration.

However, the excavations have also brought into focus a textual problem, a Biblical passage which until now was limited to philological considerations. Actually, the meaning of Neh 3: 8 which has been translated, "and they restored Jerusalem as far as the Broad Wall" (RSV) has seldom been the subject of discussion. It appears that to most Bible scholars and translators "to restore," "to complete," or a similar term seemed to express the thought required by the context and thus to give the only reasonable meaning of the text.

But the Hebrew עָזַב does not mean at all "to restore," "to complete," or "to gird around." The unmistakable meaning of the verb, including its derived and composite forms, is "to leave," "to forsake," "to leave behind," etc. [51] In spite of this, the temptation to interject a different meaning into the text of Neh 3: 8 has prevailed with most translators and com-

[50] Simons, *op. cit.*, p. 443, map.

[51] F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon* (corrected impression; Oxford, 1952), pp. 736-738. M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Jerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York, 1950), II, 1060, 1061.

mentators. Carl Siegfried read יֵאָזֵר from אָזַר, "to gird," thus following Ehrlich who likewise had suggested יֵעָזֵר* (a hypothetical verb suggested by the noun עֲזָרָה which seems to mean "enclosure"; hence the verb would be "to enclose"). Siegfried had characterized the translations of Bunsen, Schultz, Ewald and Ryssel as "adventurous." [52] As late as 1949 Wilhelm Rudolph remarked concerning Neh 3: 8, "verlassen hier ist sinnlos." [53] Since the discovery of the Ras Shamra tablets, it has been suggested that the Ugaritic *ʿdb*, "to make," "to prepare," "to set," would support the translation of *ʿāzaḇ* as "to complete," because the Ugaritic *d* can be exchanged with the Hebrew *z*. [54] But even this possibility must be ruled out, since Biblical and Talmudic Hebrew indicates that the meaning of *ʿzb* has not changed since its occurrence in oldest Biblical sources.

What is more, the Akkadian *ezēbu*, found in a wide variety of texts in the Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute, is invariably translated in terms denoting "to leave," "to abandon," "to leave behind," "to leave out," "to disregard," "to divorce," etc. [55]

The MT indicates no variants, text-restorations, or different readings due to marginal notes or copyist's errors. Although there have been occasional misgivings and doubts, the writer of the Cambridge Bible, in 1907, among others made the following suggestion: "It is possible that the builders at that point 'left' some portion of Jerusalem *outside* their wall. The circumference of the old city was larger than was now needed. In the course of the restoration of the wall, the builders abandoned at some point the outer wall and the uninhabited portion of Jerusalem which it included." [56] This was followed by L. W.

[52] Carl Siegfried, *Esra, Nehemiah, und Esther* in "Handbuch zum Alten Testament" (Göttingen, 1901), pp. 80, 81.

[53] Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia* (Tübingen, 1949), p. 116.

[54] Cyrus H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Handbook* (Rome, 1947), III, No. 1456.

[55] *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, IV (Chicago, 1958), 415-426.

[56] H. E. Ryle, *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* in "The Cambridge Bible" (Cambridge, 1907), XVI-XVII, 178.

Batten in the *ICC*: "It may be, however, that the reference is to some part of the old city, that was not included in the new, and 'abandoned' would then be right." [57] Apparently, this interpretation came in both cases as an afterthought, since to these as to most other scholars it could hardly present the meaning of the text. Thus translators were in strange agreement when they consistently but incorrectly rendered the Hebrew: עַל־יָדוֹ חִזְקִיָּה חֲנַנְיָה בֶּן־הָרַקָּחִים וַיַּעַזְבוּ יְרוּשָׁלַם עַד הַחוֹמָה הָרְחָבָה as "Next to him Hananiah, one of the perfumers, repaired; and they restored [or completed, girded around] Jerusalem as far as the Broad Wall" (RSV). This passage, however, on the basis of the verb *'āzaḇ*, should be translated: "And they *abandoned* Jerusalem as far as the Broad Wall." Some newer versions such as the RSV indicate this meaning of the Hebrew verb in marginal notes.

Most translations in modern languages reveal the same reluctance as our English versions for they, too, do not express the true meaning of the Hebrew verb.

How, then did the translators of the Greek, Latin, and Syriac Bible understand the word *'āzaḇ*?

The LXX reads as follows: καὶ ἐπὶ χεῖρα αὐτῶν ἐκράτησεν Ανανιας υἱὸς τοῦ Ρωκεῖμ, καὶ κατέλιπον Ιερουσαλημ ἕως τοῦ τείχους τοῦ πλατέος, thus agreeing with the Hebrew original. The only significant divergence is that instead of an expected μυρέψοι, "perfumers," it reads Ρωκεῖμ, a simple transliteration of the Hebrew רַקָּחִים, understood by the Greek translator as a personal name. [58] Nevertheless, κατέλιπον, "they left behind," correctly translates the meaning of the Hebrew *'āzaḇ*, even though Siegfried observes: "ויעזבו LXX κατέλιπον ist unverständlich." [59] Thomson, in his English translation of *The Septuagint Bible* comes close to a correct rendering: "And next to them Ananias, a chief of the

[57] Loring W. Batten, *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* in "The International Critical Commentary" (New York, 1913), p. 211.

[58] Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart, 1950), I, 926.

[59] Carl Siegfried, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 81.

apothecaries, fortified; and *they left Jerusalem* behind them, to the Broad Wall." [60] Thus the Greek text as well as those who follow it consistently expresses the exact understanding of the term, according to which the builders "abandoned" (part of) Jerusalem as far as the Broad Wall.

The different versions of the Syriac, too, follow the Hebrew text: "And they ܫܒܩܘ "abandoned" Jerusalem, until the Broad Wall." [61]

The Vulgate gives the same rendering: "Et juxta eum aedificavit Ananias filius pigmentarii: et dimiserunt Jerusalem usque ad murum plateae latioris." Since *dimitto* means "to give up," "to leave," "to abandon," the Latin version likewise agrees with the Hebrew. [62] The Douay-Rheims version reads: "And they left Jerusalem until the wall of the broad street." [63]

A review of the evidence from the MT and the ancient versions leads to the following conclusions:

1. The Hebrew verb *ʿāzaḇ* establishes the correct meaning of Neh 3: 8, according to which the Jews "abandoned" part of Jerusalem when Nehemiah rebuilt the city in 444.

2. The translators of the LXX employed the Greek word κατέλιπον, which agrees with the meaning of the Hebrew verb.

3. Jerome's *Vulgate* uses the Latin verb *dimitto*, which is equivalent to the Hebrew and Greek terms.

4. The Syriac version also agrees with the Hebrew text by using ܫܒܩ expressing the same meaning, "to leave," "to abandon," etc.

In view of these facts the only philological problem seems to be the question of why so many translators and commentators preferred to render this passage contrary to its

[60] Charles Thomson, *The Septuagint Bible* (Indian Hills, Col., 1954).

[61] Ceriani, *Translatio Syra-Pescitto Veteris Testamenti* (Mediolani, 1883), Tomus II (Nehemiah), p. 582; Payne Smith, *Syriac-English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1903), pp. 556, 557.

[62] *Cassell's Latin Dictionary* (New York, 1953), p. 172.

[63] *The Holy Bible*, Standard Catholic Version, Douay-Rheims Edition, (New York, 1914).

obvious philological and lexical meaning. The apparent explanation is evidently that to them "abandon" made no sense in a context where everything was geared to demonstrate the progress and completion of the building project, the restoration of the city wall. This obstacle, we hope, has now been removed by the supporting evidence of the recent excavations in Jerusalem.

The Inspection, Restoration, and Procession Texts

Inasmuch as present excavations support the basic principle expressed in Neh 3: 8, according to which part of the pre-exilic city was "abandoned," the question remains whether the specific sector referred to in this text can be located with any degree of certainty.

The following observations are based on Nehemiah's restoration and procession texts, as well as on the short account of his inspection tour. Simons' extremely critical views on these passages are more rhetorical than realistic; in fact, they are not justified. In view of the most recent archaeological data, his statement that "all three wall descriptions of Nehemiah are of an emotional nature," can be refuted without subjecting Nehemiah to a psychoanalytical judgment. [64] Even if Nehemiah's restoration and procession texts should be incomplete, as Rudolph points out, and the identification of gates and towers uncertain, they are still adequate enough to establish the general boundary-line of his city. [65]

Concerning the inspection-trip little can be added to that which has already been stated by other scholars. The position of Alt, which has also been accepted by Rudolph, is sound. [66] Nehemiah did not ride around the whole city, but he "returned" at a certain point, which is twice expressed by the use of

[64] Simons, *op. cit.*, pp. 438, 439, 442.

[65] Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia*, pp. 113, 114.

[66] Alt, *op. cit.*, III, 340-344; Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia*, pp. 111, 112.

שׁוּב in Neh 2: 15, and what verses 12-15 describe is doubtless the southern tip of the East Hill.

One point, however, merits our attention by way of illustration. If, as Simons proposes, the Valley Gate is to be sought in the Hinnom and not in the Central Valley, it created a strange situation for Nehemiah's nocturnal inspection trip. He would have had to cross the Central Valley, ascend the West Hill, and descend again to an imaginary "Valley Gate" in the Hinnom Valley. He then would have followed the Hinnom to the southern tip of the East Hill, by passing the same Central Valley which he supposedly had just transversed only a few hundred feet farther up, proceeding on foot over the ruins of the Kidron. Since he returned by the same way, he again would have by-passed the Central Valley, entering through a "Valley Gate" and a wall for whose existence there is neither contemporary, Biblical, nor archaeological evidence.

The restoration text in Neh 3 follows a counter-clockwise sequence of assignments given to each labor gang, beginning with the Sheep Gate in the northern wall. Avi-Yonah identifies this gate—as W. R. Smith and G. Dalman did before him—with the Gate of Benjamin. [67] The first section was assigned to the high priest and the priests and extended from the Sheep Gate to the Tower of the Hundred and the Tower of Hananel, with two more labor gangs following them. Another group built the Fish Gate, also identified as the Ephraim Gate. According to Alt, Avi-Yonah and other scholars this gate was situated in the Tyropoeon or Central Valley, from where the builders apparently turned south. [68]

As has already been stated, the identification of some of the gates is a comparatively difficult problem, especially since some were known by different names, or their names were changed during the centuries. The Ephraim Gate and the

[67] Avi-Yonah, *op. cit.*, p. 241; W. R. Smith, "Jerusalem" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, ed. (London, 1901), cols. 2423, 2424.

[68] Avi-Yonah, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

Corner Gate from the days of Jehoash (2 Ki 14: 13) are mentioned again during the reign of Uzziah (2 Chr 26: 9). But the Corner Gate is found neither in the restoration nor in the procession text, while the Gate of Ephraim in Neh 12: 39 is obviously a gloss, being in the wrong place between the "Broad Wall" and the "Old" or Mishneh Gate. The latter is the next gate mentioned in Neh 3: 6 as the "Old Gate," a grammatically inadmissible translation of שַׁעַר הַיְשָׁנָה.[69] Since Jeshanah appears also in 2 Chr 13: 19 as the name of a village 15 miles north of Jerusalem—the LXX transliterated it as Isana—also mentioned by Josephus, the suggestion has been made that the gate derived its name from that village.[70] Many scholars, however, seem to prefer a correction of the text itself. The generally accepted emendation of שַׁעַר הַיְשָׁנָה to שַׁעַר הַמִּשְׁנֶה eliminates the unintelligible translation of "Old Gate" and replaces it with Mishneh Gate, which Avi-Yonah identifies with the Corner Gate, placing it on the western slope of the East Hill.[71] Others, including Simons, likewise locate the Mishneh Gate in the southern portion of the Mishneh Wall on the west side; however, this would involve inclusion of at least part of the West Hill into the city. This raises the question of the location of the "Broad Wall" or the "Broad Square."[72]

Under "Mishneh" or "Second City" we understand the outlying area west of "Solomon's City," which had been incorporated into Jerusalem through the building of a second wall by Hezekiah (729-686).[73] Zep 1: 10 does not allow an exact topographical definition, but 2 Ki 22: 14 is explicit

[69] Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia*, p. 116; R. A. Bowman, *The Interpreter's Bible*, III (New York, 1954), 685; Avi-Yonah, *op. cit.*, pp. 242, 243; Simons, *op. cit.*, pp. 305, 306.

[70] Josephus, *Ant.*, xiv. 15. 12; cf. Ralph Marcus, *Josephus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957), VII, 685, n. g; Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia*, p. 116.

[71] Avi-Yonah, *op. cit.*, map on p. 240, p. 243.

[72] Simons, *op. cit.*, pp. 232, 306.

[73] 2 Chr 32 : 5; Simons, *op. cit.*, pp. 291, 332-333.

inasmuch as it indicates that at the time of Hulda the prophetess (622 B.C.) the Mishneh was a part of the city proper. The text says that she "dwelt *in* the Second Quarter *in* Jerusalem" (בַּמִּשְׁנֶה בִּירוּשָׁלִַם). Since the Mishneh Gate is placed at the west side of the city, and the sequence of the restoration program locates the sector which had been "abandoned" or "left out" in the northwest corner, we conclude that it was the Mishneh or Second City to which Neh 3: 8 refers. The area according to our passage was west of the old city wall, between the gate on the northwestern corner and the point where evidently the older and the second wall of Hezekiah met, the "Broad Wall" or the "Wall of the Square." Hence the phrase, "and they abandoned Jerusalem as far as the Broad Wall" (RSV). The text is actually an explicative note indicating two facts, firstly, that a certain sector of the city had been excluded from the rebuilding program, and secondly, where that sector was situated.

Following the "Wall of the Square" the text mentions the "Tower of the Furnaces" (v. 11), then the Valley Gate, which most archaeologists believe to be the one excavated by Crowfoot in 1927. [74] The distance between the Valley Gate and the Dung Gate amounted to a thousand cubits, approximately 1,700 feet or 500 meters (v. 13). It has been emphasized that the Valley Gate is to be placed at the lower half of the western wall of the East Hill. [75] The assignment of such a large section to one group is not necessarily an indication of error in Nehemiah's record. [76] Whether the wall in that section had not been seriously damaged, or had been partly restored when the Jews attempted to fortify the city before Nehemiah's arrival in 444, cannot be decided. It is possible that one large labor gang was sufficient to repair the whole section. Furthermore, the fact that Nehemiah chose the Valley Gate as the point to

[74] Alt, *op. cit.*, II, 327-338; Avi-Yonah, *op. cit.*, p. 239.

[75] Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia*, pp. 110-118; Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, p. 285.

[76] Simons, *op. cit.*, p. 161, note 3, p. 162.

begin and end his inspection trip is an additional support for this conclusion. While he could ride his beast in part of the Central Valley which evidently was comparatively free of rubble, he had to dismount when he reached the Kidron Valley. [77]

For the purpose of this study there is no further need to discuss the restoration of the wall on the eastern slope of the South Hill, since it has been demonstrated archaeologically that also here, in the Kidron Valley, Nehemiah "left out" the area between the outer and inner walls, which had been part of the pre-exilic city. These details indicate that it was part of Nehemiah's premeditated plan to limit the area of Jerusalem to the needs of a greatly reduced population.

The labor assignments following those on the east side or Kidron Valley are not exclusively marked by gates or fortifications, but increasingly by references to public or private buildings. We learn that some repaired a section near "the house of Eliashib the high priest" (Neh 3: 20, 21), while others worked "opposite their own houses" (v. 23). After mention of the house of Azariah there follow references to an area opposite "the Angle," and "the tower projecting from the upper house of the king and the court of the guard" (vs. 24, 25). The frequently repeated word "opposite" not only pin-points wall-sections in relationship to well-known houses or other buildings, but also seems to be indicative of the fact that outlying fortifications had become unimportant. Then again follow sections where each priest "repaired opposite his own house" (vs. 28, 29). Meshullam the son of Berechiah repaired "opposite his chamber" (v. 30).

The expression, "the house of the temple servants and of the merchants" probably refers to the service quarters of the former (v. 31). Since these buildings could not have been located on the steep slope of the Kidron Valley, they must have been part of the inner city, *i.e.*, they must have been enclosed by the inner wall built by Solomon and his successors. This,

[77] Neh 2 : 12-15.

too, lends additional support to the now established fact that Nehemiah rebuilt only the old wall on the crest of the East Hill.

The Biblical statement that "the work on the wall was finished in 52 days" (Neh 6: 15) merits more credit than Josephus' two years and four months. [78] It is evident that the people could not have left their fields or occupations for a period of above two years, be it for voluntary service or corvée. This provides a further evidence for our position that Nehemiah's Jerusalem was a "minimal" city. Even if all the Jews of the whole province could have been mobilized, they could not have repaired the circumvallation of a city comprising an area of 85 (much less 218) acres in 52 days.

The total number of men employed in the rebuilding of the wall is nowhere recorded. The priests, who were able to furnish a large contingent of men, worked on the north side where the wall had been heavily damaged. This is evident from the use of בָּנָה, "to build," instead of the otherwise employed חָזַק, "to repair."

A comparison between the small number of labor gangs employed and the length of the wall-sections assigned to them on the west side of the East Hill, and the numerous groups with short sections on the Kidron side, reveals realistic organization and intelligent leadership. According to Neh 3 there were 18 labor gangs working on the north and west side of the city wall and an additional two on the south between the Dung Gate and the Fountain Gate. The length of the whole city wall in minimalist terms was approximately 3,000 meters, the north and west wall with *ca.* 1,650 meters covered by 20 labor gangs as against 1,350 meters on the east with 22 groups. The maximalist theory would require more than 2,500 to 2,800 meters for the western section alone, to be divided among only 20 groups of laborers. This seems to be another strong argument against the archaeologically unsupported

[78] Josephus, *Ant.*, xi. 179. (v. 8).

inclusion of the western hills into post-exilic Jerusalem. This unequal distribution of sections also may explain why Batten and Simons question the reliability of Nehemiah's report.

The procession text follows the topographical order of the restoration text. Even though there are the same elements of uncertainty regarding the exact location of gates or fortifications, of names, or of some wells and pools, it has become increasingly evident that Nehemiah's descriptions have to be applied to a Jerusalem limited to the East Hill only. This conclusion becomes more certain with the lack of archaeological remains on the western hills. Inasmuch as the two companies of the procession have been sufficiently discussed and their courses analyzed, it may suffice to state that in our opinion and according to recent excavations the procession text describes the city as restricted to the East Hill.

Summary and Conclusions

Our investigation based on (1) the Biblical records dealing with Jerusalem's walls, (2) a philological study of *'zb*, and (3) the recent excavations in Jerusalem leads to the following conclusions:

1. Earlier excavations have shown that Jebusite- or pre-Israelite Jerusalem was limited to the Southeastern Hill. A narrow, inhabited zone or belt on the slopes with a system of terraces, and protected by walls and fortifications, also belonged to the city, thus increasing its size.

2. Scriptural records indicate that Solomon expanded the city toward the north, where the Temple, the royal palace and other official buildings were erected. However, this expansion was restricted to the East Hill.

3. Toward the end of the 8th century Hezekiah built an outer wall on the northwest side, evidently with the purpose of incorporating a populated area into the city proper. This addition is generally identified with the Mishneh, *i.e.*, the "Second City" or "Second Quarter." The size of that area has not been determined.

4. Recent excavations demonstrate that, contrary to general belief, post-exilic Jerusalem was not a simple rebuilding of the whole pre-exilic city. Nehemiah did not restore the outer wall on the eastern slope of the Southeast Hill, but abandoned the formerly populated belt between the two walls, diminishing the size of the city correspondingly. Of this important historical detail no reference is made in Biblical records.

5. The fact that Nehemiah intentionally and purposefully reduced the area of Jerusalem from its pre-exilic size to the requirements of a much smaller population is also substantiated strongly by philological evidence. According to Neh 3: 8 that sector lying between the northwest corner of the city and a point south of it, where an obviously former wall joined a newer one at the "Wall of the Square" or the Broad Wall, was also "abandoned" or "left out" of the restoration program. The area west of this wall, therefore, seems to be identical with the Mishneh, or Second City. It appears to be a safe conclusion that Neh 3: 8 refers to that sector of the city which formerly had been an integral part of Jerusalem and was now "abandoned" or "left out" of the restoration in 444. The city was thus again limited to the East Hill.

6. Archaeology apparently has established two additional facts: firstly, that the earliest line of wall connecting the points of the western and eastern ridges was not earlier than the Hellenistic period, and secondly, that the southern end of the Tyropoeon Valley dividing Ophel from the western ridge was not occupied until the Maccabean period. This seems to indicate that the maximalist theory which includes the Western Hill as an integral part of Jerusalem during the Jebusite or Israelite periods is no longer tenable.

7. The inspection, restoration, and procession texts, therefore, are not any longer to be interpreted according to theoretical concepts, but according to archaeological realities. These texts must be considered as describing Nehemiah's Jerusalem as limited to the East Hill.

FAITH AND EVIDENCE

EDWARD W. H. VICK
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

It is essential that two questions be clearly distinguished. How may I be certain that faith is directed toward the ultimate, as the religious man claims it to be? How may it be known that the propositions which are made in connection with that apprehension of faith are true? Unless the discussion takes into account clearly from the outset that two kinds of questions are here being asked, nothing but confusion can result. We must distinguish between the problem of what constitutes evidence for the reality of the religious awareness of God, and what for a theological statement describing or expounding this religious awareness. For both a knowledge-claim is made. The first claim is that knowledge of God is valid knowledge. The second claim is that propositions which express and interpret that knowledge are also valid. Only confusion will result if the distinction between these two questions is unclear. We must differentiate between a certain belief held within the circle of religious faith and that faith itself. What are the criteria by which we judge the certainty of these? The problem resolves itself into two aspects therefore, which may be expressed in the following two questions: How may I know that my religious apprehension, my apprehension of what I call God, is valid? How may I know that statements about the apprehension and its implications are true statements?

Why do such questions arise? As to the first, it may well be asked why if one is certain that his knowledge of God is valid, he should be concerned with showing that it is. There might be two reasons given for this, first, that one has doubt caused in the mind as to a preceding so-called "unshakeable" con-

viction, whose certainty then needs buttressing; or secondly, that one wishes to show that that claim to know God is not an irrational one, but on the contrary a most reasonable thing. The presence of doubt, the need to commend his assurance in face of that doubt, these are the pressures that lead to the quest for the establishment of the certainty.

Where is the ultimate certainty to be found? Where doubt is present we appeal from that which is less certain to that which is more certain, so hoping to ground that about which doubt has been aroused upon that about which there can be less doubt, or it is to be preferred, no doubt at all. If we are sure beyond doubt that *b* is true, and that being true, it has a direct relation (of some sort or other, which must indeed be made clear for the desired result) to *a*, which we have come to doubt, then we may be reassured in our knowledge of the truth of *a*. For our question concerning the validity of knowledge of God, the first of the two questions we differentiated at the outset, we may fill in the content of *a* and *b* more specifically. Let *a* be religious awareness, whose validity we have been led to doubt. Let *b* be the consistent explanations made on the basis of a valid religious awareness, explanations which have fruitful connections with scientific, moral, aesthetic experience. We may seek the reassurance of the religious awareness on the basis of the explanations made possible by taking that faith as a probable hypothesis, that is to say, as in doubt. So to seek reassurance of *b* we appeal from the less sure to the more sure. To establish the certainty of awareness of God, one can appeal to experience itself or one can appeal away from it to some other grounds, which are considered to be more certain than the knowledge given in experience itself. These alternatives exhaust the possibilities. Apart from them there remains skepticism. To that to which an appeal is made for the reassurance of the validity of religious awareness, our *b* above, we shall give the name "evidence." We appeal to evidence from that which is lesser known than the evidence, to the evidence which we consider better known than that from which we make the appeal.

Thus evidence is for the unconvinced or for the skeptical. Of what relevance is evidence if one is convinced already? If one does not know that watch-makers make watches one cannot argue to the existence of a watchmaker when one finds a watch upon the sands. If one does not know, the argument is not convincing (*pace* Paley). If one is convinced already, how can evidence be used? Evidence is employed to assist one to move from lesser to greater certainty; but what if one is already as certain as it is possible to be. Does an *a priori* certainty need *a posteriori* evidence? Is not the question contradictory?

It may be suggested at this stage that evidence is not for the reassurance of the believer who has come to doubt, but for the skeptic that he might come to faith, that he might be convinced by appeal to that which he has never known by talk about what someone else claims to know. But it may well be asked how one can convince another of the truth of experience by appealing to words about that experience, for words about experience can by no means be identified with that experience. The words of another about a conviction are not the same as being convinced myself. Words about God are by no means to be identified with knowing God. A transposition has taken place. What then of the evidential nature of such words, such transpositions of the "immediate utterances of experience"?

Let us attempt to set forth the various possibilities of approaching the problem of the truth-certainty of the knowledge of God. The alternatives are as follows: First, to demonstrate the existence and (at least some of) the attributes of God. Secondly, not to demonstrate but to give "evidence" or "evidences" for the existence and attributes of God, and the certainty of one's knowledge of God. We should not try to demonstrate the finality of the Christian awareness of God but rather (at the least) to show that it is not unreasonable or (at the most) show that it is highly probable. Thirdly, to affirm that the final reference point is not open to proof or

evidence of a kind analogous to empirical [1] evidence given in other instances of confirmation of knowledge (*e.g.*, in physical science), but that it carries its own authentication wrapped up within it. The knowledge of God is self-authenticating and does not require, indeed is not patent of, more than that it forbids us to make any attempt at authentication outside of the awareness. What authentication there is is *a priori* and not *a posteriori*. There may be a divergence as to the nature of the *a priori* certainty. It might be viewed as beyond doubt. It may be viewed as not having final and absolute certainty. The important point for our classification is that there can be no moving from lesser to greater certainty. Whether the certainty is final or not there is no more final certainty to be found concerning religious awareness than from within the context of that awareness. For those who would not claim absolute and final certainty would affirm that there can be no other, but insist that there is always the element of risk. One bets one's life there is a God and stays by the wager. Fourthly, then there is the skeptic. There is no demonstration, no evidence, no self-authentication. There is risk, and one had better make the best of it. But it is a risky dive into further meaninglessness. One cannot know, or claim to know that knowledge of God is either certain or probable.

One might add that to these various distinctions correspond different approaches to the task of theology, and definitions of the relationship between faith and reason. To the first corresponds the conception of the task of theology as to give proofs for the existence of God. Here theology and philosophy are one. To the second theology has the job of supplying "evidence" for its contentions. This evidence may be either compulsive, as it was intended by "Apologetics" or "Evidences," or corroborative of that which it points to, but which is known apart from the rational constructions of empirical evidence. Those who deny that it is possible to prove the reality of God or the certainty of faith, and who thus repudiate

[1] See n. 2 (on page 196).

the high rationalism which sought to demonstrate the existence and attributes of God, may indeed be attracted to seeking for "evidences" which may be set forth to commend the reality of that faith. The "prover" says: I can demonstrate the reality of that which was not demonstrated to me by reason. The "evidencer" says: I can commend on grounds other than those by which I was convinced the reality of that of which I am certain. Then there are those whose appeal is to the self-authentication of awareness of God. While the certainty of reason and logic are contrasted *toto caelo* with the certainty of knowledge of God, reason may be given a status both in preparing for religious awareness and in commending it, or it may be simply denied any appropriate place in the declaration of faith. To the fourth corresponds the reasoning of the radicals which is not really to be classified as theology at all.

To get at the heart of the matter we shall distinguish between experience and expression. When what is experienced is expressed in the logical forms of the linguistic medium a transposition takes place. A loss is sustained. Only confusion results from considering the expression as if it were the reality which it is expressing. It is possible that one may focus only upon the expression, and, finding all manner of logical pitfalls with it, be led to repudiate the reality which is being expressed thereby. If one overlooks the possibility that the experience might be the only and final court of appeal, the expression will have to be considered only on the basis of the canons of logic and rationality, that is to say in reference to what is other than that which it claims to describe. That is why the *a priori* restricting to empirical realities of statements purporting to refer to non-empirical realities is bound to misunderstand those non-empirical statements. A "protocol-statement" is a translation which may very well render the original unavailable.

Can we say anything meaningful about God to those for whom the meaningfulness of God is not already evident (to

use a pun)? To speak about the manner in which language is used is not necessarily identical with speaking about the reality apprehended in religious awareness. If such reality is unknown to the one who approaches the words, purportedly about it, they will either be strictly meaningless, or they will be made to point in another direction, that is to say the expression which is of experience *a* will be read in the light of experience *b*. Much that is of use to the theologian may come to light if this is done, but he will in the last analysis have to object to it as needlessly restrictive and refuse its limits upon his endeavors. He will have to say, "If that is all you think that I mean by what you interpret me to say, you will have misconstrued what I take the referent, the experienced reality, to be, or what I know the experience to mean."

The theologian does not use a language different from that which his fellows speak. He has no special language of his own. His usage may be different, but the language is not itself different. He employs the same kinds of constructions, indeed even the same words. So parallels may (and should) be drawn between the language. Parallels, some closer and some more remote, may be found to the usage of language by the religious. *But*, and this is the nub of the matter, parallels only indicate what is like, not what is unlike. To point to the analogies between ordinary language usage and the language usage of the religious man still leaves open the problem of the referent of the theologian's language, and its validity. Suppose we speak of discernment-commitment situations of which certain language is specially significant, shall we indeed have done anything more than to have indicated that "knowledge about" the situation is communicable in "I-It" terms? These I-It terms may be translated and made to refer to existential situations which cannot be identified with the one most important situation they originally purported to describe. Why should talk, for example, about "cosmic disclosure" be readily identified with talk about God? The "evidence" which is here presented is a particular kind of talk about particular

kinds of situations. These situation-responses are then made analogous to responses to what is the unique situation of the disclosure of God. In the name of empirical reference meaningfulness has been found which does not lead to further knowledge of the referent of such language usage. This referent still remains hidden. As symbolic language pointing to the ultimate, at least for him who is certain of the "encounter" with what stands ultimately over against him—God—, will not such language be bound to be misconstrued as pointing to something more proximate, and its usage as a consequence be only partially understood, analogically understood? When a symbol (*e.g.*, spirit), is claimed to be drawn from an immediate, self-authenticating awareness of God, and is explained in terms of some reality or discernment-situation other than the one from which it rose (and by definition all else is other), will not its intended significance, when made to point to what is other than God, be quite effectually devaluated in the process of commending itself? The appeal to the evidential value of the symbol is in terms of a particular kind of human experience, "empirical" if you will, which particular kind of human experience is made analogous, for the purpose of getting the benefit of analogous predication, with the experience of the ultimate. The appeal is as follows: you know that a discernment-situation is spoken of meaningfully in rather plain terms in the usage of language; experience of God is a discernment-situation, the language which is used to describe it is meaningfully used. Thus it cannot be said that religious language is meaningless since it has such clear parallels in language which describes experiences which no one denies. The suggestion is tacitly made that meaningful religious language may indeed point to truth.

A symbol has meaning in terms of experience, the limits of which set bounds to the meaningfulness of symbolism. So in a "desacralized cosmos" many once-potent symbols have lost their power to point. The limits of experience set limits to meaningful usage of language. That is why in the discussion

of the meaning of the term "God" nothing can be assumed at the outset. If we start with the proposition "let God be x," we then wait to see how, in the particular discussion, the unknown gets filled with meaning. For x could be given meanings p, q, or r, as the experience of the individual was interpreted in a particular way, and its significance presented in the light of that experience. (In Kant, for example, the symbol x, a postulate, stands in the first critique and the second for two realities. Starting with a particular interpretation of *e.g.*, rational experience, that is scientific reason, the term "God" is given different connotation from that which it is given when the experience is that of moral awareness.) We have seriously to reckon with the fact that the term "God" is nothing more than a *flatus vocis* for many of our contemporaries. The symbols by which the theist points may have different kinds of meaning for the non-believer. The latter may make something of them but that may not be what was intended. The believer may communciate with fellow-believer through the use of symbols. The process is one of "indirect communication" since both of them know the reality to which the symbols employed point. Thus a meeting-point is provided by the use of symbols pointing to the same reality, and thus making possible a community between two persons who both know that reality. The difference between the believer and the non-believer is that the former has at least one more connotation of the term "God" than the latter. Thus the symbol "God," if it is at all meaningful, will indicate a reality which is known. The believer has many uses of the term "God" in his vocabulary, many of which may overlap with those of the non-believer. He has one however which does not overlap at all. The meaning of that symbol "God" can only be known as the reality to which it points is disclosed. Otherwise it remains empty.

Since the theist claims that the reality "God" whom he says he knows is a living reality (the analogy of life being another difficult one to add to the arsenal), he is aware that in the usage of his pointers, his symbols, he cannot achieve a direct

communication. Moreover the theist says that his symbols serve to indicate a reality that may make itself present through them. In this sense words become "Word." Within the context of "Word," such employment of symbols will then make a community of fellowship possible, not on the level of intellectual understanding of the language involved (for that may well be very paradoxical employment), but rather in pointing back to the reference which both parties know from the *a priori* awareness of which we have spoken. Genuine symbols are thus bonds of union between those who together participate in the meaningfulness to which they point.

To appeal to "evidence" for the meaningfulness of one's expressions one hopes that such an appeal will make more plausible the claim that God who is known is the reality He is known to be. Our language is meaningful; we give evidence to show that it is; the evidence turns out to be based upon analogies, which evidential appeal evidently assumes the validity of analogical predication. We have shown, we believe, that the claim that our language is meaningful is not the same as the claim that we know God. Moreover, the claim that religious language is meaningful is based upon canons of meaning which may be appropriate in certain realms of discourse but not in others.

It is to be clearly understood that the basis for the employment of analogy is in the fact that something has been experienced. The procedure of analogical predication cannot be employed to establish that basis. It is assumed. Thus the desire for an empirical reference point for the *grounding* of religious awareness is a misplaced one. The ground is given, the reference point for theological discussion is given. Talk about, reasoning about, the significance of religious awareness is incomprehensible apart from the givenness of that awareness. Awareness is *a priori*. Language, "evidence" is *a posteriori*. It is obviously impossible to ground the validity of religious awareness in what is *a posteriori* to it.

We have intimations that our certainties of ordinary life

are not misplaced on the basis of "evidence" and we then attempt to speak univocally of evidence as relevant to our awareness of God and transcendent realities (*i.e.*, realities which transcend ordinary experience). We may say, for example, that the love of a friend which is in doubt may be checked by his faithfulness in communicating to us, even when it is difficult for him to do so, that such communication will be in accord with our particular circumstances and needs. He will not communicate pity when there has been a manifestation of what we thought was courage. He will not be silent when there is genuine need. This is the way in which "evidence" is brought to bear on the problem of the friend's faithfulness. The analogy then runs: If God loves you, there will be similar things to which you can appeal as evidence. The crux of the problem is whether we seek for evidence of that of which there is uncertainty, or whether we point to the certainty which we know by the examples which we set forth. If the former, then we must be prepared to defend the employment of the analogical usage of the idea of evidence in connection with religious awareness. To make a one-to-one co-ordination between awareness of that to which evidence is applicable in empirical experience, and awareness of what we may call God is, to say the least, a procedure which calls for justification by the one who makes it. It rests upon the failure to recognize that such empirical appeal—to "evidence"—is analogical, not univocal. It may indeed be equivocal. The problem to be faced is whether the term "evidence," "appeal to empirical reference," when used within the religious frame of reference, is in any sense analogical. This is the least that must be done by those who employ this kind of approach to the problem of religious certainty.

A point of contact between those who appeal to evidence in the manner of the scientific method to establish religious certainty and those who say religious certainty is *a priori* may be said to be found in the fact that in both cases, whether *a priori* or *a posteriori*, the certainty is experienced. For indeed

in the appeal to scientific evidence one has to "see" that the evidence *is* evidence and therefore able to produce certainty: that is to say, there is at some point an appeal to an intuitive grasp of the situation. This indeed may be admitted but it does not touch our basic contention that in the case of the theist this "grasp," his intuitive certainty, precedes any such attempt to commend it; it is *a priori*, whereas the intuitive grasp in scientific procedure is a means to bring the inquirer (who is in doubt as to the outcome) to a certainty not presupposed and otherwise unobtainable.

The appeal to immediacy is used in quite a different context in the two cases and thus no real analogy exists between them. Moreover the theist in appealing to experience from initial certainty (prior experience) is not seeking for confirmation or discomfirmation but rather for a way of expressing, perhaps commending, that which he knows as certain from the outset.

Is not the fact that one appeals to evidence already an admission that the reality for which evidence is sought is less certainly known than that evidence which is called in to help out that lack of certainty? Evidence is required for that of which we are in doubt. To speak of presenting evidence as the resting place for our faith, or as the means by which another may come to faith, is to point away from that which is the object of faith.

It may be said that there is an ambiguity in the usage of the term "evidence," that the expression is employed of commendation where there is no doubt on the part of the one who makes it. That this is a possible usage of the term we would not wish to dispute. All we are concerned to point out is that evidence is directed against somebody's doubt, and is only to be understood against a background of antecedent or concomitant doubt. Thus if the subject is in doubt concerning the validity of an hypothesis or of an experience, he will seek to confirm himself in assurance of its truth by seeking for evidence. He may not be in doubt, but have to confront the doubt of

another. This he may seek to do by appealing to "evidence." We have been contending that the procedure is misdirected, that it is at best an appeal from religious awareness to what is transposed from it. If it is the other who is in doubt, there may be a similar appealing to evidence in the attempt to share the truth-certainty of the awareness which the subject has known. But appeal to evidence is in either case a substitute for the reality, and can never produce the desired certainty.

It is a well-known, and well-worn problem of logic and of law, to determine what constitutes evidence for a particular claim. How may the decision be made as to what constitutes evidence in any particular instance? In the nature of the case it has to be seen that the evidence is relevant to, very relevant to, indeed of utmost relevance to, that for which it purports to be evidence. At some point there must be an appeal away from the co-ordination of what is said to be evidence and that-for-which-evidence-is-evidence to the insight, the intuition, that this is so, that it is actually "evidence." One sees this or one does not. Appeal is made to an intuition which may not be further questioned. One cannot after all keep on continuously appealing to the reliability of evidence without the process going on *ad infinitum*, and thus opening up an infinite regress. There must be a stopping point for which no evidence can be given that evidence is relevant. To contend that *b* and *c* constitute evidence for *a* is to affirm *a priori* that a relationship exists between them, a relationship of a particular kind, a relationship moreover which is set into sharper relief by the "evidence" now forthcoming. How does one know that? Not by a process of appealing to further evidence but by appealing away from further evidence, that is on the basis of an insight that it is so.

We have contended that the desire for an empirical reference point to provide us with religious certainty is misplaced. The best that evidence can establish is the high probability of a certain fact. The piling up of evidence, relevant to the particu-

lar matter to be proved, can at best bring one to a high degree of probability but this never quite reaches certainty. Even if the certainty is virtual it is never real. The Christian has never been content with a probable God, even if the probability be extremely high. At least one must recognize that the implication of appealing to evidence is that the *a priori* certainty is insufficient, and the appeal is thus a parley with skepticism.

If one construes the truths of religion as parallel to the truths of science it is not only natural but inevitable that empirical reference be essayed. Since, by a process of appeal to evidence provided by test situations which he arranges as best he knows, or by active observation, the scientist appears to validate his assumptions about the structure of things, there should be some parallel kind of validation for the claims which the theologian makes about reality. So runs the argument, but there is a most important distinction between the approaches of the scientist and the theologian. The former starts with initial uncertainty about certain aspects of reality, even if he shelves his uncertainty with a brash hypothesis that it must be of a certain kind and viewed in a certain way. Within the context of a reality assumed to be of a particular kind, *e.g.*, as described by Newton or by Einstein, he then proposes hypotheses which, within the kind of reality assumed, can be checked, and so validated or invalidated by appeal to empirical evidence. The question for which the scientist assumes the answer is that the cosmos is structured in a certain way. Within the limits of this assumption he then sets forth his hypotheses to be proved or disproved according to what he reckons as evidence for them.

Now the question upon which the theologian focuses is that of the reality of God. He does not assume this, but knows it. He does not set it forth as an hypothesis to be confirmed by the finding of evidence. Rather he explicates what he knows to be certain. In this his view of reason is opposed to that of the scientist. He does not set forth with the conjecture that it is the ultimate reality that he has known, and then seek a

confirmation of this. Rather he knows and then moves to make whatever explanations he does about the rest of reality on the basis of his certainty. Now it is important to distinguish between the two levels of which we have previously spoken. When he speaks *about* his religious awareness, the transposition which has taken place from immediate awareness to speech involves that his certainty be expressed in two ways: direct witness, "the immediate utterances of faith," and argumentative exposition. It is in the latter that the immediate certainty of faith becomes transposed into the suggestiveness and probabilities of reasoning. The theologian's aim is to transfer, to the best of his ability, to the rational level the certainty which he has known on the experiential level. If he is asked for "evidence" it is in reference to that which he knows, not with a high degree of probability, but of which he is certain. It is obvious that he will be asked for evidence of what he knows by one who doubts the validity of his knowledge. The "evidence" which the theologian may be called to give, and which certain of his brood are willing to supply, is for the purpose of commending the certainty which he knows in face of questions which are raised. That is why there was a department of theology once called "Evidences." "Evidences" served in the minds of those who employed it to corroborate what was known, and then to commend that knowledge and its object in face of criticism and doubt.

What then is to be the theologian's response when he is called to validate the context within which his claims are being made? The evidence of the scientist is gathered for the discovery and establishment of facts within a particular context which he has assumed. The validity of assuming that context is left unquestioned by the scientist *qua* scientist. Philosophy of science, in part, concerns itself with the examination of the scientist's assumptions. But philosophy is not science. When revolutions take place within the realm of science a new conceiving of the context may become necessary. Thus Copernicus replaces Ptolemy, and Einstein replaces

Newton. For the sake of his researches, the working scientist assumes that the universe is structured in such a way that his methods of discovery are appropriate. This he does not further question. The application of his method assumes its applicability within this context. This assumption of its applicability involves an acceptance of the structure without its being further examined. Where such an examination is conducted in the interest of science, it is made by the philosopher of science, who is driven from data discovered within a theory of the structure assumed as valid to a re-assessment of the adequacy of that theory. The scientist *qua* scientist is not primarily concerned about structure. The theologian is. Now the scientist, in the voice of certain scientistic philosophers, asks the theologian to provide evidence analogous to, or univocal with his own, when the objects of concern are quite different. It is obvious that "evidence," even when it is allowed by certain theologians, must have quite a different meaning in the theological vocabulary from that usage given it by the empirical analyst of language or the scientist. What we have called into question is the procedure on the part of the theologian of appealing to such evidence in the attempt to make more certain that than which nothing can be more certain. Anselm's critics tried to supplement his approach by appealing to such evidence. Thomas, while assuming the ontological argument, began with the "evidence" of the senses and moved from this to a "proof" of the reality of a certain kind of God. That the procedure of appealing to empirical foundations or evidence for faith is for the theologian a barren one when evidence is construed in terms of sense perception has become obvious from the discussions with the logical positivists. Their restrictive criterion for the usage of reason made it obvious that the theologian had to assert that the approach was quite inadequate to permit him to say what he had to say about God.

When asked for evidence to verify in empirical terms the claim that "God loves us as a Father loves his children," the

theist is driven to qualify the meaning of the terms as they are used in ordinary parlance. Then they continue to be qualified so that their usage becomes so different from its ordinary employment that the assertion is reduced from its original brashness to meaninglessness *in terms of empirical canons.*[2] If an assertion is either false or true, it should be possible to cite empirical evidence for or against it: if not for it then at least against it. But a statement which cannot be verified by empirical means cannot be so falsified either. So ran the argument. The logical positivists showed us the uniqueness of theological statements, as well as their own needlessly restrictive definition of reason. Their queries point up the assertion made previously that the call for evidence is a skeptical one. It demands that we establish with greater certainty that which is at present of lesser certainty or quite in doubt. While this may be necessary for the scientist who does not know at the outset whether his conjectured hypotheses are even plausible until he tests them in an empirical situation, it is quite unnecessary for the theologian whose

[2] The term "empirical" is a most misleading one. Basically it means "having reference to experience." So in defining it, one introduces another term, which because of the variety of reference it may have, needs itself defining with greater specificity to be at all useful. In a sense all our knowledge is empirical since it is we who have it, and it is thus within the limits of our experience. This gets us only to the place where we must deny an exaggerated objectivism, which is in fact self-contradictory in any case. In the particular instance of this text it means "having reference to sense-experience," which reference can act as confirmation, its possible absence as disconfirmation. The term "empirical" is used theologically of those writers whose methodological procedure requires an appeal to "experience" as opposed for example to reason, or authority (viewed in some objectivistic manner), as the means for theistic discussion. The attempt is made to isolate, analyze, describe that particular religious dimension of experience, and then to draw out its implications for discussion of God. Appeal to reason, or to authority are not uniquely religious, even if they are "experiences." Theological empiricism is the appeal to the known and unique reality of faith. Since "evidence" relates to "experience" the definition of "experience," that is of the "empirical," will determine what kind of "evidence" is admitted as valid, whether the appeal will be made to it, or from it.

certainty at the outset in his relationship with God is unquestioned. To read one discipline in the light of the other and to dictate the procedures of theological endeavor on the basis of scientific methodology is unwarranted and misleading.

It should be clear that our case is directed against a particular construing of the meaning of "evidence." If we seek an analogy for the appeal of the theist we may find it in that type of "evidence" which the witness is called to give in a law-court. This "evidence" concerns that which has been immediately experienced by him. Anything other than this is ruled out as out of order. He may only speak that which he has known by having immediately experienced it. What he has known must of necessity have antecedence and priority to that which he speaks.

This does not mean that we deny reason a place in the theological enterprise. It is not a matter of "either proof or silence." One may point rather than prove. To the mysteries of Christian faith it is very often a most complicated procedure to point. But the pointing, while it may be very direct and compulsive, does not provide the same compulsiveness as that of proof, or the appeal to "evidence." The pointing can be said to be compulsive only after the reality to which it points has become known. The term "compulsiveness" points to the experience of the empiricist who, even if he does not incline at the outset to the conjecture proposed, may indeed have to bow to the "facts" which come to light in the process of investigation. The initial uncertainty is overcome. The theist's certainty is *a priori*. The scientist's certainty is *a posteriori*. So the theist's talk about religious awareness can only indicate the direction in which to look, and the places where not to look. The theist's talk is explication, not experimentation. It is report about what is known, not report about what is coming to be known.

The term "evidence" is rejected in the sense used hitherto. There is, nevertheless, a way in which it has obviously impor-

tant currency in English and in which it may be fruitfully employed of religious knowledge. If we say that religious knowledge is "self-evident," we indicate an appeal to evidence, but in this case the evidence is internal to the apprehending self, as that self is in relation to the ground which is apart from and stands over against it. It is the self-evidence of knowing that one is in relationship to the not-self. The analogy has shifted from that of establishing of probable conclusions about a conjecture on the basis of the empirically verifiable evidence, rather to that of the speaking of the response of person to person. This kind of "knowing" is what is presented in the Scriptural account of certainty of God. The shift is a vital one, the knowledge less easy to manipulate, the theological task to be quite differently construed in consequence. The claim is made that to construe worthy knowledge only in terms of the empirical method is needlessly to restrict it. Religious knowledge is more like the knowledge that trust in another person makes available than the knowledge that comes from an empirical process. What has here been said about the *a priori* nature of the religious awareness, is differently expounded in the various theological traditions. But our formula "from initial certainty, through a process of transposition, to rational explication" [3] could serve as a definition of theology which might be applied to different schools of theology, *e.g.*, the mystical tradition, the Thomist way, liberals, Barth. In each of these cases there is an initial immediacy of awareness (defined differently indeed), and

[3] Since the form in which we have been expounding theistic certainty in this paper has been philosophical, the question may well be raised as to what can guarantee the certainty of the knowledge here treated against subjectivity. This article has had the limited purpose of setting forth the religious certainty of the theist as a given in relation to its subsequent elaborations. Thus we have not examined the means by which this certainty comes to be. In discussing this latter we would have to raise and address ourselves to the problem of the relation between rational, historical, and experiential certainty. We would then find ourselves in the midst of a discussion of the relationship between faith and history.

following this the explication in rational terms of that awareness. [4]

[4] In this description of the process by which theological statements come to be made ("from initial certainty, through a process of transposition, to rational explication" p. 198), as in the article as a whole, it has not been our concern to discuss the important issue of the historical source of the revelation which, for the Christian theist, constitutes the point of departure. It may suffice to point out that when a reality is manifested through history, that is through happening, we must give attention to all the relevant questions that may be raised relative to historical knowledge and historical evidence, after having shown that such considerations are relevant to the kind of knowledge which we have here expounded. The methods of the historian can take us only so far—to the having-happenedness of certain things. The question that must further be raised is "What is disclosed through such having-happenedness?" The Christian answer to this question has been a trinitarian one. What was disclosed then and there in the first century of our era, is continuous, indeed in unity with, what is disclosed here and now in the experience of the believer. To stress this continuity between past and present, history that took place and history that takes place, is what is intended by a doctrine of the Spirit. One can only see the inner side of the event established by historical methods (*e.g.*, the death on the Cross) as the reality disclosed there ("God was in Christ") is now manifest and whose manifestation produces the certainty of which we have been speaking. This certainty is thus tied to historical event. While knowledge of the Crucifixion of Jesus is not identical with faith in the Christ who was crucified—indeed pagan historians chronicled the crucifixion—there must be no dichotomy between the two kinds of knowledge. That certain things happened was in fact confessed from the outset of the church's history as integral to faith and to the witness to faith. The decision of faith did not take place in a vacuum but within the context of an historical frame of reference. It still does.

BOOK REVIEWS

Davies, J. G., *The Early Christian Church.* "Holt History of Religion Series." New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965. xiii + 314 pp. + 24 pp. of plates. $ 8.50.

This work is an historical treatment of the Christian church in the first five centuries. After the first two chapters, which treat "The Origins of Christianity" and "The Apostolic Age," each chapter covers approximately a century; and all the chapters, except the first, are subdivided topically into six main sections: background or environment, sources, expansion and development (including church organization), beliefs, worship, and social life. From one point of view this organization tends to fragmentize the discussion, but finds adequate compensation in that the reader can, as the author points out, "follow each section throughout" and thus have "a miniature history of the Roman empire and of the general background of the Church's growth . . . an abbreviated patrology, a consecutive account of the missionary endeavour and of internal progress and struggles; a history of Christian doctrine and of worship, and finally a short social history" (p. xii).

For a book no longer than this, the field has been surprisingly well covered. No vital item appears to have been overlooked, but in a few places we might have wished for further elaboration. On pp. 31, 32, *e.g.*, in the subsection on "The Philosophical Schools," there is no treatment of Platonic philosophy (rather the statement is made that "neither the Academic or Platonic nor the Peripatetic or Aristotelian were much in vogue in the first century AD"), and Stoicism is dismissed with only the most cursory and generalized treatment. This is so in spite of the fact that these philosophies (as well as others not treated) furnish background not only for heresies with which the early church had to contend but also for the shaping of some of the communicative terminology (and even to some degree the thought) of various church fathers.

Again, in regard to such matters as dating Polycarp's epistle (p. 80) and the *Shepherd* of Hermas (p. 81), a further sentence or two of explanation might have been helpful. In stating that Polycarp's "*Epistle to the Philippians* probably consists of two letters," might it not have been well to have referred the reader to P. N. Harrison for details concerning this thesis and at the same time to have indicated that the view has not been universally accepted? And although the reviewer himself agrees with the author in dating the earlier portions of Hermas' *Shepherd* to the late first century and the later portions to the episcopate of Pius, he wonders if the reader should not have been alerted to the problems involved in use of the Muratorian fragment for establishing the closing terminus, and also whether the reader should

not have been informed of the basis for determining the beginning terminus.

Occasionally interpretations set forth and the way in which source materials are used may raise doubts, as *e.g.*, on pp. 61, 62, in the discussion of worship in the Apostolic Age. In a subsection dealing with the Eucharist, and after mention of the *agape*, the statement is made that "in addition to the consumption of food, there is evidence that a homily was delivered, that letters from leading Christians were read, that a collection was taken for charitable purposes, and that the worshippers exchanged a kiss of peace as a sign of their solidarity." The sources cited for various of these items (such as Acts 20 : 7; Col 4 : 16; and 1 Cor 16 : 2) are so random as to raise question as to their adequacy for the purpose served. In fact, one reference (1 Cor 16 : 2) does not even appear to refer to a public gathering. The further comment that "the meetings took place at night and, although it is impossible to determine their frequency in the earliest days, it soon became the practice to hold them once a week, early on Sunday morning, i.e. on the Lord's Day" is not sufficiently documented and ignores, as well, the work of C. W. Dugmore and other scholars whose investigations might lead one to suspect that the early Sunday morning services were Easter celebrations. Whether the quotation from *I Clement*, on p. 92, is properly used as evidence of attitude regarding monepiscopacy is also open to question.

In general, however, the author has made careful use of his sources, and the fact that he has usually provided rather thorough documentation is most helpful. The seventeen two-column pages of notes (pp. 281-97) citing the early sources are a valuable tool and provide the key to a virtual storehouse of information on the topics treated.

Unfortunately, the book evidences certain elements of inconsistency and error in the presentation of chronological items. On p. 76, *e.g.*, we are informed that "Pliny [the Younger] arrived in Bithynia on 17th September, 111," but on p. 7 we read that he was "governor of Bithynia in 110." The date "110" is also given on p. 39. If "110" were to be used at all, should it not have been "*c.* 110"? But perhaps "*c.* 111" or "*c.* 112" would have been better still. Again, on p. 80 we read that "Polycarp visited Rome to confer with bishop Anicetus, *c.* 154," whereas on p. 91 we discover that "in 155 Polycarp discussed the matter in Rome with Anicetus." Even if the "154" were a misprint (the context does not seem to indicate so), one would still wonder why the "*c.*" was used in one place and not the other. The question of the date of Anicetus is further complicated, however, in that in reading this book one would assume that a chronology is used which places Anicetus' accession in 154 or 155, whereas on p. 81 the dates given for Anicetus' immediate predecessor Pius are "*c.* 140-50" (Pius actually reigned for about 15 years). Another chronological item which may be questioned is the statement on p. 73 that "Valentinus stayed for some ten years in Rome (160-170)." Is there not evidence (*e.g.*, Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 4.3) that he actually arrived there some two decades

earlier? And in any event, would not an item of this type have been an appropriate place for the use of the "*c.*"?

Admittedly, many dates in early church history cannot be determined precisely, but care should be taken to present chronological information as accurately as possible and with the use of a fairly consistent style. Otherwise the reader may become confused.

On the whole, however, this volume affords an excellent introduction to early church history and is basically reliable and authoritative. Criticisms such as those above do not detract significantly from its real value. An excellent bibliography and the section of plates enhance its worth still further.

Andrews University KENNETH A. STRAND

Froom, LeRoy Edwin, *The Conditionalist Faith of Our Fathers: The Conflict of the Ages Over the Nature and Destiny of Man.* Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald, 1966. Vol. I, 1132 pp. $ 15.00.

The second volume of this work, which appeared in 1965, was reviewed in *AUSS*, IV (July, 1966), 193-200. The present volume carries the subtitle, "The Biblical Norm and the Origin, Development, and Penetration of Innate Immortality (900 B.C. to A.D. 500)."

The first part of the book is devoted to the Old Testament (pp. 29-180): the creation of man; the fall of man, with death as punishment; the plan of redemption (brilliantly set forth); and an examir ation of Biblical terms which exclude the idea of innate immortality. The second part (pp. 183-519) produces the testimony of Jesus, sets forth the teaching of Paul and the other apostles, discusses controversial passages, and analyzes those terms which serve to designate the soul and the spirit, the Greek words translated "eternal," "immortal," "incorruptible," etc. The third part (pp. 529-754) traces the origin of the idea of natural immortality in Greece. The weakest sections here, in my view, are those concerned with the infiltration of Hellenic thought into post-exilic Judaism. The fourth part (pp. 757-1079) shows how the Biblical doctrine of conditional immortality struggled against the invasion of philosophical ideas until about A.D. 500, finally succumbing temporarily to ideas of pagan origin. The volume includes two interesting appendices (pp. 1081-1086), one on the relation between late Jewish literature and the early Christian Fathers and the other on Irenaeus' teaching on the immortality of the soul. The work is equipped with a knowledgeable bibliography and a useful index. Seven charts prepared with great care make it possible for the reader to follow the vicissitudes of the truth concerning the nature of man across the centuries.

While one cannot but admire the erudition and the tone of conviction with which Froom writes, several questions have arisen in the mind of this reviewer. Recognizing that a Latin, such as the present writer is,

may not be entirely qualified to judge the work of an Anglo-Saxon in certain respects, it nevertheless appears that the tone of the preacher which one senses in this volume hardly fits a work of its nature, although this may be more in harmony with American taste than with ours. As we have already remarked in regard to Volume II, artistic reproductions hardly have a place in a work of this kind. One finds in the imagery of these paintings, often of doubtful taste, and above all in the pictures of Christ spread profusely throughout the volume, something that is shocking.

The dead are mentioned as going to a *place*: "the unseen secret resting place of all the dead" (p. 162); the "place of death" (p. 164); "the silent, invisible place to which God told sinful Adam he must go" (p. 165). Why then say, "the condition of death or the death-state" (p. 162), "the place or state of death" (p. 164)? Some distinction should be made between a *place* and a *state*.

"Cut off": Does this mean excommunicated (p. 174), or put to death (p. 176)?

In a number of places (pp. 193-196, 198, 199, 240, 242, etc.), the Pharisees contemporary with Jesus are accused of having adopted the Platonic idea of the natural immortality of the soul. For example, "Nicodemus, the Pharisee, held to innate immortality" (p. 193); "the Pharisees had come to hold the philosophical doctrine of the natural immortality of the natural life of man" (p. 196). Froom (pp. 257, 258) cites a passage from Josephus (*Ant.*, xviii.1.3) in which that historian, who himself was a Pharisee, attributes this doctrine to the Pharisees. He could also have cited a passage in *B.J.*, ii.8.14, where the same author has the Pharisees teach that all souls are imperishable.

Is not this testimony of Josephus suspect? Although more than one theologian, including Edward White, have been misled by it, Jean Rivière accuses Josephus of failing to resist the temptation of modernizing Essene doctrines as well as those of the Pharisees (*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, VIII, col. 1749). According to John Louis Narbel, Josephus' presentation must be viewed as "a way of providing intelligibility for his readers, who were strangers to the idea of the resurrection of the body" (*Étude sur le parti pharisien* [Lausanne, 1891], pp. 226, 227). Fernand Roux declares: "According to the historian Josephus, the Pharisees are supposed to have professed the immortality of the soul. This affirmation has been recognized as false: the favorite dogma of this party was their belief in the resurrection of the dead" (*Essai sur la vie après la mort chez les Israélites* [Geneva, 1904], p. 126). Emmanuel Petavel-Olliff says: "Traditional orthodoxy has been in the habit of seeing in the Pharisees the partisans of native and inalienable immortality of the human soul. This is going a little far. In fact, this doctrine never was at home in Jerusalem. The Pharisees . . . did not hold to the separate immortality of the soul, but as the evangelist Luke tells us, to the resurrection of the body (Acts 23 : 6-8; cf. 26 : 5-8)" (*Le problème de l'immortalité*, I [1891], 122).

It is true that IV Maccabees, cited by Froom (p. 257), replaces the

resurrection with the immortality of the soul, but this is an isolated case even in the Alexandrian-Jewish literature. The unknown author of the apocryphal Book of Wisdom borrows the idea of the pre-existence of the soul from Greek philosophy. Logically he should have arrived, as Plato did, at the essential immortality of the soul. But no, he is still too much a Jew for that. He maintains that immortality is the reward of the righteous, and he teaches the annihilation of the wicked. The Book of Baruch holds the Biblical doctrine of the resurrection. According to IV Ezra, only the righteous will enjoy immortality. Although under the influence of Greek philosophy Philo totally ignored the resurrection, he did not succeed in freeing himself completely from the beliefs of the people of Israel. He always speaks of the immortality of the righteous only and believes in the annihilation of the wicked.

Is it certain that ἀναλῦσαι ("depart") in Php 1 : 23 refers to the translation of believers who remain alive until the return of Christ as Froom supposes (pp. 364-366)? Paul obviously hoped to have part in this privilege but could he, who had looked forward to a long delay before the Parousia (2 Th 2 : 1-4) still delude himself at the time when he wrote to the Philippian Christians? Is it not better to think of the ἀναλῦσαι of 2 Ti 4 : 6, where Paul announces his imminent death?

Is it possible to class the author of the letter to Diognetus among the partisans of conditionalism, as Froom does (pp. 796-801)? In chap. 6 we read, "The immortal soul inhabits a mortal tabernacle" (*MPG*, II, cols. 1175, 1176). Edmond de Pressensé says of this letter, "It admits explicitly the essential rapport of the human soul with God" (*La grande lutte du Christianisme contre le paganisme* [Paris, 1861], II, 410). Petavel-Ollif declares, "In this epistle we find the first mention of an immortal soul" (*op. cit.*, II [1892], 57, n. 5).

Having noted the above, one can declare all the more freely that the monumental work of Froom offers us the elements of a history of conditionalism set forth with consummate art and mastery. No other work can rival this. It will always prove a valuable help to those who are interested in this subject.

Séminaire Adventiste du Salève ALFRED-FÉLIX VAUCHER
Collonges-sous-Salève (Haute-Savoie), France

Hämmerly Dupuy, Daniel, *Arqueología Bíblica Paleotestamentaria desde Moisés hasta Saúl.* Tomo I: *Épocas de Moisés y de Josué*; Tomo II: *Época de los Jueces.* Lima, Peru: Departamento de Publicaciones del Colegio Union, [1966]. 550 pp., illus., maps, indices; mimeographed and paperbound.

Professor Hämmerly Dupuy has brought out in bound mimeographed form his lectures on Biblical archaeology given at Colegio Union during two recent school years. In his customary thorough manner he

has dealt with the problems by bringing together all possible data from the fields of ancient history, geography, archaeology, and the Biblical records, in order to reach his conclusions, though naturally not all these data can be presented in this work. While some scholars would disagree with some of his conclusions, his methodology is sound and his arguments should not be overlooked, for he has reasoned his way carefully, taking into consideration all the pertinent data. Where his views differ from those of others in the field, he marshals cogent arguments to support his conclusions.

The author was born in Switzerland but has lived in various countries of South America, in some of which he has carried on archaeological investigations. He has had opportunities to travel extensively throughout the lands of the Near East as well as in many other parts of the world, and was able, because of his previous geographical and ethnological studies, to gain more than most visitors from such travels. He has presented lecture series in universities in Chile, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, Panama, Venezuela, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Argentina; is a member of national and international learned societies; and has published a number of works on historical geography, anthropology, ancient history, archaeology, and related fields.

In the first part of Vol. I, "Biblical Archaeology of the Period of Moses," there are three chapters: "Moses, Monotheism and Egyptian Polytheism," "The Historical Moment of Israel's Exodus," and "The Route of the Exodus of the People of Israel." The second part, "Biblical Archaeology of the Period of Joshua," contains four chapters: "The Fall of the City of Jericho," "Joshua's Campaigns and the Burning of Hazor," "The Division of the Land of Canaan according to the El-Amarna Letters" (with Appendix A presenting a translation into Spanish of selected Amarna letters), and "The Religion of the Canaanites according to Archaeological Discoveries." The third part, which is in Vol. II (with consecutive pagination from Vol. I), is entitled "Biblical Archaeology of the Period of the Judges" and contains the following six chapters: "The Culture in Canaan during the Period of the Judges," "The Contribution of Ras Shamra to Biblical Archaeology," "The Control of Palestine in the Period of the Judges," "The Oppressors of Israel from Othniel to Gideon" (with Appendix B, "Typological and Chronological Classification of the Anthropomorphic Sarcophagi of Philistine Style"), "The Invasion of the Philistines and the Ammonite Oppression" (with Appendix C, "The Consequences of the Invasion by the Sea Peoples in the Period of the Judges"), and the final chapter, XIII, "The Conflicts between Israel and Philistia from Samson to Saul." Three to five sections, with further subheadings and subsections, comprise each chapter; the bibliographical notes for each chapter follow it immediately.

There are indices of maps and plans, of illustrations, of abbreviations and sigla, and a general index, as well as a list of errata for each volume. The maps and illustrations, though mimeographed, are of surprising

excellence and clarity. It is to be hoped that in a second edition technical faults of typography and reproduction, of which the author is already painfully aware, may be corrected, preferably by bringing out a printed edition. The work deserves wider circulation than usage as a college textbook in Spanish-speaking lands.

Andrews University LEONA G. RUNNING

Johns, Alger F., *A Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic.* "Andrews University Monographs," Vol. 1. Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 1966. xii + 108 pp. $ 5.95.

This well-constructed grammar presents Biblical Aramaic (BA) concisely to seminary students who already have some foundation in Biblical Hebrew (BH). Comparisons are frequently drawn between the two, and many topics need little elucidation because they are the same or very similar in the two languages. Until recently there was no English-language grammar of Aramaic available; the development of this book was long under way before the appearance of another Aramaic grammar in English, and the approach used here is not the same, being basically that of the "Baltimore school." The author is concerned strictly with BA; other Aramaic studies might modify what is found in the Masoretic text.

After a four-page introduction placing BA in its Semitic family setting and briefly discussing the alphabet, script, tone, and vocabulary, with a list of words identical in BH and BA, Lesson I takes up phonology from the historical and comparative-Semitic points of view. Lesson II presents nouns and adjectives; III, personal pronouns and suffixes on nouns; IV, other pronouns; V, the verbal system and specifically the perfect; VI, the imperfect, infinitive, etc.; VII, classes of nouns; VIII, the derived active conjugations; IX, the passive and reflexive conjugations; X, laryngeal verbs; XI to XV, the various classes of weak verbs; XVI and XVII, verbal suffixes with the perfect and with the imperfect, infinitive, etc.; XVIII, noun types; XIX, similar noun classes; and the last lesson, XX, numerals.

Each lesson contains the grammar presentation, followed by a vocabulary list in alphabetic order, with nouns labeled by their class as presented in Lesson VII; and then a few sentences are given for translation, made up largely from phrases drawn from Ezra and Daniel, simplified where necessary. Beginning with Lesson XII, in addition to the sentences to be translated the student is directed to translate two verses from Ezr 4 : 8 ff. From Lesson XVI on, Biblical verses constitute the only translation exercise, continuing through Ezr 6 : 18 in Lesson XX and thus completing the reading of the Aramaic part of Ezra.

Following the last lesson are six pages of paradigms. That of the regular (strong) verb is completely presented; for Hollow, Geminate,

and Lamedh He verbs the paradigms are partial, with reference to the corresponding lesson for the remaining forms. Since laryngeal verbs and Pe-weak verbs are completely exhibited in Lessons X and XI, they are not included in the paradigms but there are cross references to these lessons. A thirteen-page glossary completes the material; no index is really needed because of the logical, topical organization followed throughout, the table of contents giving clear and adequate assistance in finding any topic.

The printing, done by the Jerusalem Academic Press Ltd., is excellent. A very few corrections made on the proof were overlooked. The following corrections may be noted: on page 37, the Roman numerals IX in the heading have dropped out; on page 61, fourth line of paragraph (B), the point is lost because the hypothetical *הַעְעַל has been misprinted as הַשְׁל; on page 100, after חצף, instead of "haphel" it should read "h/aph.," meaning both haphel and aphel; on page 106 under רמה there should be added "— peil—to be thrown"; on the same page under the שׂ heading three words contain שׁ instead of שׂ; these should read *שָׂב, *שַׂבְכָא, and שָׂטַר.

When the author uses his lessons in a class, the same class is enrolled in the following term for his course in Exilic Prophets in Hebrew and Aramaic, in which the Aramaic portions of Daniel are studied as well as other parts of Daniel and selected portions of Ezekiel. This is the reason why the Biblical material used for translation in the grammar book under review is drawn exclusively from Ezra (aside from the Aramaic verse in Jeremiah 10 and the Aramaic phrase in Genesis 31). Some Aramaic in Daniel may also be read in the first term following completion of these twenty lessons.

The logical and clear presentation is highly commendable; the book should be very serviceable for use in seminaries and also for independent study by those who know something of Biblical Hebrew.

Andrews University LEONA G. RUNNING

Kubo, Sakae, *P^{72} and the Codex Vaticanus*. "Studies and Documents," ed. by Jacob Geerlings, Vol. XXVII. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1965. 196 pages. $ 10.00.

This is a condensation of Kubo's doctoral dissertation, done under Allen Wikgren of the University of Chicago. It represents an excellent example of the new approach to textual criticism. Once the new canons for the practice of this science (or should one say art?) are accepted, the use to which Kubo puts them can only call forth our admiration for his command of the chosen methodology. He has adopted "an eclecticism in which the internal evidence outweighs the external" (p. 5) because "there is no real alternative to this rather subjective method" (p. 6).

As a preliminary step, Kubo tries to determine the text of P^{72} and B. This is done by eliminating careless or intentional substitutions of words, omissions, additions and transpositions, as well as carelessness in spelling, haplography, dittography and homoeoteleuton. The result is the evaluation of the author of P^{72} as "not the best of scribes" who "cannot in any way be compared to that of Codex Vaticanus" (p. 17). The same operation is then performed on Codex Vaticanus. The conclusion of this section is that "where one manuscript is singular, the reading of the other can be regarded as the text" (p. 21). But the necessity for this conclusion does not seem to be apparent, and what is meant by "the text" is not quite clear. It would appear that neither the basic text of P^{72} nor the basic text of B is meant.

In trying to establish P^{72} within a text type, Kubo somewhat disagrees with the conclusions of Massaux, and suggests that von Soden's system is in need of revision. In his study of 1 Peter in P^{72}, Massaux established its position within the Hesychian group, particularly close to the minuscules rather than the uncials within the group. He also found that 1 Peter in P^{72} was to be grouped with von Soden's I^{b2} classification. But Massaux classified Jude in P^{72} with von Soden's I^{b1}. Kubo reports that he has done his own study for 1 and 2 Peter and Jude, and has found P^{72} closer to B than to the minuscules in the Hesychian group. In this his results are different from Massaux's, but Kubo has also found P^{72} related to von Soden's I^{b2} (especially 1739 and 323). This leads Kubo to suggest that in reality P^{72} is not related to I^{b2}, but rather "that von Soden's classification needs to be adjusted" (p. 24). The evidence for this is given in an appendix to the author's dissertation which is not included within this volume.

Chapter III represents the major portion of the present study. In it Kubo does a careful analysis of each disagreement between the basic texts of P^{72} and B "with the view of establishing a superiority of one text over the other" (p. 31). Chapter IV, then, evaluates the combination P^{72}-B against other readings "in order to understand how they arose and to confirm on a sounder basis their inferiority" (p. 96). This evaluation, as would be expected, is done on the basis of significant representative readings only. Seventy-five readings are considered in this chapter. Of these only fourteen are found to be superior in MSS other than P^{72} and B.

Kubo's main conclusion is that "P^{72} has as a whole a text superior to that of B" (p. 152). He admits that this conclusion may be questioned on the basis of the methodology employed, but he has confidence in his method. As a corollary to this basic conclusion, Kubo suggests that the text of B "is not so free of 'improvements' of the primitive text as have [*sic.*] been thought" (p. 152).

The book includes an appendix in which the editor of the series provides a collation of Codex 904. This collation, however, has no connection with what the title announces is to be found in the book. It is to be wished that this valuable addition will not pass unnoticed in spite of its omission from the title-page.

Kubo's ability as a textual critic is well demonstrated in the body of this monograph where he patiently scrutinizes variant after variant to determine which reading has the strongest claim to originality. He is guided by the canon that the harder reading which best suits the context and which best explains the reasons for the origin of the other variants is to be preferred. There are ample examples of the author's resourcefulness in the positing of possibilities for the way in which variants may have arisen, as well as of reasons for a particular reading's claim to originality. One may have questions on some of these, but on the whole one can only show respect for a job well done. When textual criticism is carried on according to the modern canons, a true sense of the correct Greek idiom becomes an indispensable piece of equipment for the textual critic. Kubo demonstrates that he is not in want of it. This study will undoubtedly become a basic reference work for any future commentary on 1 and 2 Peter and Jude.

Since variants are discussed in two chapters and are organized within these chapters according to type, variants that stand in organic relation are often discussed in separate sections. This seems inevitable, but cross references would have helped for clarity. On page 141, *e.g.*, the variant readings for Jude 5 are discussed rather briefly. The pronouncement which follows, "this section should then read απαξ παντὰς οτι θεος," does not appear to stem from the short discussion. Five variants are listed, but only three are considered. It would seem that some reference should have been made to page 86 where the reasons for adopting the reading θεος are given.

Unfortunately, due to the pressures imposed by publication deadlines, the book did not receive careful proofreading and the benefit of editorial assistance. Often sentences are less clear than one would wish. It is to be hoped that a basic study of this nature will be revised for a second printing in which English grammar and syntax will be more carefully heeded. An index of Scriptural references would also greatly enhance the value of the book.

Andrews University HEROLD WEISS

McIntyre, John, *The Shape of Christology*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966. 180 pp. $ 4.50. London: SCM Press, 1966. 30 sh.

The book is suggestive. This is both its strength and its weakness. The methodological analyses undertaken and their application to selected historical materials are the basis for an invitation to Christological construction. Its strength is in its unrelenting adherence to its methodological aim. Its weakness is that of all methodological treatises: we want to be told *how* to move from analysis to construction. The "shape" is not of things to come, but of what was and is. Such analysis of the situation, if it is comprehensive enough, is useful as a preliminary

to further Christological construction. What the book suggests is a quite ingenious way of organizing the historical materials, a host of non-methodological questions which spring from the particular categories used, the need for further writing to take us from methodology to exposition. What we learn, did we not already know it, is that Christological problems are exceedingly complex.

One of these questions is that of the relation between method and norm. Since in modern times Christology is no longer only a "medium of theological expression" but "a norm of theological validity" (p. 10), the range of Christological discussion has been considerably widened, and questions now have to be raised of a different nature from those appropriate to the classical discussion.

The "shape" of Christology, as of any discipline, is determined by the "method" employed in operating the "models" which interpret what is "given." An exposition of these technical terms is made the ground for a consideration of the three models which have had wide currency in Christological construction: the two-nature model, the psychological model, the revelation model. The discipline takes its shape from the models employed within it. It is in this way that the model comes to have a normative function.

McIntyre wishes to question this status of the model in Christological discourse. He takes the extreme permissiveness of the two-nature model as his line of attack. The principle (the model that models this model) of "no *physis anhypostatos*" permits such a wide range of conflicting interpretations, from Nestorianism to Eutychianism, Chalcedon being a compromise which needed further elucidation, that the model of the two-natures may not stand as normative. In the discussion of the relation between norms and method certain problems remain. The author affirms that what "conditions the form of Christological method" is norm (p. 45), in the particular instance that of doing justice to the worship of the church. Do methods spring from norms or do norms depend upon the prior application of method? It would seem that the distinction is not as clear-cut as the suggestion here made would imply. The matter is more complicated than is here suggested, norm and method being interactive. What lies behind this distinction is the uneasiness about the permissiveness of the two-natures model. To say that models do not merit the normativeness which they have been given is one thing. To say that models should not be normative is quite another, one which would go against the author's own purpose.

A plea is made for a "situational deployment" of the concept of human nature (p. 112). It springs from contemporary insistence on the non-fixity of human "nature" (we never seem to be able to dispense with the word), and is linked with the influence of Sartre. Here we move across a category barrier, to the psychological model. In its exposition, McIntyre is concerned with the threat of docetism. The rehabilitation of the psychological model (*the* model of the liberal Christologies) involves a moderation of historical skepticism evident during much of our present theological century. He argues that the

historical skeptics (Barth, Bultmann, Käsemann and Bornkamm are mentioned) inconsistently discuss "attitudes, motives, reactions and even feelings of Jesus" (p. 127). Thus their skepticism is not to be taken at its face value.

The psychological model is to be free to develop as is found necessary. We only get landed into insuperable difficulties when, as with the Kenotic Christologies where "consciousness" is identified with "nature," Chalcedon stands sentry over the psychological model. Heresy is just around the corner.

The discussion ends with a treatment of what is called the "revelation model." To do justice to the New Testament data, two statements are necessary. An event, interpreted as a divine action (Jesus), reveals God, but in human form, to the one in whom the Spirit dwells, schematized as A(x) reveals B(A) to C (Holy Spirit). This must be supplemented by the further statement: "God as he is in and for himself" (p. 152) is revealed in Jesus Christ to one in whom the Spirit dwells, schematized as B(A) reveals B(E) to C (Holy Spirit). His basic criticism of the revelation model is that it is abstract. While it depends upon "other models for its content and indeed for its form" (p. 168), specifically the soteriological, it is presented in such a manner as to make it appear that it can stand independently of these. What he calls for is a rewriting of Christological theory in the light of an application of the two-natures model (nature being viewed not in static terms but by means of the psychological model) to this revelation model. This would mean pushing beyond the Christology of Barth with its historical skepticism and would make available to us an apologetic suited to the rough and tumble of the common room! He thus reiterates his invitation made earlier: "I should like to enter a plea for the extension of the psychological model, in some respects at least to the divine nature, for how else can we properly speak about the 'mind of Christ' or indeed 'the will of God'?" (p. 143). (We note again the suggestive nature of the book. To enter a plea is not to suggest a program.)

His criticism of revelation as being non-biblical is based upon a particular conception of what appeal to Scripture is. For "biblical" is not to be confined to mean "amenable to direct reference to the text of Scripture." It may mean conformity to the approach and intention of Scripture, a much more difficult and complex criterion. On such a reading, who shall say that the revelation concept is not biblical? "Word of God" is certainly a biblical model in both senses of the term "biblical." A similar naïveté is to be found in the reference to Chalcedon where he defends it against dualism (p. 93). Surely it is not *what* is said but the way in which it is said that is crucial. The intention may be to preserve unity: the form which the expression takes may make that intention incapable of fulfilment. The criticisms of Chalcedon made by Schleiermacher are cogent at this point. McIntyre does not consider these, nor certain contemporary attempts at Christological construction which notice them (Tillich's, for example). We cannot save Chalcedon merely by appealing to its words, nor even to its in-

tention. How it says what it says may confuse the intention of what is to be said.

There are here many things to stimulate, and some to frustrate. But one must not expect more than the author intends. What we are here given is a method, by which a model (*i.e.*, the idea of a model) may be applied to the given materials of Christological history. But hints for construction might follow clarification.

The following errata were noted: "sciptures" for scriptures (p. 42, l. 37), "which is the model is" for "which the model is" (p. 57, l. 12), "protects" for "projects" (p. 106, l. 21).

Andrews University EDWARD W. H. VICK

Strand, Kenneth A., *German Bibles Before Luther: The Story of 14 High-German Editions*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966. 64 pp. $ 4.00.

The author of this fascinating volume wrote his doctoral dissertation on the translation of the New Testament into Low German by the Brethren of the Common Life at Rostock. He later presented a detailed account in his book entitled, *A Reformation Paradox: The Condemned New Testament of the Rostock Brethren of the Common Life* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ann Arbor Publishers, 1960). Moreover, in his next book, *Reformation Bibles in the Crossfire* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Ann Arbor Publishers, 1961), he added further information in a chapter devoted exclusively to this subject. These contributions may be considered as preludes to the work reviewed here.

Once more the writer refers to the remarkable treatise by Gerard Zerbolt of Zutphen entitled, *De Libris Teutonicalibus*, in which the reader is advised that it is permissible to make proper use of the Bible in his own vernacular. Zerbolt's production was not considered as a safe guide for laymen, for which reason only one copy has survived. That being the case, we must not be surprised to find even today all sorts of persons in high positions who either strongly condemn or highly favor the reading of sacred writings by ordinary laymen. At the same time we must look forward to reading reviews of the latest book by Strand that will go to an extreme in accusing him of having misrepresented certain facts and opinions. The old controversy has not yet yielded to a demand for enlightened interpretation of the historical developments.

Particularly valuable is Chapter IV, which is devoted to the use of the Bible in the Middle Ages. The author asks an important question here, and he indicates that he has long been aware of two widespread attitudes on the part of both Roman Catholic and Protestant scholars. On the one hand we wonder if the publishers of the translated Bibles were good Catholics, and on the other hand we must reckon with those Protestants who imagine that Luther was unique in his work as a

translator of the Bible into his own vernacular. On p. 33 Strand refers to an astonishing remark in Luther's *Table Talks*: "Thirty years ago no one read the Bible." A similar statement by the same Professor Luther has caused enormous misunderstanding: "Under the papacy, the Bible was unknown by the people." As a direct result, says Strand correctly, "there was a time when relatively little attention was devoted to the medieval German Bible, especially among Protestant scholars." It certainly is high time that the general public becomes properly educated in this field of study, and it is for this reason in particular that Strand's impartial discussion can dispel unwanted delusions. Luther's *Table Talks* were, of course, written for the most part by his students who often were careless in reporting what he actually did say.

The whole book is beautiful and meticulously precise. All of the fourteen Bibles have been carefully traced and their manuscript sources properly described. The latest findings by outstanding authorities have been utilized. Especially valuable are the illustrations and also the references to work done by the artists who took great pains to make their books attractive to discriminating students of the Christian religion. On page 61 there is unfortunately a printing error in the omission of the plate number and description, but Strand's complete list of plates on page 42 provides us with the information that this is Plate XVIII and that it shows a page from the American Bible Society Library copy of the First Schönsperger Bible.

It was Martin Luther who shaped for the German people of today their language, which is neither High German nor Low German, but that of the Chancery of Saxony, about half-way between North and South, and between East and West. In this manner he destroyed the Low German language, which at the end of the Middle Ages was still the official organ for such famous cities as Cologne, Hamburg, Bremen, Lübeck, and Magdeburg. The fact that Luther used those Bibles accessible to him makes Strand's book a guide for numerous students in our universities and theological seminaries.

University of Michigan ALBERT HYMA

Thiele, Edwin R., *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings: A Reconstruction of the Chronology of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah*. Revised edition. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965. xxvi + 232 pp. with numerous charts. $ 6.00.

E. R. Thiele's book really needs neither an introduction nor a recommendation. His scheme of the chronologies of the divided kingdoms of Israel and Judah has been well known ever since its first publication as an article in *JNES*, III (1944), 137-186. This work was later expanded into book form and published by the University of

Chicago Press in 1951. It was justifiably hailed as the first real breakthrough in the study of the perplexing problems connected with Hebrew chronology, and Thiele's chronological scheme has been accepted and used by an increasing number of Biblical scholars and writers. That some solutions advocated by Thiele have not found general acceptance is understandable in view of the nature of the complex and thorny problems connected with all ancient chronologies. W. F. Albright, for example, while accepting certain solutions of Thiele has rejected others (see *BASOR*, No. 100 [Dec., 1945], 16-22), and this reviewer has found himself in disagreement with Thiele's chronology of King Hezekiah's reign (see *AUSS*, II [1964], 40-52), although he agrees with him on most of his major premises.

Since the appearance of the first edition of his book, Thiele has repeatedly defended his position in articles dealing with various phases of Hebrew chronology. In these articles he has also clarified a number of details. However, for several years, his *opus magnum* was out of print and unobtainable. This fact and the discovery of new evidence made the publication of a second edition urgent. It is, therefore, with gratitude to the author and to the new publisher that we greet the reappearance of this valuable work, which no one who works in the field of the history of the divided Israelite kingdoms can afford to disregard or ignore.

Into the revised edition new discoveries bearing on Hebrew chronology have been incorporated such as the Chaldaean Chronicles published by D. J. Wiseman in 1956. Thiele has also taken cognizance of his critics, and marshalled new arguments in support of his views. On the other hand, the new edition is 66 pages shorter than the former, probably caused by a desire of the publisher to keep the price on the level of the earlier edition, fourteen years its senior. Chapters IX-XI of the first edition, dealing with the variant data of the Greek texts and of Josephus, and Thiele's discussion of the chronologies of other scholars, have been dropped. However, the new book contains a chapter not found in the former edition on "The Origin of the Book of Kings." Another difference noticeable between the two editions is the abundant use of charts in the new edition against a very sparing use of such devices in the earlier work.

Andrews University SIEGFRIED H. HORN

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW

CONSONANTS

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

MASORETIC VOWEL POINTINGS

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

ABBREVIATIONS OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

AAS	Annales archéol. de Syrie
AASOR	Annual, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res.
ADAJ	Annual, Dep. of Ant. of Jordan
AER	American Ecclesiastical Review
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung
AfP	Archiv für Papyrusforschung
AJA	Amer. Journal of Archaeology
AJSL	Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang. and Literature
ALBO	Analecta Lovan. Bibl. et Orient.
ANET	Ancient Near Eastern Texts, J. B. Pritchard, ed., 2d ed., 1955
ANF	The Ante-Nicene Fathers
AO	Acta Orientalia
ARG	Archiv für Reformationsgesch.
ARW	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft
ASAE	Annales, Serv des Ant de l'Ég.
ASB	Acta Sanctorum (ed. Bolland)
ATHR	Anglican Theological Review
AUSS	Andrews Univ. Sem. Studies
BA	Biblical Archaeologist
BASOR	Bulletin, Amer. Sch of Or. Res.
Bib	Biblica
BIES	Bulletin, Israel Expl. Soc.
BIFAO	Bulletin Inst. Franç. d'Arch. Or.
BiOr	Bibliotheca Orientalis
BJPES	Bulletin, Jewish Pal. Expl. Soc.
BJRL	Bulletin, John Rylands Library
BMB	Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth
BQR	Baptist Quarterly Review
BR	Biblical Research (Chicago)
BRG	Biblioth. Rerum Germanicarum
BS	Bibliotheca Sacra
BSHPF	Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français
BT	Bible Translator
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CC	Christian Century
CdE	Chronique d'Égypte
CH	Church History
CIG	Corpus Inscript. Graecarum
CIL	Corpus Inscript. Latinarum
CIS	Corpus Inscript. Semiticarum
CJTh	Canadian Journal of Theology
CSEL	Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.
CT	Christianity Today
ER	Ecumenical Review
EThL	Ephemer. Theol. Lovanienses
ET	Expository Times
HJ	Hibbert Journal
HThR	Harvard Theological Review

HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
Int	Interpretation
JACh	Jahrb. für Ant. und Christentum
JAOS	Journ. of the Amer. Or. Soc.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JBR	Journal of Bible and Religion
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Arch.
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JR	Journal of Religion
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JThS	Journal of Theol. Studies
KJV	King James Version
LQ	Lutheran Quarterly
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
MPG	Migne, Patrologia Graeca
MPL	Migne, Patrologia Latina
MQR	Mennonite Quarterly Review
NKZ	Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nic. Fathers
NRTh	Nouvelle Revue Théologique
NT	Novum Testamentum
NTA	New Testament Abstracts
NTS	New Testament Studies
Num	Numen
OCh	Oriens Christianus
OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
Or	Orientalia
OTS	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
PJB	Palästina-Jahrbuch
PRE	Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche
QDAP	Quarterly, Dep. of Ant. in Pal.
RA	Revue d'Assyr. et d'Arch. Or.
RAC	Rivista di Archaeologia Cristiana
RB	Revue Biblique
RE	Review and Expositor
RdE	Revue d'Égyptologie
RHE	Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique
RHPR	Revue d'Hist. et de Philos. Rel.
RHR	Revue de l'Histoire des Religions
RL	Religion in Life
RLA	Reallexikon der Assyriologie
RQ	Revue de Qumrân
RSR	Revue des Sciences Réligieuses
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SJTh	Scottish Journal of Theology
STh	Studia Theologica
ThEH	Theologische Existenz heute.
ThQ	Theologische Quartalschrift
ThT	Theology Today
ThLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung
ThR	Theologische Rundschau
Trad	Traditio
ThS	Theological Studies
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
VC	Verbum Caro
VD	Verbum Domini
VCh	Vigiliae Christianae
VT	Vetus Testamentum
WThJ	Westminster Theol. Journal
WZKM	Wiener Zeitschr. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenlandes
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie
ZAS	Zeitsch. für ägyptische Sprache
ZAW	Zeitsch. für die alttes Wiss.
ZDMG	Zeitsch der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft
ZDPV	Zeitsch. des Deutsch Pal. Ver.
ZKG	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte
ZHTh	Zeitsch. für hist. Theologie
ZKTh	Zeitsch. für kath. Theologie
ZNW	Zeitsch. für die neutest. Wiss.
ZSTh	Zeitschrift für syst. Theologie
ZThK	Zeitsch. für Theol. und Kirche

Printed by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands