

BULLETIN  
OF THE  
CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

---

BULLETIN  
DE LA  
SOCIÉTÉ CANADIENNE DES ÉTUDES BIBLIQUES

No. 38

1978

No. 39

1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PREFACE . . . . .	ii
I.	PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS (1978) . . . . .	1
II.	ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS: ANNUAL MEETING (1978). . . . .	20
III.	PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY: ANNUAL MEETING (1978) . . . . .	26
IV.	C.S.B.S. EXECUTIVE (1978-79). . . . .	31
V.	PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS (1979) . . . . .	33
VI.	ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS: ANNUAL MEETING (1979). . . . .	68
VII.	PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY: ANNUAL MEETING (1979) . . . . .	75
VIII.	C.S.B.S. EXECUTIVE (1979-80). . . . .	82
IX.	NEWS OF C.S.B.S. MEMBERSHIP: PUBLICATIONS, RESEARCH, NEW APPOINTMENTS, THESES AND DISSERTATIONS (1978-79). . . . .	84
X.	NOTICES . . . . .	97

[CN ISSN 0068-970X]

EDITOR: C.M. FOLEY  
ST. THOMAS MORE COLLEGE  
UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
1437 College Drive  
SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN  
S7N 0W6  
CANADA

PREFACE

Thanks are due to Peter Craigie, Peter Richardson, the Executive Secretary of the C.S.B.S., and the previous editor, J. David Whitehead, all of whom collected material included in this issue of the Bulletin. I also wish to thank Dr. R.W. Nostbakken, Director of the School of Religious Studies at the University of Saskatchewan, who provided the current editor with a grant of \$150.00 to help defray the costs of preparation and printing.

This issue included Nos. 38 and 39 of the Bulletin. The format is similar to that of previous issues, with the notable exception of Section IX. The "News of C.S.B.S. Membership" for 1978 and 1979 forms a single section. While some of the information is dated, I feel that its inclusion is worthwhile for the sake of both interest and completeness.

I intend to return to the former practice of preparing the Bulletin for distribution prior to the annual spring meeting of the Society. Members are invited to submit material of interest to the Society for inclusion in the Bulletin. The editor welcomes any suggestions for improving subsequent issues.

Christopher M. Foley  
Editor

ON THE CURIOUS NATURE OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

1978 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

THE CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

John Sandys-Wunsch  
Memorial University

May, 1978

On the Curious Nature of Biblical Theology

The reason for the title of this address is that unlike the history of biblical religion, which is a safe, solid, academically respectable pursuit, biblical theology is based on the stubborn conviction that despite years of excellent work in the Journal of Theological Studies and similar publications, the Bible might just have something important to say after all. The difficulty is that while what ancient Israelites or New Testament Christians actually believed can be dealt with by historical methods alone, the extent to which we might agree or disagree with them--the substance of biblical theology--brings into play and threatens to alter our own basic convictions about truth. Now to raise the problem of personal conviction or even, horror of horrors, revelation in an academic setting seems about as appropriate as showing a blue movie to a group of nuns on retreat. Scholarship has come to be seen as scientific research to the point where it is a serious question whether the study of religion is a humanity or a social science. As Jacob Neusner points out in a recent article, the scholars have inherited the earth. One might qualify this by saying that while they have inherited exegesis, it is Anita Bryant who has inherited biblical theology. Both scholars and Anita Bryant have in somewhat different ways done terrible things to the understanding of the Bible, and therefore I thought the CSBS might be one place amongst the learned societies where it would be possible to drop the pose of the

scientific religionist who considers himself to be above messy things like personal convictions as he studies less enlightened souls who suffer from them.

Therefore, in this paper I would like to touch on the two sides of biblical theology: namely, the role of the question of truth in serious scholarly discussion and the history and possible future of biblical theology in particular. What I will try to argue is that there is a possible alternative to our dangerously impoverished notions of scholarship and that just as in the past great biblical theologies sprang from richer notions of what it meant to be human, so in the future biblical theology will depend on more complicated notions about humanity than our natural taste for simplicity finds acceptable.

To appreciate what biblical theology has been, I think we must take an unfashionable look at some of the philosophical underpinnings of modern scholarship. Despite the fond belief of many English-speaking scholars that biblical criticism was a nineteenth-century invention, the fact of the matter is that the scientific study of the Bible as a coherent discipline emerged in German universities in the second half of the eighteenth century. The men who took over and nurtured the ideas of their forerunners were men of the Enlightenment; that is, they were influenced at first by Leibnitz as seen through Wolff and Baumgarten and then later by Kant. As a result, their perception of truth tended to be based on the model of mathematics and the new physical sciences. In their innocence, some of them believed that a scholarly, scientific approach to the Bible would



eliminate old controversies and produce an agreed-upon body of knowledge comparable with mathematics, universal in its significance and acceptability. J. P. Gabler, sometimes erroneously described as the father of the idea of biblical theology, stated that it was the task of exegesis to sift biblical documents and separate out the eternal, universal doctrines from the particular historical circumstances with which they were mixed up.

Two general observations can be made about the history of biblical criticism and biblical theology in its early period. First, the application of historical scholarly methods did not produce agreement amongst scholars, still less certainty in matters of religion. Secondly, the ultimate weakness of this approach was that of the Enlightenment in general: namely, an uncertainty of how to deal with matters not amenable to scientific treatment. In fact, the first part of the nineteenth century was marked by a certain recoil from scholarship; for example, any full interpretation of Kierkegaard's Unscientific Postscript has to take into account his reaction to the methods and widely diverging viewpoints of German biblical scholars of his day. Unfortunately, in Germany the reaction was on the part of super-orthodox Lutheran conservatives like Hengstenberg, who were unable to produce a viable alternative to the direction biblical theology had begun to take. The final degeneration of biblical theology into the history of biblical religion was the inexorable working out of the implications of an inadequate starting point.

It is precisely a similar inadequate starting point that tends

to be the problem of modern biblical scholarship--and indeed of the study of religion in general--that is, the feeling that one must distinguish between objective facts which are the concern of scholarship and subjective convictions whose truth or falsity is beyond any sort of measurement, any sort of agreement, and any sort of legitimate interest for scholarship. The danger is that if we follow this model, we will turn the study of the Bible into a discipline as dull, boring, and irrelevant as academic psychology.

Is it possible, then, to have a scholarship that is not exclusively scientific? The answer to this question depends on our understanding of what it means to be human, how human beings become aware of themselves and the world around them. At one time this problem was dealt with by philosophy, but English-speaking philosophy having generally turned into a convoluted lexicography, one must look elsewhere for help. The thinker on whom I shall rely in much of this paper is the German existentialist Karl Jaspers, not because he represents the final truth in the matter, but because his thought is able to grasp more of the complexities of life than the impoverished positivism underlying much of modern scholarship.

That aspect of Jaspers' thought which is of importance to our discussion of biblical theology is his analysis of our experience of ourselves. Each individual first becomes aware of simply being alive; prior to the development of self-reflection he lives entirely in a world of experience. Then as he develops he becomes aware of another level of existence, that which Jaspers calls consciousness in general or, more popularly, the world of fact. Here clear and

distinct ideas are part of a general body of knowledge which is convincing to anyone with the ability to grasp its coherence. This is the level at which most scholarship operates; the existence of the J source behind the pentateuch or Q behind the synoptic gospels are scientific questions which in theory, at least, could be solved to everyone's satisfaction if only enough evidence were available.

However, there is another level of human existence which Jaspers calls Geist--the world of values or ideas in a specific sense of the word. What is distinctive about this world of values is that absolute certainty or universal agreement is impossible. Those who admire Flanders and Swan will remember the little cannibal's difficulty in proving to his parents that eating people is wrong. Indeed, in the world of Geist--of values--exact proof is impossible. No amount of evidence will ever prove to cannibal couples that their dietary habits are morally wrong in the same way that an analysis of the DDT content of the average North American will show beyond doubt that nutritionally other animals might be safer to eat.

At this level of human existence we may well discover right and wrong, but with the full realization that we will never reach commonly accepted conclusions. But at this point we are invited to make a decision; for once we are confronted with what we recognize as a positive value, we are then faced with a choice whether to act on it. Once an idea impresses us as true, it makes a demand on us--it becomes, in Jaspers' words, a cipher, an indication of transcendence. If we do act on this perception--a good example is Schweitzer's decision to give up a promising academic career and go to Africa--

it is then we reach a further stage of perception, the discovery of our own identity, that individual "I" unique and distinct from the rest of the world. This Jaspers calls Existenz. This identity is not an object amongst other objects in the world, nor can it be frozen for all time once it is realized; rather, we have to discover this "I" time and time again, as we respond to the challenge life faces us with.

Obviously, an individual's personal decision is beyond debate, but the grounds on which he based it can and should be matters of scholarly concern, however much they lie beyond the area where proof universal is possible.

The significance of Jaspers' discussion of what it means to be human is that it is a far more adequate discussion than the model underlying some approaches to scholarship. In these less satisfactory approaches, little attention is given to matters that cannot be verified scientifically, so that there is an almost infinite gap between real truths and personal convictions, which are usually thought of as emotionally based. The effect of using this impoverished model is that the gap can only be overcome by invoking some external authority, such as the church, or more popularly now, by appealing to some equally authoritarian Marxist-type system, where the transition from fact to belief is given some specious kind of scientific justification.

Given, then, that the Bible contains ideas in Jaspers' specific use of the word, it is possible to see how biblical theology--the discussion of these ideas--can be a legitimate scholarly pursuit,



once we recognize the significance of an area beyond the factual which is open to general discussion. In fact, a scholarship that limits itself to cataloguing the ideas of the Bible has failed to discuss the Bible fully.

At this point, I should deal with the possible objection that surely all this talk about philosophy--a Greek invention--is not necessary in dealing with Hebrew and Christian scriptures. Surely, biblical theology as a setting out of biblical truth or truths as a preliminary to full-scale systematic theology should be unalloyed by philosophical or theological presuppositions. But the actual history of biblical theology shows that this point of view is not an adequate one. The great biblical theologies of earlier times, those of Spinoza, de Wette, or Vatke, were written under the influence of new and exciting developments in philosophy, and the rebirth of biblical theology in this century has been under the influence of new currents in philosophy, such as Heidegger, or in theology, such as Barth. Furthermore, it is precisely those scholars who had a historical rather than a theological bent who have not been interested in producing a biblical theology. One only needs to think of Albrecht Alt as an example here.

What I have done so far in this paper is to argue the first part of my thesis--namely, that it is possible and indeed necessary to have a serious scholarship that deals with values, beliefs, and convictions not in terms of their historical causes or development, but rather in terms of their truth. Yet this scholarship is not an affront to the integrity of those to whom it is presented; that is, it is not

brainwashing, for a genuine effort to discover truth consists in what Jaspers refers to as "liebende Kampf"--with other human beings both alive and dead--"an affectionate struggle," or communication in a sense far beyond the mere transmission of facts or reputed facts. This sort of scholarship can and should be practised in many disciplines; when it is applied to the Bible, it is known as biblical theology.

I hope I will be permitted one splenetic aside. While many of my best friends are social scientists, I consider that unless scholarship recovers its interest in the pursuit of truth other than scientific truth, then not only will the university betray one of its traditional functions, the result may also help to make possible a nightmare world, where one's best course would be to take to the hills with a rifle. If this seems strange, remember that Jaspers, one of the few who did not pursue philosophy as a scientific discipline, was also one of the few university professors who opposed Nazism from the beginning. Totalitarian ideology is the pornography of our day--and we are far from immune in Canada.

The second point of my argument deals with the possible direction biblical theology might take. In starting my discussion about possible new approaches, I should admit that there has always existed an embattled minority of biblical scholars who felt there were indeed ideas in the Bible. However, their notion of an idea was too much in the Enlightenment or Cartesian tradition of clear and distinct ideas about an object in the physical world. Thus, ideas about God in the Bible tended to be treated in the same

fashion as ideas about the movement of the celestial bodies or the reproductive processes of the garden snail. But once one admits that neither God nor one's own personal identity is an object among objects in the world, then having clear and distinct scientific ideas about the one is as futile as clear and distinct ideas about the other. If there are ideas in the Bible, we must not see them in the scientific sense of the word.

Furthermore, the application of Cartesian categories of thought to the Bible has produced some serious dislocations of interpretation. Let me explain why. J. P. Gabler, mentioned earlier, stated quite specifically that the duty of biblical theology was to separate out eternal truths about God from incidental historical matters. The result of such an undertaking would have been a scientifically-based and testable body of doctrine comparable--though Gabler does not say this explicitly--to Newton's description of the physical universe. This sort of descriptive approach to biblical theology was actually attempted by G. L. Bauer and has been undertaken many times since. It has always run into two problems, which I think are sufficient to show its inapplicability: first, there are precious few consistent biblical doctrines, and second, even where some sort of doctrine can be teased out, it is a poor, lifeless thing at best.

For example, suppose one tries to set out the Old Testament doctrine of God's righteous judgement, assuming, of course, that such a thing exists. The clearest and therefore least satisfactory statement about this is Ezekiel's claim that God rewards the good and punishes the evil without regard for their background or former

circumstances. Fortunately for good sense, but unfortunately for an easy biblical theology, other parts of the Bible are far from agreeing with Ezekiel on this point. Even Proverbs contains a few sayings that suggest that it is possible for the wicked to prosper, and when one gets to Jeremiah and Job, the problem becomes so acute that any statement about God's judgements as seen by the Old Testament degenerates into a banal summary of Ezekiel and Deuteronomy versus the rest.

However, the notion of biblical doctrine played a large part in many biblical theologies for two centuries, though in later instances it took the form of the development of biblical doctrine. What biblical doctrine developed into was often as hazy as the mythical desert Yahwism from which it was supposed to have sprung, but ethical monotheism often showed up in the process. Despite a definite disclaimer by Eichrodt, one has the suspicion that this idea still haunts attempts to find the biblical doctrine about love, marriage, and other forms of warfare. In particular, Old Testament theology has tended to look for some sort of central theme, finding itself in an inferior position to New Testament theology, where with one possible exception Jesus is the centre of interest. One only has to read Rudolph Smend's monograph on the search for a Mitte to the Old Testament to appreciate the difficulties, and I agree with him that only the most generalized theme is likely to suffice. His own choice--"Yahweh the God of Israel and Israel Yahweh's people"--is as good a choice as any, unless, of course, you are interested in Job or Ecclesiastes.



In fact, the search for doctrine in the Old Testament has tended to assume that biblical authors were German professors of philosophy working out some coherent theory for the edification of students and the amazement of colleagues. In our century one scholar who broke with this approach was Gerhard von Rad. Von Rad saw the authors of the Old Testament not as German professors but as German preachers; that is, people for whom revelation takes place Sunday mornings between the hours of 11 and 12, or only too frequently 12:45. Within its limitations, von Rad's approach has the great merit of seeing that the Bible offers us not so much statements of doctrine based on factual assertions but ideas in Jaspers' sense of the term; that is, presentations of values that challenge us about the nature of our own personal decisions. Von Rad's approach is not without its weaknesses; his attachment to interpretation of history left him less able than G. K. Chesterton to appreciate Job; further, there are important parts of the Old Testament, such as Jeremiah's confessions, where the author is not preaching at us but simply trying to make sense for himself out of this mess we call life. Nonetheless, von Rad made a significant breakthrough in biblical theology.

In the New Testament theology the work which has a comparable effect is, of course, Bultmann's Theology of the New Testament, which derives its importance not only from Bultmann's careful exegesis but also from his use of Heidegger's existentialist categories for interpreting Paul.

In my discussion so far I have concentrated on weaknesses in biblical theology; but I think it would be fair for anyone here to

ask me: Could a biblical theology based on Jaspers' viewpoint be any more successful? At this point the only honorable thing to do is to try to give an example of how such a biblical theology might be worked out.

Jaspers argues that Transcendence, whatever name we may give it, is mediated to us in what he calls ciphers. He says of them: "Ciphers light the roots of things. They are not cognition; what is conceived in them is vision and interpretation. They cannot be experienced and verified as generally valid. Their truth is linked with Existenz. The magnetism of Transcendence for Existenz is voiced in ciphers. They open areas of Being. They illuminate my decisions. They enhance or dampen my awareness of being, and of myself." Ciphers, then, in a milieu used to the Bible, are words or images, such as "God," "Jesus," "Israel," or "love," which link transcendence to our lives. But it is only when these words or ideas become more than words and ideas for us personally that they can become ciphers. For example, if one reads Origen, one finds his way of talking about God in middle platonist terms quaint and possibly interesting from the standpoint of the history of ideas. But for Origen these middle platonist concepts were ciphers which mediated an awareness of God. Therefore, it is the task of biblical theology to disembody the Bible both from the quaintness of its origins and the professionalism of the commentaries in order that those who study it can recognize it as fraught with possible ciphers for their own Existenz.

Furthermore, ciphers do not remain constant. While they



obviously exist in a realm where scientific proof or disproof is not applicable, this does not mean that ciphers cannot be challenged, altered, enriched, or replaced. What is also worth noting is that just as this struggle in the realm of ciphers takes place within us, so it can also be seen as taking place within the Bible itself. In my opinion, biblical theology should concentrate more on this struggle within the realm of ciphers rather than on coherent biblical doctrines. Perhaps the most notable example of this struggle in the world of ciphers is in the book of Job, but for our purposes it is more convenient to take a smaller unit, one of the so-called confessions of Jeremiah, the series of personal poems in which the prophet reflects on his personal and professional difficulties in anguished dialogue with God. Now, although some of these poems are set out as conversations between Jeremiah and God, it is impossible for most of us to believe that God literally dropped in for a chat with Jeremiah. If we are to make sense of Jeremiah's confessions, we must see him as a person to whom doubts and difficulties came in the same way they come to us, although Jeremiah's insight into the situation is incomparably greater than our own.

Sooner or later some manifest unfairness on the part of life in general impinges on us, and what is strange is that often this is not because we have been neglecting our duties, but because we have been attending to them; yet our best efforts for what we considered worthwhile have failed miserably. In Jeremiah's case his attempts to rouse a sense of social justice amongst his contemporaries backfired, and those who did not regard him as mad saw him as a traitor

to his own country. Jeremiah refuses to ascribe this to the inscrutable will of God and meekly accept it; one of his confessions begins apparently with a conventional expression of piety:

Righteous art thou, O Lord when I complain to thee.

But it is quite clear that this convention does not meet the needs of the case, for he continues with an abruptness that cannot be conveyed fully in English:

Yet I have a serious injustice to discuss with thee.

Why does the way of the wicked prosper?

Why do all who are treacherous thrive?

Thou plantest them, and they take root;

They grow and bring forth fruit.

In other words, Yahweh himself, as far as Jeremiah can see, actively helps the wicked, despite the hypocrisy which is perfectly clear to both Jeremiah and Yahweh.

Now, according to the machinery of this poem, Yahweh answers Jeremiah directly:

If you have raced with men on foot, and they have

wearièd you,

How will you compete with horses?

And if in a safe land you fall down,

How will you do in the jungle of the Jordan?

In other words, your troubles have just begun, and you have not seen the worst yet by any means.

Now, unfortunately, this machinery tends to blind us to the situation, for we get a picture of Jeremiah being rebuked by God very

much as a professor tells off a student after a bad essay. But if we accept this view, we miss the point of the story in two ways. First, the point of this poem is Jeremiah's decision to continue what he feels is right; it was not God who said that worse things were under way--it was Jeremiah himself who was quite aware of what his decision would entail and who described it in what we can only call a mythological fashion.

But the second point we miss if we do not see behind the machinery is that Jeremiah's questions were not asked on the level of ideas. He was not simply intrigued by the age-old problem of how a good God allows evil--the sort of thing he might have looked up in Teilhard de Chardin when he had a free hour in the library; the battle in his mind was going on at the level of Existenz, to use Jaspers' term, where the decision was not "How do I explain?" but "What do I do?" The fact that Jeremiah sees God speaking to him is a function of his decision for what he knew was the will of God. This is a clear example of what Jaspers means by transcendence manifesting itself to Existenz; that is, we become aware of God when we make what we know is the right decision at a time when it is the last thing on earth we want to do.

Jeremiah makes this difficulty of ignoring our Existenz once we have glimpsed it very clear in another passage:

If I say I will not mention him,  
or speak any more in his name,  
There is in my heart as it were a burning fire,  
shut up in my bones,

And I am weary with holding it in and I cannot.

The struggle here in Jeremiah is between the conventional view or cipher of God which it would be in Jeremiah's own best interests to adopt and the cipher of God mediated by earlier prophets and recognized by Jeremiah himself of a God who is more interested in justice than nationalism. That we are here dealing with a struggle in Jeremiah and not with the complacency of someone who knows he is right is shown by the mythological imagery at the beginning of this poem:

O Lord thou as deceived me,  
and I was deceived;  
Thou are stronger than I,  
and thou hast prevailed.

Here as in other passages in the Old Testament where we meet expressions of God being devious, fleeing, or hard to pin down, we have the echoes of this struggle in the world of ciphers. Truth at the level of ciphers and our Existenz, which is the same thing, is not easy to come by, and even when we think for a moment that we have got somewhere we may be called upon again by different circumstances or new insights to begin the struggle all over again.

I think that Jaspers' concept of a necessary and continuing struggle in the world of ciphers helps us to appreciate something in the Old Testament which is automatically obscured by every book on the Old Testament which makes a statement to the effect that "In the Old Testament belief in God is assumed rather than proved," for this suggests that the Old Testament writers, unlike ourselves, lived in



a simpler, serener age of faith. The trouble is that if such an age of faith ever existed, it would be as useful to us as descriptions of mountain climbing would be a drowning man. If the Old Testament or Bible as a whole is going to speak to us in a way that makes a difference, we must become sensitive to its descriptions of difficulties which are as acute as our own and not altogether different.

What I have done is to indicate how in a scholarly context it is possible to deal with values and beliefs in a way which goes beyond a flat, prosaic discussion of their nominal objective content. A scholarly method which fails to raise the question of the parallels between Jeremiah's experience and the experience of many others, not least of all ourselves, has probably noticed everything except the obvious. No doubt there are Ugaritic terms in Jeremiah, but this was scarcely his prime interest, and this is worth bearing in mind. A purely scientific approach to Jeremiah's religious utterances makes as much sense as treating Moby Dick as a treatise on whale-catching.

To sum up my argument this evening, what I have been suggesting about biblical theology is twofold. First, as distinct from the history of biblical religion, biblical theology belongs to a world of discourse different from the world of scientific discussion. I have indicated some personal concern that the discussion of values and beliefs--the quest for truth in the less usual sense of the word--should not be excluded from the academic enterprise simply because it does not meet the standard of universal verification. I have also argued that, in fact, scholarship too often bases itself

unreflectingly on an inadequate view of what being human means, and I have argued that there are other diagrams of humanity which are more adequate. In particular, I have argued that the philosophy of Karl Jaspers offers us one such diagram, and I have tried to show why biblical theology is helped more by Jaspers' philosophy than by models used previously.

In effect, I have been trying to suggest that we are cheating both ourselves and our disciplines if in our teaching we limit ourselves to the historical origins and meanings of religious books--and here I include more than the Bible--without ever allowing for the possibility that they might on occasion be right. Biblical theology is a curious phenomenon in that while it relies on both scientific exegesis and philosophical assessment of the human condition, it tries to go beyond both these to give hints where we might find substantial help in the Bible as we grapple with the ultimate truths of life.



ANNUAL MEETING (1978)

ABSTRACTS

The following abstracts are given in the order in which they appear in the programme.

- (1) Donna Runnals (McGill University). "Qumran and Masada: an examination of Jewish sectarian attitudes during the First Revolt".

When a scroll fragment containing part of the 4Q 'Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice' was found in the Masada excavation, Yigael Yadin suggested that it served as proof that the Essenes had participated in the revolt against the Romans. This paper reviews the archaeological evidence and re-examines the sectarian positions described in Josephus' Jewish War as well as in other sources in order to clarify the attitudes of the Essenes and the Zealots toward each other and toward participation in the First Revolt.

- (2) Baruch Halpern (York University). "The Ritual of Kingship and the Early Israelite Monarchy".

Saul's coronation stands between two eras in Israelite history and religion. Before it, the theological conception of the savior-judge, the pattern of whose career has been epitomized in Judg. 2:11-19; 3:7-11, infused Israelite views of the league leadership. After it, the royal ideology grew slowly into the form it assumed under Solomon.

This study examines, in the context of a new source division of 1 Sam 8-14, the place of Saul's accession in this historical continuum. Saul is seen to be portrayed in the narratives as an avatar of the Divine Warrior, like the "judges" who preceded; this same conception is seen to underlie the earliest forms of Israel's coronation rituals, which have apparently been informed by Saul's. At the same time, the constitutional modifications introduced with the change to monarchy under Saul are seen to have prototypical reflections in the narratives of his rise. Evidently, the process of the king's designation and "election" remained the same throughout the history of Israel's monarchy.

- (3) Alan Mendelsohn (McMaster University). "Secular Education and Greek Wisdom among Jews of the Hellenistic Period".

I shall begin the presentation with an overview of the role of the liberal arts and sciences in classical authors (cf. Plato's Republic VII). Next I shall examine briefly the rabbinic concept which most closely approximates the Greek one: i.e., Greek Wisdom. Turning to Philo of Alexandria, I shall argue that the parallel concept found in his writings differs from both of the above traditions. Whereas the classical Greeks considered secular education simply as a stepping-stone to philosophy, Philo endowed it with theological significance. Whereas the rabbis seem to have been distrustful (at best) of what they perceived as an alien body of knowledge, Philo was receptive to Greek secular culture. Philo's position is a measure of the assimilation of some of his co-religionists. Philo's views also are indicative of the cultural priorities and aspirations of upper-class Alexandrian Jewry.

- (4) R.W. Huebsch (Niagara University). "Remnant in the Book of Jubilees".

Few scholars would question the importance of "the remnant" for understanding the thrust of the Hebrew Bible. Similarly, "the remnant" has been understood as integral to the full appreciation of the New Testament message. Unfortunately, however, there has been no systematic attempt to examine the function and significance of "the remnant" in the inter-testamental period. It is the purpose of this paper to begin to remedy this situation by discussing the meaning and the significance of "the remnant" in the Pseudepigraphic Book of Jubilees.

- (5) R.W. Fisher (Wilfrid Laurier University). "Messengers at Mari".

This paper attempts to deal with two concerns. The first is the function of certain messengers found in the Mari texts and called mubassiri. The evidence seems to indicate that these mubassiri were probably military couriers who brought the good news of military victory.

The second concern is the maximum utilization of the minute details of the economic and administrative documents which are so numerous in cuneiform literature. The findings of this particular paper are based partly upon a careful scrutiny of two "delivery receipts".

A brief postscript considers the significance this data may have the mebassar, the "herald of good news", in Second Isaiah.

- (6) Jared J. Jackson (Pittsburgh Theological Seminary).  
"Style in Ugaritic Letters"

(Abstract not available)

- (7) David J. Hawkin (Memorial University), "Intention and Structure in the Fourth Gospel".

It is axiomatic that Johannine theology is expressed in a narrative of the past. This signifies a transposition with two facets: theology is transposed into story and present into past. In the Fourth Gospel this transposition and retrojection is bolder, more central to the Evangelist's intention and more through-going than in the Synoptics. In the performance of this transposition the Fourth Evangelist reveals his deepest concern. He wishes to present Jesus as the way, for he is truth and life. This paper argues that an examination of the structure of the Fourth Gospel reveals this central concern to be expressed as a single development in two phases, which I have called "normative religion" and "normative Christianity".

- (8) R. Pummer (University of Ottawa), "New Evidence for Samaritan Christianity?"

Whereas the question of Jewish Christians and their theology has been much discussed, a corresponding consideration of Samaritan Christians is of recent origin. The research into the latter has concentrated on finding traces of their theology in certain New Testament writings. For the later periods, not even their existence seems to be ascertainable with certainty. In recent years, some archaeological and epigraphic data came to light that are interpreted as evidence for the continued existence of Samaritan Christians up to approximately the 6th/7th century. It is these finds that will be discussed in the present paper.

- (9) Earl Breech (York University), "Symbol and Metaphor, Kingdom of God and the Parables of Jesus".

It has become an axiom of New Testament scholarship that "the Kingdom of God is the ultimate referent of the parables of Jesus" (Norman Perrin). But did Jesus appear as one who proclaimed the Kingdom? Do the parables function to refer to the Kingdom?

These questions can be addressed by considering the relationship between symbol and metaphor, Kingdom of God and the parables of Jesus. It will be argued that the parables do not function to refer to the Kingdom of God, as Perrin claims. Rather, the parables -- uttered in response to questions about the Kingdom -- function to disclose a world in which that power is called "God" which engenders "all things counter, original, spare, strange" (Hopkins).

#### 10. Seminar on Anti-Judaism (I)

- (a) John Horman, "Anti-Celtiberianism in the Roman Empire"

Expressions of dislike or hostility to other cultural or national groups were not unusual within the Roman Empire. Every student of Classical literature will recall passages of this nature directed against the Jews, the Syrians, the Persians, the Asians, the Greeks and the Egyptians, and others. Even the Celtiberians come in for their share of abuse. Expressions of hostility or dislike toward the Jews within the New Testament should be seen in the light of similar expressions of antagonism by many classical authors to other groups within the Roman Empire. Thus it is doubtful whether the author of the Gospel of John used "the Jews" as shorthand to describe either the ruling Jewish authorities or the unbelieving world. A more likely hypothesis is that he simply had a stereotyped dislike of Jews, just as Catullus had a stereotyped dislike of Celtiberians. Anti-Jewish sentiment in John becomes a problem because later generations, reading the Gospel of John as scripture, came to see these expressions as revealing eternal truths rather than one man's prejudice.

- (b) Paul Garnet, "The Qumran Attitude to Outsiders in the Light of the Exilic Soteriology".

(Abstract not available)

- (c) Donna Runnalls, "Josephus' Polemic: A Study of Method"

By restricting the definition of polemic to "an aggressive attack on or refutation of the opinions or principles of another" (Webster's Third New International Dictionary) this paper will isolate specific passages in the Jewish War and Contra Apionem.



An analysis of the polemic of these passages will show that three methods are used. These methods have been tentatively called: the polemical reverse, the sermon-diatribes, and the rhetorical argument.

11. Michael Newton (McMaster University) "The Concept of Purity in the Letters of Paul".

It has long been recognized by students of Judaism that attitudes to the Jewish purity laws served to delineate different religious groups in the period 200 b.c.e. - 200 c.e. and that a concern with purity loomed large in the lives of Jews. A persistence of this concern can be discerned in the letters of Paul. While he declared that "nothing is unclean in itself", he makes use of a terminology that reflects the deep influence the purity traditions had on him. Some of the central tenets of his belief are elucidated by the concept of purity. The purity language of the Temple sanctuary is applied to the new Christian community and he retains the traditional view regarding sex and family life, as well as the view that sinful acts in themselves bring about impurity. A reading of Paul from the point of view of purity can provide us with valuable insights into his thought.

12. Adrian Leske (Concordia College), "The Christological Implications in Matt. 11: 28-30".

Arguments that Jesus is depicted in this strophe as wisdom personified on the basis of its parallels with Sir. 51 break down with Jesus' claim to be praus kai tapeinos to kardia. This paper examines the background of this terminology in Old Testament and intertestamental literature and concludes that the present English translations of this phrase are generally misleading, that the Messiahship of Jesus presented here is in opposition to the messianic ideas prevalent in his day, that Jesus is here depicted as the poor man par excellence.

13. Seminar on Anti-Judaism (II)

- (a) William Klassen, "Recent Publications on Anti-Judaism in the New Testament".

Some further contributions to the literature in this area will be assessed. This assessment will include the collection of primary sources published by M. Stern and also a selection of articles and books published during the past year. As time permits, a critical evaluation will be made of these contributions as well.

- (b) Benno Przybylski, "The Sitz im Leben of the Anti-Jewish Polemic in the Gospel of Matthew".

(Abstract not available)

- (c) David Granskou, "The Structure of Matthew's Gospel and its Anti-Jewish Implications"

Is there a movement within the Matthean structure which has an anti-Jewish aspect? Initial evidence seems to suggest a mission of Jesus to Israel in the first thirteen chapters of Matthew's which changes in chapter thirteen into a mission to a New Israel and the world, away from Judaism. The paper will explore the extent to which these observations can be substantiated in detail.

\* \* \* \*



CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

SOCIÉTÉ CANADIENNE DES ÉTUDES BIBLIQUES

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY

(Annual Meeting, London, 1978)

The 46th annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies/Société Canadienne des Etudes Bibliques was held at the University of Western Ontario (London) during the 1978 Learned Societies Conference, on May 27th, 1978.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Dr. John Sandys-Wunsch, at 1500 hours.

The following persons were present at the Annual Meeting of the Society in London, 1978:

C. Anderson, W. Aufrecht, E. Bellefontaine, E. Bieman, A. Brunet, P. Craigie, E. Combs, E. Crowley, B. Cullen, J. Dahms, P. Davis, B. Fisher, C. Foley, D. Fox, D. Fraikin, L. Gaston, D. Granskou, B. Halpern, D. Hawkin, J. Horman, R. Huebsch, J. Jackson, H. Kay, C. Kazmierski, W. Klassen, J. Kloppenborg, A. Leske, W. McCreedy, B. Martin, A. Mendelson, H. Merklinger, S. Miletic, P. Milne, M. Newton, R. Osborne, R. Pummer, B. Przybylski, A. Reinhartz, P. Richardson, D. Runnalls, E. Sanders, J. Sandys-Wunsch, V. van Zutphen, N. Wagner, J.D. Whitehead, J. Wood.

1. The minutes of the 45th Annual Meeting (published in the Bulletin) were approved.
2. Report of the Executive Secretary (P.C. Craigie)
  - 2.1. The Executive Committee of the Society met in Toronto (February 11th, 1978). The principal item of business was the programme for the Annual Meetings. Other items of business are discussed elsewhere in this report.
  - 2.2. The 1978 Annual Meeting marks the first anniversary of the dissolution of the Canadian Region of the S.B.L. The Executive Committee are still working, in conjunction with the S.B.L., on an appropriate form of linkage between the two societies. In the meantime, the large overlap in membership between the C.S.B.S. and the S.B.L. ensures continuing good relationships.

- 2.3. Humanities Research Council of Canada (Canadian Federation for the Humanities). The Annual Meeting of the H.R.C.C. was held on May 26th, 1978; the Secretary will report orally on events transpiring at that meeting.

The secretary, who is currently the Society's representative to H.R.C.C., will be considered for the position of Director (there is a rotating system of representation of Societies by means of Directors); an oral report will be presented on this matter.

- 2.4. Registration as a Charitable Organization

The C.S.B.S./S.C.E.B. has now achieved status as a registered charity in Canada; as such, it can receive gifts, which are tax-deductible for income tax purposes. Further details will be announced to all members in the Fall mailing.

- 2.5. Canadian Biblical Studies Project

Professor John Moir has been awarded a Canada Council leave fellowship for 1978/79, and will begin the writing part of the project during the leave. He has already made considerable progress in microfilming the Society's records, bulletins, etc., and has prepared a substantial bibliography.

- 2.6. Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion

The Annual Meeting of the Corporation was held on May 26th. The secretary will present an oral report of the proceedings and transactions of the Corporation.

- 2.7. Essay Prizes

The Society extends its congratulations to Ms. Adele Reinhartz, McMaster University, who was awarded the Essay Prize for a paper pertaining to the New Testament. No prize was awarded in the category of Old Testament/Hebrew Bible.

- 2.8. The Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas intends to hold its annual meeting in Toronto in 1980. The society, upon the decision of the Executive Committee, has associated itself with the invitation already extended to S.N.T.S. and offered its support in the preparation of the meetings.
- 2.9. This annual meeting marks the end of the term of service by the current Executive Secretary. The last three years have seen a number of changes in the life of the Society:

the full membership of the Society in the H.R.C.C., the dissolution of the Canadian Region of the S.B.L., the granting of charitable registration, etc. The secretary conveys his best wishes to his successor in the task, Professor Peter Richardson, Principal of University College in the University of Toronto.

### 3. Report of the Treasurer (W. Aufrecht)

- 3.1. By 31 October 1977 (our cut-off date for receiving members into the Society for any given year) our membership totalled 123, an increase of 15 over the previous year, even though 8 members did not renew. Since that date, 16 renewed and new memberships have been received, for a total of 139 members as of 1 May 1978.

The breakdown of membership is as follows:

Honourary	5
Full	102
Dual (CTS or CSSR)	15
Student	17
	139

As of 1 June 1978, 88 members (including the 5 honorary ones) had submitted their dues for the period 30 June 1978 to 31 December 1979. Seven of these are new or lapsed members. Following the Annual Meeting, the names of those members paid up for 1978/79 will be sent to the WLU Press, distributors of the journal Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses. The Society cannot afford any delinquency in payment. Your subscription to SR ends on 30 June if your current dues are not in.

Beginning in July, annual membership will be brought into conformity with the publication of the journal SR. This means that members other than those who receive the Journal through another society, will receive 6 issues of the journal. There has been no increase in the fee with this change. However, it does mean that full membership is \$15.00, student membership is \$9.00 and dual membership is \$7.50.

The Canada Council (through the Humanities Research Council) continues to support the CSBS through its programme of travel grants. The Society received \$1,048.00 to cover the transportation costs of bringing the Executive together in Toronto (11 February). This included the President (St. John's), the Vice-President (Vancouver), the Executive Secretary (Calgary) and two members-at-large (Waterloo and London).

We have also received from the Canada Council \$1,656.00 this year towards travel expenses to the Annual Meeting (London), an increase of 20% over what was expected. The amount of money the Society receives for this purpose is based on the number of members who officially registered at the Annual Meeting the previous year. It is often the case that members choose not to pay the conference registration fee, though they are in attendance. Each member, who saves himself \$25.00, costs the Society about \$60.00 in next year's travel grant! If everyone registered, we would have a higher travel grant, more people could get travel money, and the cost for those in attendance could amount to less. Therefore, we urge members to register officially so that the following year more money can be made available for the purposes of travel.

Apart from the Canada Council, our financial support comes exclusively through membership dues. Most of this money goes to the journal. In addition, beginning this year, a \$3.00 assessment per full-time faculty member was paid to HRCC to cover cost of the Society's membership in that organization. This means that the Society retains \$1.00 from full-time faculty who are full members of the Society (our largest category of membership). For the next year and a half, the membership fee has not been changed but if the Society is to maintain a full programme for its members, a raise in fees will be necessary.

### 3.2. Financial Statement. 3 June 1977 - 1 June 1978

<u>Income</u>		<u>Expenditures</u>	
Balance on Hand	\$1,393.78	Corporation Dues (76-77)	36.00
Dues (77-78)	589.00	Annual Meeting (76-77)	59.43
CC-Travel/Exec.	1,048.00	BULLETIN (76-77)	77.88
CC-Travel/Ann.Meet.	1,656.00	Exec. Meeting (76-77)	58.38
Miscellaneous	5.00	Bank Charges (76-77)	1.00
Dues (78-79)	1,105.50	SR Subscriptions (123)	738.00
		Student Essay	50.00
		Exec. Meeting (77-78)	1,124.40
		BULLETIN (77-78)	129.10
		HRCC	150.00
		Travel Annual Meeting	1,656.00
		Miscellaneous	10.00
		Bank Charges (77-78)	1.00
		Annual Meeting (77-78)	82.00
		Corporation Dues (77-78)	36.00
			\$4,209.19
		Balance on Hand	
		1 June 1978	\$1,588.09
	<u>\$5,797.28</u>		<u>\$5,797.28</u>



4. Report of the Nominating Committee (C.P. Anderson)

- 4.1. Nominated for Vice-President: Prof. Vernon Fawcett  
 4.2. Nominated as "Member-at-large" and Programme Chairman for 1979: Prof. Benno Przybylski.
- Both nominees were elected; a full list of officers will be published elsewhere (in the Bulletin).

5. New Members

The following persons were elected to membership in the Society:

Pierre Bongie (Grand Séminaire de Montréal); Earl Breech (York University); D.A. Carson (Northwest Baptist Theological Seminary); Philip G. Davies (McMaster University); Harold H.P. Dressler (Vancouver); Michael W. Duggan (University of Calgary); Pierre Guillemette (Université de Montréal); Vern A. Hannah (Canadian Nazarene College); Harold A. Kay (Huron College); Carl R. Kazmierski (Ottawa University); B. Barry Levy (McGill University); Shirley Magder (Toronto); Brice Martin (Agincourt); Wayne O. McCready (McMaster University); G. Plaut (Toronto); R. Pummer (University of Ottawa); William P. Vanderveeken (Mount Albert); Vincent H. Vanzutphen (St. Peter's Seminary);

6. Annual Meeting (1979). The annual meeting in 1979, in conjunction with the Learned Societies Conference, will be held at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon.7. Raise in Membership Dues, 1980.

The following new schedule of dues, to become effective in 1980, was presented by the Treasurer and approved by those present at the Annual Meeting:

Full membership:	\$15.00
Student membership:	\$9.00
Dual* membership:	\$7.50

(\*Subscription to SR paid through another Society).

Note: This will be the first raise in dues for several years.

## 8. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1615.

[Note: letters of thanks were sent, on behalf of the Society, to (a) Principal Morden (Huron College) and (b) Maurice Davidson, (Director, Learned Societies Conference).]

Respectfully submitted,

P.C. Craigie (Exec. Sec.)



- (3) Professor Benno Przybylski,  
Dept. of Religious Studies,  
McMaster University,  
Hamilton, Ontario.

Other Offices:

- (a) Local Representative: Annual Meeting (1979)

Professor Christopher Foley,  
St. Thomas More College,  
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

- (b) Representative to the Canadian Federation for the Humanities

Professor Peter Craigie, (Director, 1978-81)  
Department of Religious Studies,  
University of Calgary,  
Calgary, Alberta.

- (c) Research and Publication Committee

Chairman: Professor David Whitehead (519) 884-8110  
Members: to be appointed

- (d) Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/ Corporation  
Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses

Members nominated by the Society/ membres només  
de la Société:

- (1) C.H.H. Scobie
- (2) A.M. Brunet
- (3) J. Cahill
- (4) J.C. Hurd
- (5) N.E. Wagner
- (6) P.C. Craigie (designated Director) (403) 284-6987  
Dept. of Religious Studies,  
University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta.

THE TRIAL OF JESUS AS JEWISH-CHRISTIAN POLARIZATION

1979 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

THE CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

Charles P. Anderson  
University of British Columbia

May, 1979

THE TRIAL OF JESUS AS JEWISH-CHRISTIAN POLARIZATION

Blasphemy and Polemic in Mark's Gospel

Charles P. Anderson

University of British Columbia

The exchange of the historicizing approach to the gospels for the redactional and the literary not only calls attention to the literary and theological dynamics of individual narratives and the gospels as wholes; it also raises new questions about the evangelists' perceptions of and responses to events contemporary to them. It is now widely recognized that the gospel figure of Jesus is at least sometimes a champion of the evangelist's views. One thing is certain -- Jesus and the evangelist never disagree!<sup>1</sup> J. Louis Martyn may not be far from the truth when he daringly suggests (at least it was daring in 1968) the concept of 'doubling'; in some texts in the Fourth Gospel, 'Jesus' represents both Jesus of Nazareth and the contemporary Christian preacher.<sup>2</sup> This insight probably applies more or less to each of the gospels. In Mark's case, considerable attention has been given to the literary aspects of the gospel as story, particularly to its main characters, identified by T.J. Weeden as Jesus, the Jewish 'Establishment', the disciples, and the crowds.<sup>3</sup> Such studies have emphasized what may be called intramural polemics, demonstrating how Mark's Jesus corrects the disciples' misunderstanding by teaching a passion Christology and its corollary of appropriate discipleship.

In this paper, I shall concentrate on Mark's extra-mural polemic as it is expressed in the narrative of Jesus' trial by the Jewish court. Two points will be emphasized and a question raised. The points are these: 1) The blasphemy charge is of basic importance for Mark's gospel. Not only is it the core of the trial narrative, but it serves a further literary purpose in relating the trial, the climax of Jewish rejection of Jesus' teaching, to the beginnings of Jewish opposition. 2) The 'blasphemy against the Holy Spirit' is not the key to Mark's blasphemy motif. On the contrary, it stands apart from all other blasphemy texts in Mark and must be interpreted accordingly. The question is, to what extent does the Jewish trial in Mark reflect events in his own time, in which Christians found themselves caught up?

I. Mark's understanding of the blasphemy charge.

A. The two charges.

Mark's account of Jesus' trial by the Jewish court contains two charges. The first arises out of testimony concerning a temple saying attributed to Jesus:

And some stood up and bore false witness against him, saying, 'We heard him say, "I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands."' (14:57f.)

No law is alleged to have been broken, nor does Mark have any such law in mind. That misses the point. Kilpatrick is on the wrong track when he connects this saying to the following blasphemy charge, taking his cue from Acts 6:11-14.<sup>4</sup> The key to the passage, as Lloyd Gaston has correctly seen,<sup>5</sup> is in what at first reading seems



curious, namely that, as an example of false testimony, Mark utilizes a saying which he himself regards as authentic. Apparently, Matthew also found it curious and by clever modifications transformed the false witnesses into true witnesses and their testimony into a validation of his own christology.<sup>6</sup> In Matthew the saying is not about destroying and building temples, but about the power or authority of Jesus. It is christological rather than ecclesiological.

However, Mark also has transformed the saying. Gaston is probably correct in maintaining that this saying has come to Mark by way of anti-Christian polemic -- as it also has to John and Luke -- and that Mark has put this negative charge to positive use. Mark's major change was the addition of the word pair cheiropoiētos/acheiropoiētos, a well-known motif in early Christian teaching concerning the temple theme.<sup>7</sup> A corollary of this addition is the Christian distinction between temples -- between the one in Jerusalem, and the eschatological community. The form of the saying in 15:29, placed on the lips of mockers, 'You destroyer and three-day rebuilders of the temple,' shows that Mark is aware that in anti-Christian polemic this distinction is not made. The same is true in John 2:20. Both Mark and John naturally consider the anti-Christian interpretation a misunderstanding. To accuse Jesus on the basis of a misunderstanding of one of his sayings could certainly be regarded by Mark as bearing false witness.<sup>8</sup>

However, it is not the temple saying that proves decisive in Jesus' trial, but the other charge:

And the high priest tore his mantle, and said, 'Why do we still need witnesses? You have heard his blasphemy. What is your decision?' And they all condemned him as deserving death. (14:63f.)

On the grounds that Jesus has blasphemed during the trial itself, the court convicts and sentences him. Matthew makes only stylistic changes to this passage; in essence he agrees with Mark. On the other hand, neither Luke nor John mentions either charge in their respective narratives, though both charges or reasonable facsimiles surface elsewhere in their writings.<sup>9</sup>

#### B. Blasphemy in Mark

The term 'blasphemy' appears seven times in Mark, four in verbal and three in substantive form.<sup>10</sup> Three instances are in the pericope of the unforgivable sin (3:28f.). Another belongs to a list of defilements arising out of the heart of man (7:22; translated 'slander' in RSV and NEB). The fifth refers to taunts directed at Jesus on the cross (15:29; they 'derided' him -- RSV). In the remaining two examples, the word is applied by Jewish leaders to statements of Jesus, to his forgiveness of the paralytic's sins (2:7) and to his confession of his own identity during the trial (14:64). Among these texts, blasphemy has an expressed object in only two cases. In 3:29 it is the Holy Spirit; in 15:29 it is Jesus. It is obvious that in 2:7 and 14:64, the implied object is God. The three remaining cases seem to be a different order. Even if God or divine things are still the implied object, and that is not certain, the seriousness of the offence is much less than in 2:7, 3:29 and 14:64. That is certainly the case with the two usages in

3:28, where 'blasphemies' stand in contrast to the unforgivable blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The same is true in 7:22 where 'blasphemy' is one vice among others which vulgarize (*koinounta*) man, or render him impure. These two passages (3:28; 7:22) may therefore be set aside as not directly relevant to the present inquiry. The important texts are those where either God, the Holy Spirit, or Jesus is the object of blasphemy and where blasphemy is taken with utmost seriousness.<sup>11</sup>

1. Jesus' forgiveness of the paralytic's sins (2:1-12).

The significance of this pericope in the collection of conflict stories culminating in the determination of Jesus' enemies to destroy him is well known. Perhaps less widely recognized is its importance in introducing the blasphemy motif in Mark and, in turn, Mark's artful integration of that motif with the beginning and the climax of Jewish polemic against Jesus' teaching. In 1:14-3:6, following the prologue, Mark sets the stage for the rest of his gospel. In chapter 1 he tells of Jesus' mission to Galilee, his healings, exorcisms and teaching. With the understandable exception of the unclean spirits, everyone's response is positive. The first disciples abandon vocational and kinship commitments to follow Jesus. His *didache*, unlike that of the scribes, is recognized as authoritative in the Capernaum synagogue. People come seeking him from 'everywhere'; (1:37,45). But in chapter 2, a new note is introduced: the positive response, while continued, is now joined by a negative one on the part of the scribes and Pharisees and Herodians (2:6f., 16, 24; 3:2,6). The community is now shown to be

divided in its assessment of Jesus' *didache*. Thus early in the gospel, Mark exhibits opposing responses to Jesus. The one leads to the formation of a body of disciples authorized to preach and to exorcise in his name (6:7-13).<sup>12</sup> The other leads to Jesus' death. Mark has no interest in demonstrating a chronological relationship between the opposing responses but simply that the two exist.

Growing out of the negative response to Jesus is a conspiracy motif, which emerges fully in 3:1-6. Noteworthy are the following points: (1) Prior to any word or act of Jesus, his opponents are watching him, or even lying in wait for him,<sup>13</sup> to see if he will violate the Sabbath by healing a withered hand.<sup>14</sup> (2) Their purpose is to 'accuse him,' i.e., in a court of law (*katēgorēsōsin autou*).<sup>15</sup> Despite the fact that Mark does not mention Sabbath healing in Jesus' trial, it is clear that this passage points forward to the trial narrative. In the Fourth Gospel also, breaking the Sabbath, like the blasphemy of making Jesus equal with God, is cause for seeking Jesus' death (5:18; 10:33,36). (3) Those who oppose Jesus have hardened hearts. Mark may think of their hardness of heart as explaining why they reject one who brings good news and who heals, thereby denying themselves his benefits.<sup>16</sup> (4) Pharisees who had been present plot with the Herodians against Jesus, with the intention of killing him (*auton apolesōsin*).

Having established his conspiracy motif, Mark does not return to it until 8:31. From then on it is never far from the surface (10:33f.; 11:18; 12:13; 14:1; 10f., 43ff.) and leads directly to the Sanhedrin trial and beyond it to the trial before Pilate and on to



the crucifixion. Mark leaves no doubt that Jesus' death was due to a plot by the Jewish leaders, who were involved at every stage of opposition to Jesus.

Now, to return to the blasphemy motif. Blasphemy is the first charge (though as yet unspoken) made against Jesus by his opponents in Mark. Such an emphatic position is hardly fortuitous. Further, as the first member of the conflict stories, it stands in special relation to the last member, where Jesus' death is plotted. The association of blasphemy and conspiracy is thus established in that early portion of the Gospel where the opposing responses to Jesus are also laid out. What is forgiveness of sins to the one is blasphemy to the other. Finally, the series -- opposition, charge of blasphemy, conspiracy to kill Jesus -- point forward to the trial, where one again, in concert, they prove to be the decisive motifs. From a thematic perspective, therefore, the blasphemy motif introduced in 2:7 is not only significant; in Mark's gospel it is indispensable. It ties together other essential motifs in Mark and provides the author with a conceptual tool which will later be employed skillfully and powerfully as he brings to a climax his treatment of anti-Christian polemic.

## 2. The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (3:29f.)

The second mention of blasphemy in Mark is also found in a polemical context. In response to the scribal accusation that he exorcises by the power of Beelzebul by whom he is possessed, Jesus first questions the logic involved with three sayings concerning divisions -- a divided kingdom cannot stand, nor a divided house,

nor, obviously, a divided Satan. Mark places next the saying about plundering the strong man's house, which presupposes a different logic from the preceding sayings, but which Mark sees as applicable to the fall of Satan's kingdom. Finally, the logion involving the unforgivable sin caps the series, ending with Mark's pointer back to the beginning accusation:

'Truly I say to you, all sins will be forgiven the sons of men, and whatever blasphemies they utter; but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin, -- for they had said, "He has an unclean spirit."' (3:28-30)

The importance of this saying to Mark is indicated by the introductory asseveration, 'Amen legō hymin'.<sup>17</sup> The subject, as in our first pericope, 2:7, is the forgiveness of sins, but in this case concentrates on a particular type of sin.

Mark's rough Greek (hosa-- neuter-- properly refers to hamartēmata, not blasphēmiai - feminine) need not detain us,<sup>19</sup> nor deflect our attention from the main issue, which is the one exception to the rule of universal forgiveness of sins. An interpretation of this text must take into account the Q version of the saying in which a sharp distinction is drawn between a word spoken against the Son of Man and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Matt. 12:32; Luke 12:10). In all three gospels a two-part form is employed in which the second part is a contrast to the first. In Luke, the first part of the saying affirms forgiveness of anyone who speaks against the Son of Man; the second denies it to one who blasphemes the Spirit. Luke makes no reference to the Markan sins and blasphemies which

will be forgiven the sons of men. In Matthew, both points are made, each in a two part form:

Therefore, I tell you, every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven men, but the blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven. And whoever says a word against the Son of man will be forgiven; but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come. (12:31f.)

Only Mark directly relates the saying to the Beelzebul pericope (v. 30; cf. v. 22), though in order he is followed by Matthew. Luke indicates no connection at all between the unforgivable sin and Beelzebul.

The question is, does Mark agree or disagree with the position taken by Matthew and Luke? Does he believe that verbal abuse of the Son of Man is forgivable? According to Burkill, in an article entitled "Blasphemy: St. Mark's Gospel as Damnation History," "... in St. Mark's view any hostile expression of apistia -- disbelief in Jesus as Messiah, the Son of God and the Son of man -- constitutes an instance of blasphem̄ia."<sup>20</sup> Since Jesus possesses the Spirit (1:10), to speak a word against Jesus is to blaspheme the Spirit. Burkill's theory of reciprocity holds that, in Mark's view, to accuse Jesus of blasphemy is to blaspheme, not in the weaker sense of 7:22, but in the stronger sense of 3:29. Thus Burkill interprets the trial and the paralytic pericopes in the light of his understanding of 3:29, and concludes that Mark's gospel is really bad news for the Jewish leaders. In attributing blasphemy to Jesus, they unwittingly commit the unpardonable sin.

Burkill's interpretation might be more convincing if he had explained how Matthew and Luke, who share and intensify Mark's conception of the close relationship between the Spirit and Jesus (e.g., Matt. 1:18,20; 3:16; Luke 1:35; 3:22; 23:46), nevertheless explicitly deny that a word against Jesus is the blasphemy against the Spirit. To assume a simple identification between the Spirit and Jesus in Mark is unwarranted, and I suggest that Mark does not disagree with the other synoptists on this point. Mark's silence regarding the consequences for salvation of verbal attacks against Jesus is hardly evidence in itself for one position or the other. However, that very silence may well have precipitated the need for both Matthew and Luke to include the clarifying saying of Q.

There are two separate issues here -- the meaning of the logion in itself,<sup>20a</sup> and the use made of it by Mark. The point of the logion derives from an attack on the Holy Spirit. But the saying does not indicate what constitutes such an attack, except that it must be something quite extraordinary since it is different from all other "blasphemies and sins." By assigning it the Beelzebul setting Mark indicates his interpretation of the saying, which seems to be along these lines: the unforgivable sin is the confusion or reversal of the symbols of good and evil.<sup>21</sup> To identify the Holy Spirit as Beelzebul or the prince of demons is to commit an unparalleled error regarding ultimate matters. It demonstrates the lack of the valuating and ordering ability necessary to recognize right and wrong, truth and error, good and evil. It shows that one's true end is lost to view. This is much more serious than losing the



way. A path can be found again, but if the goal has become a non-goal, or a non-goal the goal, no path is sufficient. To blaspheme Jesus shows that one is not on the right path. But to blaspheme the Spirit indicates that most fearsome, pathological, and destructive of all human conditions where the goal itself is confused. For Mark, that condition stands apart from all others.

My conclusion, therefore, is that the paralytic pericope and the unforgivable sin pericope deal with different issues. The latter goes beyond the Jewish-Christian controversy, even though the two may intersect at points. The typical Jewish anti-Christian polemic is expressed in 2:7. It would be academic to ask whether Mark thought that blasphemy there was forgivable, since it is Jesus who is accused, and that falsely. Nevertheless, I think it likely that if asked whether the accusation itself is forgivable, Mark would reply, "Of course it is forgivable. See my book on this, e.g., 3:28 and 7:22."

### 3. The Sanhedrin trial (14:61-64)

The accusation found in 2:7 is repeated in the trial. Here, however, it is portrayed unmistakably as the official or normative Jewish assessment, not just of Jesus' claim to forgive sins, but of his identity. I say 'official or normative' not only because of the broad representation in the trial of Jewish leadership,<sup>22</sup> but also because of the trial format itself. Whereas John and Luke envisage what is best called a preliminary hearing,<sup>23</sup> there can be no doubt that Mark, and following him Matthew, intend their readers to conceive of a trial in a Jewish court. Mark calls it a

sanhedrin,<sup>24</sup> portrays the high priest as its presiding officer, includes witnesses and their testimony, has a decision called for and a judgment delivered. How better demonstrate the decisive issue between Jew and Christian than bring them into a trial, indeed make them emerge as the core of the trial?

It is also important to recognize the basis of this normative assessment. Together, the high priest's question and Jesus affirmative reply constitute a Christological confession,<sup>25</sup> containing the two basic Christological titles in Mark: Christ and Son of the Blessed, i.e., Son of God. The interpretive Son of Man, used by Mark in the passion predictions to give a correct view of the title 'Christ,' has that same function here.<sup>26</sup> Further, the reply contains other Christian affirmations concerning Jesus' enthronement and parousia. The *ego eimi* has nothing to do with Exodus 3:14, as Haenchen recognizes (against Stauffer)<sup>27</sup>, but is simply a natural part of the dialogue with the high priest, so that out of it emerges a model Christian confession. One could almost find here the core of a baptismal liturgy in which the candidate is asked, 'Do you believe in Jesus, the Son of God?' He answers, 'I do.' The following Son of Man saying is not part of the formula, but is placed in conjunction with it, and derived ultimately from Daniel 7:13 and Ps. 110:1.<sup>28</sup>

A further point of interest is the paradigmatic nature of Jesus' confession, especially in the context of a gospel where discipleship is urged in terms strongly suggesting imitation (8:34-8; 10:43f.). Jesus now practices what he preached in 13:9-11, where he told his disciples that they would be delivered up to councils (*synedria*) and

would stand before governors and kings to bear witness before them (or, against them).<sup>29</sup> In Jesus as confessor, Mark presents a model for disciples to follow. Thus are welded into a single unit the christological and discipleship themes which are found in close conjunction in the three passion predictions (8:31-9:1; 9:30-37; 10:32-45).<sup>30</sup> In making his confession, Jesus is both teacher and disciple. This text is the high point of instruction for Christian discipleship.

The difference in type between the temple saying charge and the blasphemy charge should not be overlooked. While the first relates primarily to an act of Jesus, albeit future, the second concerns not a deed but Jesus' identity. That is, from Mark's point of view, Jesus is accused, convicted and sentenced for being who he is. Taken as an accurate statement of fact, this passage has posed insuperable problems.<sup>31</sup> But taken as a dramatic creation it makes eminent sense. Jesus' confession is a necessary element in the trial as determined by Mark's purpose. It expresses the Christian normative statement regarding Jesus. Likewise, the court's judgment represents the Jewish normative statement regarding Jesus, or rather, regarding the Christian confession of Jesus as Christ and Son of God. In this way Mark makes clear the major issues dividing the normative Jewish and Christian teachings and attitudes. For him, the typical response of Jewish authorities toward the gospel is to brand its basic premise blasphemous.

In his article, 'Good News is No News,' Jonathan Smith draws on Morton Smith's notion that in Greco-Roman aretalogies, the terms

magician, divine man, and son of god relate to a single figure, but from three different perspectives, that of the enemies, the 'sceptical but reverent admirers,' and the believers.<sup>32</sup> Even though the terminology does not apply to Mark, and the concept of the 'sceptical but reverent believers' must be substantially modified,<sup>33</sup> the pattern has some significance for Mark, particularly when one considers the overlap between magic and blasphemy. Both transgress well recognized limits of human activity and in fact were considered illegal in their respective settings and could entail the death sentence.<sup>34</sup> Both involve speech which is deemed capable of unleashing dangerous power on the community. The concept of magician could almost be substituted for that of blasphemer in the Markan trial narrative. However, that would greatly weaken the contrast Mark wishes to make, and very likely, would not strike the same responsive note in his community. The term blasphemy belongs to the Jewish anti-Christian polemical tradition, just as the temple saying does, and Mark is not free to exchange either for something else, given his goals.

Before summarizing this section of the paper, we shall briefly consider the only passage in Mark where Jesus is the object of blasphemy, 15:29.

#### 4. The derision of Jesus on the cross (15:29)

In 15:29, some unidentified observers of the crucified Jesus blaspheme him. Translators generally if not universally understand the verb here in its weaker sense, 'They derided him.' That puts this text together with 3:28 and 7:22 and sets it apart from 2:7, 3:29 and 14:64. Blasphemy here is not a rejection of God or the



Holy Spirit, but a ridiculing of a person. The following verse supports this view: 'In a similar way the chief priests and scribes made fun of [him]....' Further, within v. 29 itself, Mark demonstrates this weaker meaning by the exegetical 'wagging their heads' and 'Aha, the destroyer of the sanctuary and the three-day builder.' Their blasphemy consists in this action and these words. Like the following empaizontes, blasphemy here signifies mockery or making fun of Jesus.

#### C. Summary and Conclusions

In Mark's gospel, blasphemy has at least two significantly distinct nuances. The one points to what for Mark is the most hopeless religious perspective possible in which good and evil are wrongly identified. The unforgivable sin is to make the spirit of God into the spirit of Satan. There exists no path to salvation for those who cannot even identify the goal. The other obvious meaning of blasphemy in Mark's gospel does not presuppose that confusion of the symbols of good and evil. Here the object may be persons, such as Jesus in 15:29, or perhaps even God in 3:28 and 7:22. But there is no attack on the traditional symbol system itself.<sup>35</sup> Even though they are not treated with due respect by word and action, the ultimate religious symbols remain intact along with their meanings and their inter-relationships. There is no question but what these blasphemies are forgivable in Mark's view just as they are in Matthew's and Luke's.

To which category do 2:7 and 14:64 belong? Perhaps they constitute a separate class, since they alone are applied to Jesus as

subject. However, in Mark's perspective, the world view from which they spring is that of the Jewish 'establishment'. How does Mark think this differs from the Christian? Apart from practical aspects such as the Sabbath and purity laws, the fundamental distinction concerns the evaluation of Jesus. In this, Mark and John are not far apart. For both, the issue has crystallized around the term 'Son of God,' and its implications. This is fairly clear in John, whose only use of the term 'blasphemy' is in connection with Jesus' proclamation 'I and the Father are one' (10:30; cf. 10:33,36). In Jewish eyes, the status attributed to Jesus by the Christians was indistinguishable from that of God himself. Therefore, the Christian confession was perceived as a breach of the basic Jewish premise of monotheism. What to one is the wisdom of God is to the other blasphemy against God.<sup>36</sup> In this context, blasphemy has something of hybris in it -- it points to human transgression against divine rights. But it presupposes the one God of Judaism whose rights are being violated. This has nothing to do either with cursing God or with blaspheming against the Holy Spirit.<sup>37</sup> To my knowledge, cursing God never appears as a Jewish accusation against Christians, while blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is, I suspect, exclusively a Christian, not a Jewish formulation, as is the cursing of Jesus (1 Cor. 12:3).<sup>38</sup> The issue in Mark 2:7 and 14:64 is Jewish reaction to Christian preaching. In 3:29 it is Christian reaction to a confusion of the symbols of good and evil. The two issues are quite different.

Blasphemy, therefore, expresses both Jewish and Christian viewpoints in Mark. The Jews (erroneously, for Mark) employ the

term against Christians for proclaiming forgiveness of sins in Jesus, the Son of God. The Jews understandably think the Christians are denying the oneness of God. Blasphemy also identifies the unforgivable sin. But there is no warrant for confusing these two usages in Mark's gospel. Mark neither explicitly nor implicitly accuses the Jews of the unforgivable sin for rejecting Jesus. Indeed, despite the fact that the disciples and the Jewish leaders represent those who follow and those who consciously choose not to follow Jesus but rather to oppose him, their difference is one of degree. They are not appropriate symbols of good and evil. Both exhibit apistia. Both serve as a warning to the reader.

My conclusion, therefore, is that in 2:7 and 14:64 we find a third and distinctive use of blasphemy. Here Mark employs it to represent his understanding of Jewish assessment of Christian missionary preaching. By introducing Jewish hostility to Jesus with this concept, and again employing it as the key charge in the trial narrative, Mark binds these two passages together. What was begun in 2:7 reaches its climax in 14:64. At first unspoken, at the end it becomes the proclaimed unanimous verdict of Jewish officials. While the Roman trial and the crucifixion remain to be narrated, Jesus' fate is definitively decided by the Jewish court. The Roman trial, as far as factors normally constituting a trial are concerned, is hardly a trial at all. Pilate does not arrive at a valid decision on the basis of evidence, but merely carries out the will of the Jewish court. The decisive judgment takes place in the Jewish trial narrative.

## II. The trials of Jesus and other Christians

We have now dealt with the blasphemy accusation as Mark's characterization of Jewish anti-Christian polemic. The remaining question is whether Mark's trial narrative is concerned only with the idea of Jewish rejection of the Christian way or if there is a further dimension to be discovered in it.

The proper exploration of this question involves inquiring about the functions of and the reasons for trial stories in early Christian literature. Time permits only a brief treatment here.

It seems probable that trial stories made their appearance at a certain stage in the development of early Christianity. Paul nowhere reveals knowledge of a narrative of a trial either of Jesus or of Christians, nor of the charges mentioned in either the Jewish or the Roman trials in any of the gospels. Why then are such stories involving both Jesus and Christian missionaries found in the gospels and Acts, and why are they so well integrated into their literary contexts? Why was not the Church content to follow the path taken by Paul of concentrating on preaching the crucified and resurrected Messiah? Even an emphasis on Jesus' teaching, his healings and other wonders of revelation and salvation does not necessitate trial stories. What did they contribute to early Christian life?

That Mark has created the Jewish trial scene is supported by overwhelming evidence.<sup>39</sup> Various motifs have been blended into this narrative, some distinctively Markan,<sup>40</sup> some not. The latter are shared with John, who works these motifs into non-trial but still polemical scenes and with Luke, who works them into the trial of



Stephen, but not into his passion narrative. It seems that here as elsewhere in the gospels and Acts the motifs were more important than the settings. All this points to a large measure of literary freedom in the early Church concerning the Jewish trial of Jesus. Even if we assume a 'tradition' of an actual trial or hearing behind Mark's narrative, we still have to ask why Mark has chosen to include that 'tradition' and work it into his gospel in the particular way that he has. Trial stories had become particularly significant in the Church. Why? The obvious answer is that Christians were now facing trials themselves.

That explanation, which is hardly novel, nevertheless may help to place in proper perspective several factors relating to the trial narrative in Mark. We have already observed the essential place given it in this gospel, especially in relation to the charge of blasphemy. Jesus' trial and death have hovered behind the scenes since the first conflict stories, emerging at important points into explicit expression. The importance of the trial is not due just to the fact that it polarizes the Christian and the Jewish ways and illustrates Jewish rejection of the gospel.<sup>41</sup> Mark also makes plain that the trial and its consequences are the result of Jewish hostility to Christian missionizing.<sup>42</sup> The trial is part of a larger pattern: Christian preaching and healing, positive response, as illustrated in the gathering of disciples, negative response as evidenced in hostility and conspiracy, Jewish trial, Roman trial, Roman punishment. Every element in the series is necessary in Mark's gospel, but without the Jewish trial, Roman involvement is

unexplained and the earlier negative response is of no consequence. To take the Jewish trial out of Mark's gospel therefore would remove the one element which explains all the antagonism facing the Christian mission, and would leave the community in peace.

Second, the statement put in Jesus' mouth by Mark can only be understood as a Christian confession. The scene created by Mark surely reflects his conception of events prophesied in 13:9 and being fulfilled in his own time. The accused Jesus is put in a position where he must openly declare himself regarding the Christian homologia. Other charges do not require an answer and, in fulfillment of Isaiah 53:7 and Psalm 38:13-16, the accused is silent. No evidence of wrong-doing is turned up by the court -- this point is reiterated by Pilate in the Roman trial (15:14). But the accused cannot remain unresponsive to the question, do you believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God? There is no way out; the accused must either deny the confession as Peter explicitly does (14:68-72), making himself vulnerable to the Son of Man's denial of himself at the final judgment (8:38), or he must 'hold fast the confession' (Heb. 4:14), risking his life now but saving it for eternity. Naturally, in Mark's narrative, Jesus makes 'the good confession.' (I Tim. 5:12f.) The Jewish authorities are now certain that the accused is guilty of being a Christian. Mark's Jewish trial narrative therefore plays a role similar to John 9:1-34 in identifying Christians.<sup>43</sup> There is a difference, however. In John the narrative ends in the prospective Christian's excommunication from the synagogue and in his confession of faith. In Mark the

trial leads to the Roman court.

Third, as just indicated, the Jewish trial is a bridge to the Roman trial. It stands between the missionary activity of Jesus and his disciples and the Roman trial and execution of Jesus. It is in the Roman court where final decisions are made by those with power to execute. All four gospels make this point. Further, they all portray Jewish leaders as accusers in the Roman court, and the accusations as unrelated (with the minor exception of Luke 23:2 'saying that he himself is Christ a king') to the previous trial or hearing. In Mark's case, a clear distinction is made between the two trials. The first serves positively to identify the individual as a Christian, the second to secure his condemnation by the proper authorities.

Fourth, Mark's account of the Roman trial of Jesus is at least as consistent with what little is known of later Christian trials as with what little is known of Jesus' trial. Consider Mark's picture of the legal basis of Jesus' conviction. It is true that it can be explained in terms of the latitude allowed to proconsuls, legates and prefects or procurators within the well-recognized principles of cognitio and coercitio.<sup>44</sup> However, while Mark apparently knows that Jesus in fact was executed for a political crime (15:26), in the trial scene itself Pilate does not find Jesus guilty of that or any other crime. The sole factors in Pilate's decision against Jesus are the influence of his accusers and the public hostility which they have stirred up (15:15). That pattern of accusers plus public hostility is well known from accounts of later Roman persecutions

of Christians.<sup>45</sup> This feature of the Roman trial may reflect events contemporary to Mark or in the recent past. Tradition has been thoroughly reworked into a 'relevant' narrative.

Fifth, some of Mark's injunctions to secrecy may be best understood in relation to a setting of persecution.<sup>46</sup> Public identification of Christian teachers and healers was all too easy and special precautions were necessary in the troubled times in which Mark writes. Of course, secrecy was not to be confused with denial. If betrayed and called to account, every Christian was required to make an open confession of his faith. However, while its shadow falls over this whole gospel (e.g., see 4:17b, 8:34), martyrdom is not a cultic requirement or even an ideal for Mark. Therefore, one should not take unnecessary risks.

Finally, it is well established that the passion narratives reveal increasingly a shift of blame for Jesus' death from the Romans to the Jews, and that this movement is to be seen already in Mark.<sup>46</sup> Suggested motives for the shift include the necessity of not antagonizing the Romans and the worsening of relations between Jews and Christians. Both points are probably true as far as they go. But we need to divest ourselves even more from presuppositions stemming from seeing these accounts primarily as dealing with the trial of Jesus, and see them also -- perhaps especially -- in relation to the conditions faced by Christians vis-a-vis their neighbours and the Roman government. At present, redactional analysis of Mark's trial stories is mostly concerned with theological questions. What is now needed is a full-scale examination of the



trial narratives and other relevant portions of early Christian literature in relation to the social conditions in which Christians found themselves.<sup>47</sup> We need to construct a much fuller picture of Mark's -- and the other evangelists' -- understanding of Christian-Roman relations, in addition to our growing knowledge of Christian-Jewish relations. Mark is not concerned just with the true believers, the heretics, and the Jewish critics. He is fighting not on two but on three fronts, even though the third of necessity must be treated with some delicacy.

Related to the question of the historical setting of Mark's gospel is his portrait of Jesus. Mark's Jesus has a dual character, but the reason is not that Mark unsuccessfully tries to combine the post-resurrection proclamation with the traditions of an historical Jesus as Wrede thought. Rather, it is to be found in the fact that Jesus has to play two different roles in Mark's gospel: he is both the redeemer and Lord of the community, and its model of discipleship. Jesus represents both the one who "gives his life as a ransom for many," (10:45) and those who stand before governors and kings and are brought to trial (13:9). Whereas Luke finds his heroes among the first generation of Christians (Peter, Stephen, Paul), Mark unequivocally looks to Jesus. None of the disciples is displayed as an example of faith, though I agree with Best<sup>48</sup> and Tannehill<sup>49</sup> that they are not quite as negatively presented as Weeden thinks. While they are not models of faith, still there is hope for their salvation.

Since Jesus has two roles to play, it is not surprising that in the Jewish trial scene features of both the redemptive and the heroic appear in the persecuted Messiah/Son of God/Son of Man. Jesus' confession, however, is strictly heroic. This is obvious not only from its content but also from its relation to the Petrine denial, into which the trial scene is sandwiched. Thus Mark presents in the closest possible relationship two ways of facing persecution. Peter's way calls to mind the interpretation of the parable of the sower:

"And these in like manner are the ones sown upon rocky ground, who, when they hear the word, immediately receive it with joy; and they have no root in themselves, but endure for awhile; then, when tribulation or persecution arises on account of the word, immediately they fall away." (4:16f.)

Peter is the prime example in Mark's gospel of the disciple who falls away. While all the disciples desert Jesus, it is only Peter who actually verbally denies Jesus. Yet he is at the same time one of the first two to follow Jesus (1:16f.). Is it mere chance that in the interpretation of the parable, the seed which springs up so rapidly falls epi ta petrôdē, "upon rocky ground," i.e., upon 'Petrine soil'? Does Mark perceive a pun here on Peter's name? Mark apparently does not understand Petros as Matthew does, in the sense of a solid foundation for a building (Matt. 16:18) but rather as indicating shallowness of fertile soil. This interpretation is consistent with Peter's confession and its sequel in 8:29ff., where Peter's enthusiasm once again is shown to lack depth.

However that may be, at the very time that Peter denies

acquaintance with Jesus, Jesus makes his Christian confession. Mark's Jesus perseveres to the end (13:13). Knowing that the rejection of the gospel by the powerful will lead to their rejection of him, he nevertheless prays, "Not what I will but what you will." (14:36) Mark's Jesus is not only the Messiah, the Son of God, and the Son of Man who inspires awe -- he is also Mark's ideal Christian disciple. Who else could say, "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me" (8:34), and then lead the way?

Does all this necessitate the conclusion that members of Mark's community were facing trials in Roman courts and that they were blaming local leaders of the Jewish community for it?<sup>50</sup> Perhaps not, but that interpretation seems consistent with the evidence. It is possible that Mark is led both by his sources<sup>51</sup> and the requirements of his story to cast the Jewish leaders of Jesus' time in the antagonist's role, and that therefore further inferences should not be drawn about them nor from the trial account. However, Jesus' confession which can only be seen as belonging to the time of the Church, together with his portrayal as the ideal Christian facing persecution and of Peter as the one who apostatizes under pressure, points to Mark's present situation. Mark's redactional hand is to be seen in his molding of the tradition so that it thematizes the world of his community. An important aspect of that world is what they perceive as persecution. Mark's gospel is shaped not just by the kerygma of the early Church, but by its understanding of the kerygma plus the kerygma's reception and rejection and the implications of both for believers.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Robert C. Tannehill, "The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role," JR 57 (1977), 386-405.

<sup>2</sup>History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel (1968), pp. 7-10.

<sup>3</sup>Mark -- Traditions in Conflict (1971); see also Tannehill; Ernest Best, "The Role of the Disciples in Mark," NTS 23 (1977), 377-401; David J. Hawkin, "The Incomprehension of the Disciples in the Marcan Redaction," JBL 91 (1972), 491-500.

<sup>4</sup>G.D. Kilpatrick, The Trial of Jesus (1953), pp. 9f.

<sup>5</sup>No Stone on Another (1970), pp. 65-74.

<sup>6</sup>Matthew achieves this by changing Mark's katalusō into dunamai katalusai (see also Matthew's modification of Mark 6:5 in Matt. 13:58); creating a break between this saying and the concept of bearing false witness by eliminating Mark's epseudomartyroun, by substituting the number 'two' for the Marcan 'some', thereby suggesting the legitimacy of the witnesses, and finally by omitting the Marcan comment that the witnesses did not agree even on this saying.

<sup>7</sup>Gaston, p. 69.

<sup>8</sup>John Donahue traces the false witness motif to a "pre-Markan tradition of the suffering Just One, directly influenced by the psalms: '...for unjust witnesses have risen against me and their injustice is false.' (Ps. 27:12); 'Unjust witnesses rise up; they ask me of things that I know not.' (Ps. 35:11). "Temple, Trial, and Royal Christology" in Werner H. Kelber, ed., The Passion in Mark, Studies in Mark 14-16 (1976), pp. 51-79; see p. 67. Donahue sees this saying as a culmination of "the anti-Jerusalem and anti-Temple polemic which runs through the Gospel."

<sup>9</sup>Acts 6:11-14; John 2:19-21, 10:33-36.

<sup>10</sup>Verbal: 2-7; 3:28; 3:29; 15:29; Substantive: 3:28; 7:22; 14:64. Mark does not indicate any conceptual distinction between the two forms.

<sup>11</sup>For a broader treatment of blasphemy, see Beyer's article in TONT, I: 621ff.

<sup>12</sup>It is true that the disciples are a more complex set of characters than is here suggested; my point is only that they are representatives of those who follow Jesus. Their dullness and



faithlessness are other matters. See Robert C. Tannehill, "The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role," *Journal of Religion* 57 (1977), 386-405. See also Thomas L. Budesheim, "Jesus and the Disciples in Conflict with Judaism," *ZNW* 62 (1971), 190-209.

<sup>13</sup>For this meaning of *paratēreō*, see Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon*, pp. 627f.

<sup>14</sup>Whether in fact healing by word on the Sabbath was not permitted is another matter. See David Flusser, *Jesus*, tr. by Ronald Walls (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), p. 50.

<sup>15</sup>Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich, p. 424.

<sup>16</sup>A similar motif is found in 6:1-6a. See E. Graesser, "Jesus in Nazareth (Mark vi, 1-6a): Notes on the Redaction and Theology of St. Mark." *NTS* 16 (1969-70), 1-23.

<sup>17</sup>V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to Mark* (1959), p. 242.

<sup>18</sup>*Hamartia* in 2:5; *hamartēmata* in 3:28.

<sup>19</sup>Taylor, pp. 242 ff.

<sup>20</sup>T.A. Burkill, "Blasphemy: St. Mark's Gospel as Damnation History," in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part I* (pp. 51-74), ed. by Jacob Neusner (1975), pp. 55f. Donald Juel, *Messiah and Temple* (1977), p. 103, takes much the same line.

<sup>20a</sup>M. Eugene Boring argues that the saying is a prophetic oracle directed at detractors of Christian prophets. "How May We Identify Oracles of Christian Prophets in the Synoptic Tradition? Mark 3:28-29 as a Test Case," *JBL* 91 (1972), 501-521.

<sup>21</sup>T.W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (1949), p. 110.

<sup>22</sup>High priest, chief priests, elders, scribes. But why are the Pharisees (and Herodians) not included? On this see Michael J. Cook, *Mark's Treatment of the Jewish Leaders* (1978), who finds the solution in Mark's sources.

<sup>23</sup>See appendix.

<sup>24</sup>See Ellis Rivkin, "Beth Din, Boulé, Sanhedrin: A Tragedy of Errors," *HUCA* 46 (1975), 181-199. Rivkin convincingly argues that sanhedrins were called by the high priests as required to deal with matters of political concern. These sanhedrins, as political instruments of the Romans, were designed to facilitate Roman rule. They are quite distinct from the Beth Din which an instrument of

dual-law Judaism. A contributing factor to the confusion of the two is the misleading title given to Mishna Sanhedrin which is about the Beth Din, not sanhedrins under the prefects or procurators and high priests.

<sup>25</sup>See Vernon H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (1963), pp. 113-117. Neufeld concludes that "...the basic homologia in the synoptic gospels is 'Iesous estin ho Christos,' followed by 'Iesous estin ho huioi tou theou.'" (p. 117) The first was applied during Jesus' lifetime, the second by the early Church. (pp. 142f.)

<sup>26</sup>Norman Perrin, "The Christology of Mark; A Study in Methodology," *Journal of Religion* 51 (1971), 173-187, see p. 179, n. 12.

<sup>27</sup>Ernest Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu* (1966), 511. John R. Donahue, *Are You the Christ?* (1973), pp. 92f., may be correct in finding here a "formula of revelation or identification" (cf. Mark 6:50; 13:6).

<sup>28</sup>See Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teachings of Jesus* (1967), pp. 173ff.; Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (1961), pp. 48f.

<sup>29</sup>Neufeld (p. 31) sees a close relation between Pilate's question and that of the high priest; in responding to both, Jesus makes the 'good confession' (cf. 1 Tim. 6:13).

<sup>30</sup>As Perrin points out, in those three texts "Mark is presenting his own Passion-oriented Christology, using Son of Man, and then drawing out the consequences for Christian discipleship..." "Christology," p. 179.

<sup>31</sup>See Donald Juel, *Messiah and Temple* (1977), pp. 2ff., 59ff.

<sup>32</sup>In Neusner, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-38. See also Morton Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* (1973), pp. 220f. Smith sees in Mark 3:28f. evidence that Jesus was considered a magician in his own lifetime, and that his followers have since answered that charge by identifying the spirit by which he heals as the Holy Spirit. (p. 339)

<sup>33</sup>On this see Weeden, *Traditions*; also "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel," *ZNW* 59 (1968), 145-158; Tannehill; Hawkin.

<sup>34</sup>On the illegality of Magic, see Morton Smith, p. 220.

<sup>35</sup>Douglas Hare, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution in the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (1967), slightly confuses the issue when he writes, "Jewish Symbols of the first rank were Torah, Temple and Holy City; not far behind were the purity and food laws,

circumcision and Sabbath...Christians subordinated all symbols to the central symbol of their faith, the Christ." (Pp.4f.). What is not considered here is the fact that above all these symbols in both Judaism and Christianity is the supreme symbol or concept, "God". The Torah, Temple, Holy City, and Christ all derive their symbolic power from a meaning complex shared by both religions. The Jewish-Christian conflict thus concerns the relation of these secondary symbols to the primary symbol. Mark 3:22-30 raises this issue, but the pericope itself is concerned with an attack on the primary symbol.

<sup>36</sup>Paul states the issue somewhat differently: "We preach Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles." (1 Cor. 1:23)

<sup>37</sup>Despite Lev. 24:10ff., Rabbinic Judaism distinguishes between using abusive language against God and cursing God, according to Solomon Zeitlin, Who Crucified Jesus?, p. 53; refs. there to Talmud Keritut 7 (a man cannot be executed for using abusive language against God, though God may cause his premature death) and, in contrast, to Sanh. 7:5 ("cursing God by the name of God" made one liable to capital punishment).

<sup>38</sup>According to Origen, cursing Jesus was an initiatory or admission requirement among the Ophites. Contra Celsum 6:28; Catena fragm. 47 in I Cor. 12:3 (ref. in Henry Chadwick's tr. of Contra Celsum, p. 344, n. 2)

<sup>39</sup>See Donahue; Juel.

<sup>40</sup>Norman Perrin, "Towards an Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark," in Christology and a Modern Pilgrimage. A Discussion with Norman Perrin, ed. by Hans Dieter Betz (1974), pp. 1-52. Perrin identifies these as "the messianic secret, the reinterpretation of the Son of God christology, and the misunderstanding of the disciples...." (p. 32)

<sup>41</sup>Juel correctly emphasizes the rejection motif (and its counterpart, vindication) in the trial narrative (pp. 56f., 67 and elsewhere), but I cannot agree when he claims "...the trial has no causal relationship to the trial before Pilate." (p. 67) In general, however, his study is one of the better treatments to date of the Markan trial.

<sup>42</sup>As Burkill points out, "Blasphemy," pp. 57 f., Mark has more than one causal theory. The death of Jesus has both divine and human causes. See also his book, New Light on the Earliest Gospel (1972), p. 177.

<sup>43</sup>Martyn.

<sup>44</sup>See A.N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament (1963), pp. 1-23.

<sup>45</sup>Leon Hardy Canfield, The Early Persecutions of Christians (1913); W.H.C. Frend, Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church (1965).

<sup>46</sup>Especially those directed at those who are exorcized of demons (or the demons themselves) (1:34, 3:12). Perhaps these are considered unstable people who might unintentionally betray the Christian healer. However, see 5:1-20, where the demoniac himself becomes a missionary -- under command of the Lord. In 1:44 the leper is told not to speak to anyone -- but the leper disobeys (see also 7:36) and as a result the healer has to avoid the urban areas. Those who witness the raising of the 12 year old are also warned not to speak of it (5:43). There are other indications in Mark of the missionary-healer's desire for a low profile (e.g., 7:24; 8:26), though some of these may be explained as withdrawal for rest (6:31; 7:24; 9:30). See Howard Clark Kee, Community of the New Age, Studies in Mark's Gospel (1977), 169-171.

<sup>47</sup>Paul Winter, On the Trial of Jesus (1961).

<sup>48</sup>Kee makes an admirable beginning in this direction, as far as the gospel as a whole is concerned, though his concern is not particularly with the conditions imposed by persecution, nor does his book deal in detail with the trial narratives. See also Ernest Best, The Temptation and the Passion (1965), ch. 8.

<sup>49</sup>See notes 1 and 3 above.

<sup>50</sup>Whether Mark's view is justified or based on suspicion and rumor cannot be present be answered. See Origen's well known comments in which he blames Jews for spreading rumors about Christians which touched off the persecutions in Rome (Contra Celsum 6:27). See also Albert Heinrichs, "Pagan Ritual and the Alleged Crimes of the Early Christians: A Reconsideration," in Kyriakon, Festschrift Johannes Quasten, ed. by Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann (1970), Vol. I, pp. 18-35.

<sup>51</sup>Cook, pp. 52 ff.



## APPENDIX

Mark's trial narrative is distinctive in its selection and representation of events. A brief comparison of it with the relevant accounts in the other gospels will demonstrate this point.

Matthew clearly stands in the Markan tradition. Although he introduces some modifications into both charges (see note 6), the essential features of Mark's account are retained.

Luke, however, presents quite a different scene. The event takes place in two locations, first at night in the high priest's house (22:54-65), where Jesus is mistreated, commanded to prophesy (v. 64; cf. Mk. 14:65), and blasphemed (v. 65 cf. Mk. 15:29), and, second, in the morning in an unnamed place of assembly (eis to synedrion) where the presbyterion tou laou composed of chief priest and scribes (22:66-71) meets. There is no reference to a temple saying or to witnesses, or consequently, to Jesus' silence (Mk. 14:61). The whole assembly, not just the high priest, whose presence is unmentioned, questions Jesus. The Markan question, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" is here found as two separate questions (Luke, like Matthew, has "Son of God"). The return of the Son of Man is lacking, putting stress on his enthronement, as might be expected of Luke. Finally, Jesus' confession is considerably more ambiguous, perhaps even enigmatic, than in Mark, and it is not labelled blasphemous by the assembly. Their response (v. 71) is not part of a legal judgment, but prompts them to take Jesus

immediately to Pilate. Luke therefore does not envisage a Jewish trial of Jesus, but an assembly which on the basis of hearing Jesus confess himself as Son of God initiates proceedings before the Roman court. Whether or not Luke's narrative (22:66-71) is more 'historical' than Mark's, it exhibits too many distinctive features to seriously doubt its independence of Mark. (David Catchpole, "The Problems of the Historicity of the Sanhedrin Trial," The Trial of Jesus, ed. by Ernst Bammel (1970), pp. 47-65).

John presents a somewhat different picture yet. Jesus is taken to Annas and questioned privately about his disciples and his didache (18:12-14; 19-23). Jesus replies that he has never taught secretly, but in "synagogues and in the temple, where all Jews come together" (v. 20). Jesus is struck for his apparent insolence, and sent to Caiaphas, and in the morning on to Pilate. He never appears before a Jewish assembly at all. There are no witnesses (Jesus invites Annas to seek such), no charges, no confession, no decision, and certainly no trial. John stands at the opposite end of the spectrum from Mark and Matthew, with Luke somewhere between them. Only Mark and Matthew convey the impression of a trial. In John, the counterpart is a private, inconclusive hearing, and in Luke it is a public but conclusive hearing. We should not speak of a Jewish trial narrative in Luke or John, but perhaps of a hearing narrative.

What is especially significant is that both Luke and John utilize both the blasphemy and temple saying motifs elsewhere. John locates the temple saying, logically enough, immediately following

the cleansing of the temple (2:14ff.). The temple, however, is Jesus' body, and it is not Jesus but the Jews who will destroy it, though Jesus will raise it (not build it) in three days. The Jews misunderstand. As in Mark 15:29, they interpret the saying literally, though here that extends to both parts of the saying, while in Mark the misunderstanding is confined to the second part. The blasphemy charge in John 10 has no literary or thematic connection with the hearing before Annas or with the Roman trial.

Luke's employment of these charges is found not in his gospel but in Acts. It is not Jesus but Stephen who is accused (again, by false witnesses, 6:11) of "speaking blasphemous words against Moses and God" (6:11) and "this holy place" (6:13). It is less clear that behind 6:14, "we heard him say that this Jesus the Nazaraioi will destroy this place" is something akin to the temple saying of Mark 14. In any case, the charges of preaching the temple's destruction and of blasphemous words are brought by witnesses before a Jewish assembly. In contrast to Jesus' hearing, this one is presided over by the high priest who, like the one in Mark's trial, asks questions. Further, as in Mark, false witnesses attempt to make out a case against the accused. What is lacking is the Markan christological formula. But we should not expect it, since Luke has already employed it in his hearing narrative. We see, then, that the two charges in the Markan trial narrative are located by Luke in Stephen's trial and are found in non-trial contexts in John. This not only points to the paramount importance of the motifs over the settings, but also that even by the time of the composition of all

four canonical gospels, there was no authoritative account of a Jewish trial of Jesus. More important, it was not even agreed that there had been a trial. This makes it imperative to sort out the factors motivating the composition of the first trial narrative.

All this suggests that Mark has constructed his trial scene around basic issues in the early Church regarding Jewish response to Christian missionary preaching, issues which find other expressions in Luke and John. The temple saying is one such issue, but for Mark, it has been blown out of proportion by Jewish critics and in any case has been misunderstood. The blasphemy charge, however, penetrates to the heart of the matter. It is based on the actual Christian confession of Jesus and it represents in the clearest possible manner Jewish rejection of that confession.



C.S.B.S./ S.C.E.B.

ANNUAL MEETING (1979)

ABSTRACTS

(Note: The abstracts are given according to the order of the draft programme)

FREDERIK WISSE (McMaster University) "On Being Scientific in New Testament Studies"

Some doubts have arisen about the scientific nature of present-day NT scholarship. Possible reasons are the increase in ideologically orientated interpretation (fundamentalist, Marxist, feminist, liberationist, anti-anti-Semitic etc.) and new methods of interpretation, such as structuralism, which are deliberately subjective and imply a basic dissatisfaction with objective historical research. Yet the assured results and scientific reputation of NT scholarship depend largely on the much maligned historical-critical method.

The paper explores the conditions and methods necessary for a scientific approach to the New Testament and the place it should have in the larger theological enterprise.

P. JOSEPH CAHILL (University of Alberta) "The Purpose of the Johannine Gospel"

A brief analysis of Jan-A. Bühner's thesis in Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4 Evangelium (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1977).

WILLIAM KLASSEN (University of Manitoba) "The Crucifixion at Giv'at ha-Mivtar and at Golgotha"

In this paper I wish to analyze the evidence with respect to crucifixion in the second decade of the first century and assess its implications for the crucifixion of Jesus. By means of overhead projector the various possible postures of crucifixion in the first century and the conclusions that can be drawn from this evidence will be analyzed. Since we are dealing here with a unique discovery the question will need to be raised whether any conclusions can be drawn about the crucifixion of Jesus based on this evidence. An attempt will be

made to canvas all the recent literature on this discovery.

GERD LÜDEMANN (McMaster University/Göttingen) "Anti-Paulinism before 70 C.E."

This paper tries to establish that there is more evidence for a rejection of Paul and his theology before 70 C.E. than is today generally assumed. One part deals with James's rise to power in the Jerusalem church, the history of this church, and James's martyrdom. Another part will show that the opponents of 1 Cor. 2 and Gal. are Palestinian Jewish Christians whose demands were tolerated if not backed by James. A third part tries to prove that on the basis of an analysis of Acts 21 and from what we know by Paul himself the conclusion seems inevitable that the collection was rejected.

MICHAEL NEWTON (Memorial University) "Sin and Impurity in the Religious Community at Qumran"

That there existed a concern with purity in the community at Qumran is not disputed today but the view persists that there were two kinds of purity; moral and ritual, and that each performed a different function in the community's religious life. An examination of the disciplinary regulations of Qumran reveals that this distinction is in error. In order to protect the community from impurity various measures were taken to exclude those who were guilty of either moral or ceremonial transgressions which would pollute the community and thus threaten the continued presence of the divine in its midst.

WAYNE O. MCCREADY (University of Calgary) "The Use of Scripture as a Means of Self-Definition in IQS"

The intention of this presentation is to discuss the Qumran community's use of Jewish scripture in defining themselves as being right. Qumran was only one of a number of groups in Palestine before the turn of the common era that made the claim that they had the correct way of understanding man's relationship to God. To validate their claims they used a standard that would be accepted by all of Judaism. This discussion will attempt to show how Qumran used scripture in IQS to support their claims and it will also attempt to show how scripture in turn affected their understanding of themselves.

ROBERT W. HUEBSCH (Niagara University) "Remnant in the Inter-Testamental Period: A Study of the Book of Enoch"

Significant scholarly studies have contributed to the understanding of "the remnant" both in the Hebrew Bible and in the New Testament. The question of remnant in the inter-testamental period, however, has been largely ignored. This

paper is a continuation of a project (cf. CSBS Convention, May 1978) to examine the function and significance of the remnant in the inter-testamental literature. Specifically, in the paper, the meaning and significance of "the remnant" in the Pseudepigraphic Book of Enoch will be discussed.

ROBERT E. OSBORNE (Carleton University) "St. Paul's other Shipwreck"

This paper examines the evidence that St. Paul may have been shipwrecked on the island of Mljet (Melite Illyrical) prior to his shipwreck on the island of Malta (Melite Africana). The author proposes that this earlier shipwreck occurred around A.D. 40, during the so-called "Silent Years" and finds support for the dating in II Cor. 11:25.

KENNETH J. NEUMANN (Saskatoon) "Frequent Stylistic Features as Clues to the Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles"

Most stylistic studies of Paul have concentrated on features which occur infrequently and used these results for conclusions on the authenticity of particular letters. Even the relatively recent work of Walter Bujard on Colossians, although it includes some frequent stylistic features, relies mostly upon infrequent aspects. The success of certain literary studies employing the computer to study frequent features suggests the similar application of such tools to the Pauline letters. Some features have been studied, but they need to be put into perspective with many other stylistic aspects. Such indices will probably contribute the most reliable results for use in deciding authenticity.

CYNTHIA CRYSDALE (Toronto School of Theology) "Ressentiment and Agape in Paul"

Max Scheler, in his book, *Ressentiment*, has taken a notion originating with Nietzsche and developed it in relation to Christian love and modern morality. Ressentiment is a life-perspective caused by systematic repression of supposedly evil emotions, resulting in certain value delusions. Love is the external appearance of good behavior laid over these repressed emotions. Christian love thus becomes an inverted expression of hatred. St. Paul's understanding of love is contrasted to this conception. An exegesis of I Cor. 13 shows that love, for Paul, is not rooted in man's self-effort to hide evil feelings but moves from God to man as gift. Growth in love is the continued outpouring of God's love into the heart of the believer by the Spirit, rather than a process of increased repression and self-control.

DAVID JOBLING (St. Andrew's College) "The Leadership of Israel 'Between' Joshua and Saul: A Structural Analysis"

The Deuteronomic History is divided up by programmatic editorial sections (Noth, McCarthy). The section thus defined from Judg 2:6 to 1 Sam 12 is dominated ("over-determined") by the theme ("isotopy") of political leadership. The programme laid out in Judg 2 leaves a logical gap--there is provision for leadership (the judges) only if Israel sins. In the following chapters the problem of continuity of leadership constantly recurs; it is gradually resolved into the poles of anarchy and monarchy, and finally decided in favour of the latter. The methods of structural analysis (Lévi-Strauss) will be used to display the system of theological oppositions in play, and their mediation.

DONNA RUNNALLS (McGill University) "Wheat, Ashes, and Biblical Theophanies: Judges 6:11-24 and 2 Sam. 24:15-25 in the Light of a Recent Archaeological Discovery"

The discovery at Gezer of a heavy ash layer containing charred wheat kernels has so far invited various interpretation. This paper proposes that the ash layer is the remains of a threshing floor where burning took place for a very specific reason. In the light of this interpretation it seems necessary to reconsider the place of stories of theophanies at the 'threshing floor' within the general typology of biblical theophanies.

LYLE ESLINGER (McMaster University) "Towards a Contextual Reading: Genesis 6:1-4"

This paper is an attempt to understand the mysterious characters of Genesis 6:1-4 and the role they play in the events leading up to the flood. It is suggested that the context of Genesis 6:1-4 offers important verbal clues leading to a contextual identification of the sons of gods and daughters of men, and that the narrative patterns of Genesis 1-11 suggest an important role for the events of 6:1-4 as final provocation for the flood.

ADRIAN M. LESKE (Concordia College) "The Ebionites, Anti-Judaism and the Gospel of Matthew"

A reexamination of the Ebionites and their relationship to N.T. Christianity as seen through their acceptance of the Gospel of Matthew, and an attempt to answer the question: To what extent was the condemnation of the Ebionites by the church fathers due to the Anti-Jewish movement within the early church?



WILLIAM KLASSEN (University of Manitoba) "Recent Publications on Anti-Judaism in the New Testament"

A bibliographical report of recent publications on Anti-Judaism in the N. T. will be circulated.

DONALD J. MCCARTHY (University of Manitoba) "The Definition of Anti-Semitism: Some Problems and a Tentative Solution"

Abstract not available.

ROBERT C. CULLEY (McGill University) "Narrative Analysis with Examples from the Stories of the Prophets in Kings"

In analyzing narrative, key elements are events and participants. There have been attempts recently to examine action and actors in biblical narratives. This paper will touch on action, roles, and the way these "slots" are filled in O.T. narrative by using examples from the stories of the prophets in the books of Kings.

JARED J. JACKSON (Pittsburgh Theological Seminary) "A Rhetorical Study of Psalm 33"

Careful attention to the formal structure of this model hymn helps to elucidate the intention of the whole, shedding light on the flow of ideas and how they are designed in order to enhance the praise of God. Attention will be given to particles, repetition, alliteration, and other aspects of style. Special notice will be taken of the "tenses" (qt, ya) and their sequence, and of nominal clauses, as instruments of the poem's design. An attempt will be made to compare and contrast relevant features of ancient Near Eastern hymnody.

JOHN MOIR (University of Toronto) "'Mildewed with Discretion': Toronto's Higher Critics and Public Opinion in the 1920's"

By the 1920's the churches as bodies had ceased to oppose higher criticism--the Workman, Jackson and similar cases were in the past. Public opinion, however, moves slowly (as Disraeli said when passing the Second Reform Act in 1866, "Now we must educate our new masters"), and public opinion was not as ready as the churches or the university to tolerate liberal thinking and higher criticism. At Toronto in the 1920's a small number of higher critics seemed bent on flaunting their ideas, including their left-wing political opinions, and the result was a series of comic opera affairs which pitted the professors against the public, while the University administration tried to control its faculty and pacify John Public.

CHARLES P. ANDERSON (University of B.C.) "The Trial of Jesus as Jewish-Christian Polarization"

A comparison of the relevant materials in the four gospels shows that Mark's account of the trial of Jesus by the Jewish court is best regarded not as historical but as the climax of an underlying theme in his gospel. By it he demonstrates the fundamental and, from his point of view, apparently unbridgeable gap between the Jewish and the Christian ways. This gulf is symbolized not just by the condemnation of Jesus by the Sanhedrin, but more basically by their application of the concept of blasphemy to his profession of Christian faith.

PAUL E. DION (Collège Dominicain de Philosophie et de Théologie) "The Aramaic 'Family Letter', and Related Epistolary Forms in Other Oriental Languages and in Hellenistic Greek"

The Aramaic "family letters" discovered at Hermopolis West in 1948 display a wealth of affectionate epistolary formulae, arranged after a definite pattern. A handful of earlier letters, written in Aramaic, Hebrew or Phoenician, show largely the same characteristics, but the basic pattern followed by these West Semitic letters has not yet been found elsewhere. Many of the individual formulae, however, seem to be derived from Egyptian models, and some have close counterparts in family correspondence from late Babylonia and from Roman Egypt, with a few reflections in the Pauline Epistles.

R. VAN LEEUWEN (St. Michael's College) Old Testament Prize Essay: "Isaiah 14:12, הֲוֹלֵלִים 'al Gwym, and Gilgamesh 11:6"

This paper presents a solution to the crux in question after examining its difficulties, and adduces an apparently intentional parallel to the Gilgamesh Epic. The OT usage of HLS is established and it is proposed to read gəwī(m) (back) for MT gōyim (nations).

BEN F. MEYER (McMaster University) "Why Jerusalem?"

Why did the leaders of the earliest Jewish Christian community settle in Jerusalem? Because of a command of the risen Jesus (Acts 1:4)? Because the Easter experience of the disciples and specifically that of Peter took place there (F. C. Burkitt)? For pragmatic reasons, namely, to be able to address all Israel (Martin Hengel)? Clues to the most basic reason are given in Gal. 2:9, Acts 2:5-11, and in Synoptic texts applying to the followers of Jesus the imagery of the city on the mountain (Mt. 5:14, Thomas 32), the cosmic rock (Mt. 16:18) and the new sanctuary (Mk. 14:58 parr.), all of them seen against a massive tradition on Jerusalem, Zion, and temple. The saved community of hebraioi conceived this

tradition as prophecy and conceived itself as the key to fulfilment. It was the presence of the community that made city, mountain, and temple the Zion of fulfilment (inaugurated eschatology). Why Jerusalem? Because the earliest Christian self-definition drew on symbolic schemes of which the most fundamental was the sanctuary on the mountain at the centre of the world.

PHILIP G. DAVIS (McMaster University) "The Markan Redaction: Jewish or Gentile Christianity?"

Recent years have witnessed a growing tendency in Markan scholarship to assign the final redaction to a community of Jewish Christians. This view was expounded in different ways by John Donahue in *Are You the Christ?* (1973) and by Werner Kelber in *The Kingdom in Mark* (1974), while it appears to be a tacit assumption in Ronald Juel's *Messiah and Temple* (1977). The most detailed effort in this direction is Howard Clark Kee's *Community of the New Age* (1977), wherein the author attempts to establish socio-cultural characteristics of the Markan community as a controlling factor for interpretation. This paper will critically assess some of Kee's major contentions and will argue that vital internal evidence, in addition to such external indications as we possess, still impels us to assign the redaction of Mark to a community of Gentile Christians.

TERRY DONALDSON (Toronto School of Theology) New Testament Prize Essay: "Parallels: Their Use, Misuse and Limitations"

Though the comparative religions approach is an important tool in the study of the New Testament, it is often used carelessly. This paper is an attempt to develop rigorous criteria for the proper use of religious parallels in the study of the New Testament, and to test these criteria out in reference to the work of W. Schmithals and K. H. Rengstorff on the origin of the New Testament apostolate.

PANEL DISCUSSION: Anti-Judaism in the Passion Narrative

For the abstract of Charles P. Anderson see the Presidential Address. Abstracts for Erwin Buck, Lloyd Gaston and David Granskou are not available at this time.

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

SOCIÉTÉ CANADIENNE DES ÉTUDES BIBLIQUES

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY

(Annual Meeting, Saskatoon, 1979)

The 47th Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies/Société Canadienne des Etudes Bibliques was held on Saturday, the 26th of May, 1979, at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon during the 1979 Learned Societies Conference.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Professor C. P. Anderson, at 16.15 hours.

The following were present at the 1979 meeting:

W. R. Adamson, C. P. Anderson, W. Aufrecht, A. Brunet, E. Buck, E. Combs, P. Craigie, C. Crysdale, R. Cullley, J. Culliton, I. Dahms, P. Davis, S. Diament, T. Donaldson, J. C. Duff, J. Eilman, V. Fawcett, C. M. Foley, L. Gaston, D. Granskou, D. Hartzfeld, D. Hawkin, R. Hobbs, R. Huebsch, J. Hurd, L. Hurtado, J. Jackson, D. Jobling, C. Johnston, W. Klassen, T. Kleven, J. S. Kloppenborg, A. Leske, D. Linn, G. Lüdemann, W. McCready, B. Meyer, J. Moir, K. Neumann, M. Newton, R. Osborne, W. G. Plaut, B. Przybylski, H. Remus, P. Richardson, S. Riegel, M. Rogers, D. Runnalls, A. Trites, R. Van Leeuwen, N. Wagner, S. Wilson, V. Wishart, F. Wisse.

Regrets were received from Professors Sandys-Wunsch, Sanders, Scobie and Whitehead.

1. Memorial Resolutions were read in honour of Canon Matthew Truran Newby (ob. 23rd of October, 1978) and the Reverend Doctor Robert Ferdinand Schnell (ob. 13th of July, 1978).
2. The Minutes of the 46th Meeting had not yet been circulated; they will need to be approved next year.
3. The Canadian Federation for the Humanities was represented by Professor Michael Batts of the University of British Columbia, the Chairman of the Executive Committee. He spoke about the Federation, SSHRC, the aid to Scholarly Publishing Programme, and other matters. Professor Batts then withdrew.



4. SSHRCC. The following motions were proposed:

That the CSBS/SCEB urge in the strongest possible terms the continuation and increase of the leave fellowship programme (Wilson/Craigie).

Approved unanimously.

That the CSBS/SCEB express its dismay at the large amounts of research funds being directed to "new" programmes to promote research in areas of national interest." (Craigie/Runnalls).

Approved unanimously.

The Secretary was directed to forward these motions to Mr. Fortier, (with a carbon copy to S.F.H.), including a statement of the thinking behind the motions particularly of the need for open discussion of research priorities.

5. Report of the Executive Secretary (G. P. Richardson)

- 5.1 The Executive Committee met in Toronto on Saturday, the 20th of January, 1979, in Victoria College, University of Toronto. The main items of business were the programme for the Annual Meeting, a draft statement on aid to Learned Societies, and the forthcoming History of Biblical Studies in Canada.
- 5.2 This meeting marks the second anniversary of the dissolution of the Canadian region of the S.B.L. There is nothing to report on a formal linkage between the C.S.B.S. and the S.B.L.
- 5.3 Prize Essays. Mr. R. van Leeuwen of the Institute of Christian Thought, St. Michael's College (Hebrew Bible) and Mr. Terry Donaldson of Wycliffe College (New Testament) are to be congratulated on their prize essays.
- 5.4 History of Biblical Studies in Canada. Professor Moir (Scarborough College, University of Toronto) is making excellent progress on the history. He reported on his work in the programme, and also in the Annual Meeting.
- 5.5 The International Association for the History of Religions will meet at the University of Manitoba from August 17 - 21, 1980.
- The Studiorum Novi Testament Societas will meet at the University of Toronto from August 25 - 29, 1980. It was decided at last year's meeting that C.S.B.S. would continue to meet with the Learned in 1980.

- 5.6 Registration as a Charitable Organization. As reported last year, CSBS/SCEB is now able to give tax-deductible receipts. The first contribution has been made, and members are urged to keep this before them, so that over the years we can build up a fund to assist in the work of the Society.
- 5.7 Aid to Learned Societies. In November the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council circulated a draft statement on aid to Learned Societies, as a basis for discussion on how best to assist in the funding of societies. The draft statement indicated the SSHRCC's intention of continuing its practice of support for travel to the Learned Societies meeting, and it noted that some Societies received support for administration, in a few cases very substantial support.

The draft statement aimed to develop a uniform policy which would allow the application of a formula which took into account members' annual dues.

As proposed, the formula was intended to apply to administrative costs, including the cost of an executive meeting between annual meetings. The following conditions were proposed:

- assume \$15 annual dues.
- assume minimum size of society 200 members.
- award predicated on total eligible costs less revenue (minimum \$15/person) up to a table of maxima (200 members = \$3,500 + \$5/member over 200).

A small ad hoc group was convened which agreed to argue for the principle and against the formula. This was confirmed by the Executive Meeting. The issue was subsequently the main subject at a meeting convened in Toronto by the Canadian Federation for the Humanities on the 9th of February.

The SSHRC has recently indicated that it will continue its ad hoc arrangements; it encourages continuing discussion and further responses, up to the 31st of October.

- 5.8 New Programmes of Grants in Support of International Scholarly Exchange. The SSHRCC has recently circulated a booklet describing 5 new programmes
- Travel grants to permit Canadian scholars

to participate in international scholarly conferences.

- (b) Travel grants to permit Canadian scholars to exercise administrative and executive responsibilities in international organizations.
- (c) Aid to secretaries of international organizations during the time they are located in Canada.
- (d) Grants to facilitate international collaborative research.
- (e) Exchanges between SSHRCC and the Academy of Sciences of Hungary.

5.9 SSHRCC Advisory Committees. The Executive Secretary would appreciate names of persons qualified and willing to serve on several SSHRCC committees.

5.10 The Canadian Federation for the Humanities. The recently appointed Executive Director, Ms Viviane Launay-Elbaz, will be present at the annual meeting. (See above, item 3).

#### 6. Treasurer's Report (W. Aufrecht)

6.1 By 31 October, 1978 (our cut-off date for receiving members into the Society for any given year), our membership totalled 135, an increase of 11 over the previous year, even though 12 members did not renew. Since that date, 8 renewed and new memberships have been received, for a total of 143 members as of 1 May, 1979.

The breakdown of membership is as follows:

- Life	5
Full	99
Dual	21
Student	18
	<hr/>
	143
	<hr/>

Beginning this year, annual membership was brought into conformity with the publication of the journal SR. This means that members other than those who receive the journal through another society, will receive the journal through issue 8:4 (December, 1979).

In October, renewal of membership will take place in the usual manner. Membership will be from January to December and the fees will be:

Full	\$15.00
Student	9.00
Dual	7.50

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada supports the CSBS through its programme of travel grants. The Society received \$501.60 to cover the transportation costs of bringing the Executive together in Toronto (20 January). This included the President (Vancouver), and three members-at-large (Waterloo, Hamilton and London).

We received \$1,985.00 this year toward travel expenses to the Annual Meeting. The amount of money the Society receives for this purpose is based on the number of members who officially registered at the Annual Meeting the previous year. Members are urged, therefore, to register officially so that money can be made available in the following year.

The allocation of funds for the Annual Meeting continues to be difficult. This year, we had an unusually large number of applications, and the amount anticipated is not sufficient to meet the demand. Among the criteria for the allocation of funds were the following: Persons not on the programme received no support. Applications from the Prairies were scrutinized more carefully than those whose transportation costs would be more considerable. Persons who received substantial grants last year, could not be awarded funds this year.

Apart from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, our financial support comes exclusively through membership dues. Most of this money goes to the journal. In addition a \$3.00 assessment per full-time faculty member was paid to SSHRCC to cover the cost of the Society's membership in that organization. This means that the Society retains \$1.00 from full-time faculty who are full members of the Society. Until the new membership fees are collected, therefore, the Society will have a rather meager balance in its account, but I do not anticipate difficulty in paying our bills.



6.2 Financial Statement (1 June, 1978 - 31 May, 1979)Operating Account

Balance on Hand	\$1,588.09	Annual Meeting	\$ 107.60
Dues (1978-79)	669.00	Service Charges	2.50
CC-Travel/Executive	501.60	CFH	195.00
Miscellaneous	1,985.00	Exec. Meeting	481.60
Travel Grant/Annual Meeting		Essay Prizes	100.00
		Miscellaneous	16.60
		Printing	30.49
		SR subscriptions(122)	1,098.00
		Travel Grant/Annual Meeting	1,985.00
		Balance on Hand	\$4,016.79
		May 20, 1979	731.90
	<u>\$4,748.69</u>		<u>\$4,748.69</u>

Charitable Account

Donations	\$ 100.00	Bank Charges	\$ 1.00
		Balance on Hand	99.00
	<u>\$ 100.00</u>		<u>\$ 100.00</u>

7. Report of the Nominating Committee (V. Fawcett)

7.1 Nominated as Vice-President: Professor C. H. H. Scobie

7.2 Nominated as Member-at-Large and Research and Publications Convener (including Editor of the Bulletin): Professor C. Foley (3 year-term).

Both nominees were elected.

7.3 A note of thanks was moved on behalf of David Whitehead, and appreciation was expressed for the work of Professors Richardson, Aufrecht and Foley.

8. New Members. The following were elected to membership in the Society:R. Baergen, C. Crysdaile, T. Donaldson, L. Eslinger,  
B. Levinson, G. Ludemann, J. Moir, R. A. Quammie,  
R. C. Van Leeuwen, F. Wisse.9. Annual Meeting. The 1980 Annual Meeting will be held at the Université du Québec à Montréal.10. Other Reports10.1 Bulletin. The Secretary reported for the Editor and apologized for the delay in its publication. It will be distributed during the summer.10.2 History of Biblical Studies. Professor John Moir reported on his progress and thanked especially Professors Brunet and Culley. He also thanked the University of Toronto for research funds.10.3 Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion. Professor Craigie reported on the publication programme. He was congratulated for being named President of the Corporation.

11. Thanks were expressed to the Province of Saskatchewan and the City of Saskatoon for their generosity in providing a buffet, to the University for its facilities, and to the Colleges for their reception. (Note: letters of thanks will be sent).

12. The meeting adjourned at about 17:30 hours.

Respectfully submitted

G. P. Richardson  
Executive Secretary

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

SOCIÉTÉ CANADIENNE DES ÉTUDES BIBLIQUES

OFFICERS / OFFICIERS: 1979-80

President/Président

Professor Vernon Fawcett  
Emmanuel College  
Victoria University  
75 Queen's Park Crescent  
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1K7

Vice-President/Vice-Président

Professor C. H. H. Scobie  
Department of Religious Studies  
Mt. Allison University  
Sackville, New Brunswick E0A 3C0

Executive-Secretary/Secrétaire

Professor Peter Richardson (416) 978-3160  
Principal  
University College  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1

Treasurer/Trésorier

Professor Walter Aufrecht (416) 978-3809  
Victoria College  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1K7

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE/MEMBRES ELUS

- (1) Professor Elizabeth Bieman  
Department of English  
University of Western Ontario  
London, Ontario N6A 3K7

- (2) Professor Benno Przybylski  
Department of Religious Studies  
McMaster University  
Hamilton, Ontario L8S 4L8
- (3) Professor C. M. Foley  
St. Thomas More College  
University of Saskatchewan  
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 0W6

Other Offices:

- (a) Representative to the Canadian Federation for the Humanities

Professor Peter Craigie (Director, 1978-81)  
Department of Religious Studies  
University of Calgary  
Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4

- (b) Research and Publication Committee

Chairman: Professor C. M. Foley

Members: To be appointed

- (c) Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Corporation  
Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses

Members nominated by the Society/membres només  
de la Société:

- (1) C. H. H. Scobie  
(2) A. M. Brunet  
(3) J. Cahill  
(4) J. C. Hurd  
(5) N. E. Wagner  
(6) P. C. Craigie (designed Director) (403) 284-6987  
Department of Religious Studies  
University of Calgary  
Calgary, Alberta

- (d) Local Representative: Annual Meeting 1980

To be appointed



NEWS OF C.S.B.S. MEMBERSHIP

1. PUBLICATIONS BY MEMBERS: BOOKS

- Carson, D.A.  
The Sermon on the Mount. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978.  
The King James Version Debate. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.
- Craigie, P.C.  
The Old Testament and the Problem of War. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Culley, R.  
ed. Perspectives on Old Testament Narrative. Semeia, XV (1979).
- Fox, D.J.  
The "Matthew-Luke Commentary" of Philoxenus: Text, Translation and Critical Analysis. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Greidanus, S.  
Sola Scriptura: Problems and Principles in Preaching Historical Texts. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1979.
- Jobling, D.  
The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Three Structural Analyses in the Old Testament. JSOT Supplement Series, VII. Sheffield, 1978.
- Kazmierski, C.  
Jesus, the Son of God. A Study of the Markan Tradition and its Redaction by the Evangelist. Würzburg: Echter, 1979.
- Klassen, W.  
ed. The New Way of Jesus. Newton: Faith and Life Press, 1980.
- Richardson, P.  
Paul's Ethic of Freedom. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979.
- Segal, A.F.  
Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Judaism (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity XXV). Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Wilson, S.G.  
Luke and the Pastoral Epistles. London: SPCK, 1979.

2. PUBLICATIONS BY MEMBERS: ARTICLES

- Carson, D.A.  
"Current Source Criticism of the Fourth Gospel: Some Methodological Questions," JBL, XCVII (1978), 411-429.  
"The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7-11," JBL, XCVIII (1979), 547-566.  
"Hermeneutics: A Brief Assessment of Some Recent Developments," Themelios, Jan. 1980.
- Clarke, E.G.  
Review of S. Segert, Altaramäische Grammatik. In JBL, XCVI (1977), 573-575.  
Review of R. Jongeling, Een Aramus Boek Job. In BO, 1979.  
Review of M.J. Mulder, De Targum op het Hooqlied. In BO, 1979.
- Cox, C.  
"Cyril of Alexandria's Text for Deuteronomy," International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies' Bulletin, X (1977), 31-35.  
"Bible, Armenian," in The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literature, II. H. Weber (ed.). Gulf Breeze: Academic International Press, 1978. Pp. 239-244.
- Craigie, P.C.  
"Deborah and Anat," ZAW, XC (1978), 374-381.  
"Biblical and Tamil Poetry," SR, VIII (1979), 169-175.
- Culley, R.  
"Analyse alttestamentlicher Erzählungen. Erträge der jüngsten Methodendiskussion," BN, VI (1978), 27-39.
- Dion, P.E.  
"The Language Spoken in Ancient Sam'ā'l," JNES, XXXVII (1978), 115-118.  
Contribution to D. Pardee, with the collaboration of J.D. Whitehead and P.E. Dion, "An Overview of Ancient Hebrew Epistolography," JBL, XCVII (1978), 321-346.  
"Le 'Rouleau du Temple' et les Douze," Science et Esprit, XXXI (1979), 81-83.
- Dressler, H.H.P.  
"The Identification of the Ugaritic DNIL with the Daniel of Ezekiel," VT, XXIX (1979), 152-161.

- Duhaime, J.L.  
 "El elogio de los Padres de Ben Sira y el Cántico de Moisés (Sir 44-50 y Dt 32)," Estudios Bíblicos, XXXV (1976), 223-228.
- "L'Instruction sur les deux Esprits (1QS III,13-IV,26) et les interpolations dualistes à Qumrân," RB, LXXXIV (1977), 566-594.
- "Le Dieu vengeur des Psaumes," dans Dieu, parole et silence. Montreal: Fides, 1978. Pp. 63-73.
- Fraïkin, D.  
 "'Charismes et ministères' à la lumière de I Cor. 12-14," Eglise et Théologie, IX (1978), 455-463.
- Gaston, L.  
 "Paul and the Torah," in Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity. A.T. Davies (ed.). Paulist Press, 1979. Pp. 48-71.
- "Judeo-Christian Traditions in Canadian Society--Source of Strength or Division?," in Communication Faith in a Multicultural Society. Toronto, 1979. Pp. 46-51.
- Translation of: Markus Barth, "St. Paul--A Good Jew," Horizons in Biblical Theology, I (1979), 7-45.
- Hobbs, T.R.  
 "Some Proverbial Reflections in the Book of Jeremiah," ZAW, XCI (1979), 62-72.
- "Old Testament Theology in the Seventies and Beyond," McMaster Theological Bulletin, V:3 (1979).
- Horman, J.  
 "The Source of the Version of the Parable of the Sower in the Gospel of Thomas," NT, XXI (1979), 326-343.
- Hubbard, B.J.  
 "The Role of Commissioning Accounts in Acts," in Perspectives on Luke-Acts. C. Talbert (ed.). Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1978. Pp. 187-198.
- "Luke, Josephus and Rome: A Comparative Approach to the Lukan Sitz im Leben," in Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers I. P. Achtemeier (ed.). Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979. Pp. 59-68.
- Hurtado, L.W.  
 Review of H. Gamble, Jr., The Textual History of the Book of Romans. In JBL, XCVII (1978), 305.

- Review of G. Aulen, Jesus in Contemporary Research. In Themelios, IV (1978), 42.
- Review of C.F.D. Moule, The Origin of Christology. In TSF News and Reviews, (Oct., 1978), 10-12.
- "New Testament Christology: A Critique of Bousset's Influence," TS, XL (1979), 306-317.
- "The Jerusalem Collection and the Book of Galatians," JSNT, V (1979), 46-62.
- Review of J.D.G. Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the New Testament. In JBL, XCVIII (1979), 135-137.
- Jobling, D.  
 "Jeremiah's Poem in III 1 - IV 2," VT, XXVIII (1978), 45-55.
- "A Structural Analysis of Gen. 2:4b - 3A24," in Society of Biblical Literature 1978 Seminar Papers, I. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978. Pp. 61-70. (To appear later in Semeia).
- Mosca, P.G.  
 "The Punic Inscriptions," in Excavations at Carthage 1975. The Punic Project: First Interim Report, AASOR, XLIII (1978), 151-190 (esp. 186-190).
- "The Punic Inscriptions," in Excavations at Carthage 1976. Second Interim Report: Punic Project. Oriental Institute Publications. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (in press).
- Stager, L. E., Mosca, P.G., and Schwartz, J., "Conclusions and Interpretations," in Excavations at Carthage 1976 (in press).
- Pummer, R.  
 "New Evidence for Samaritan Christianity?" CBQ, XLI (1979), 98-117.
- "The Book of Jubilees and the Samaritans," Eglise et Théologie, X (1979), 147-178.
- "The Samaritan Manuscripts of the Chester Beatty Library," Studies, LXVIII (1979), 66-756.
- Rollmann, H.  
 "Troeltsch, von Hügel, and Modernism," The Downside Review, XCV (1978), 35-60.
- "Adolf von Harnack's Answer to a Recently Published Letter of Friedrich von Hügel," JAAR, XLVI (1978).



"Baron Friedrich von Hügel's Mystical Element of Religion, Reviewed by Himself," The Downside Review, XCVII (1979), 304-307.

"Ein Brief Adolf von Harnacks an Rudolf Otto über die Gnadenreligion Indiens," Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, XXXI (1979), 399-403.

"Holtzmann, von Hügel, and Modernism," The Downside Review, XCVII (1979), 128-143; 221-244.

"Rudolf Otto and India," Religious Studies Review, V (1979), 199-203.

"Sidney Gigdon in Warren," Brigham Young University Studies (forthcoming).

"Zwei Briefe Hermann Gunkels an Adolf Jülicher zur religionsgeschichtlichen und formgeschichtlichen Methode," ZTK (forthcoming).

Scobie, C.H.H.

"The Use of Source Material in the Speeches of Acts III and VII," NTS, XXV (1978-9), 399-421.

Segal, A.F.

"Magic and Heavenly Ascent," Proceedings of the Philadelphia Seminar in Christian Origins, 1977.

Segal, A.F., and Dahl, N.A., "Philo and the Rabbis on the Name of God," JSJ, X (1979), 1-28.

"Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity and their Environments." In Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung, II. H. Temporini und W. Haase (ed.). Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1979.

"Rabbinic Polemic and the Radicalization of Gnosticism." In Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung, II. H. Temporini und W. Haase (ed.). Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1979.

Trites, A.A.

"The Prayer Motif in Luke-Acts." In Perspectives on Luke-Acts. C.H. Talbert (ed.). Danville, VA: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978. Pp. 168-186.

"Witness." In The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. C. Brown (ed.). Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978. Pp. 1047-1051.

"The Transfiguration of Jesus: The Gospel in Microcosm," The Evangelical Quarterly, LI (1979), 67-79.

### 3. CURRENT RESEARCH

Anderson, C.P.

Introduction to Biblical Exegesis: a handbook for beginning students in biblical studies.

Bound, J.F.

"Who are the 'Virgins' Discussed in I Corinthians 7:25-40?" New Testament Prize Essay to be presented to the annual meeting of the CSBS in Montreal, 1980.

Breech, E.J.

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Research Grant: Storytelling and Parables in Late Western Antiquity (\$71,435). Funding for the first two years has been received, and the funding for a third and final year has been requested.

Clark, E.G.

Completion of the KWIC Concordance to Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, with J.C. Hurd and W.E. Aufrecht.

Cox, C.

"Linguistic Characteristics of the Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy." Presented at The Society for Armenian Studies' International Conference on Armenian Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania, July 11-14, 1979.

"The Textual Relations of the Armenian Version of Deuteronomy." Presented at the annual meeting of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies during the SBL meetings in New York, Nov. 15, 1979.

Culley, R.

"Semiotics, Folklore, and Narrative Analysis." Presented in a Consultation on Narrative at the SBL annual meetings in New York, 1979.

Dion, P.E.

Active participant in the SBL Epistolography Project; collaborating with D. Pardee in the preparation of Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters; preparing the first part of "Les types épistolaires hébréo-araméens jusqu'au temps de Bar-Kokhbah."

Aramaic Epistolography.

The Book of Deuteronomy (mostly as a collection of laws).

- Dressler, H.H.P.  
"The Metamorphosis of a Lacuna: Is AT - Ajj . WAN ... a Marriage Proposal." To be published in the Schaeffer Festschrift.
- Duhaime, J.L.  
"La Bible en chaire." Conférence du carême, 1977.  
"Dieu-Roi dans l'Ancien Testament." Communication au congrès de la Société canadienne de Théologie, 1978.  
"Le Dieu de la vie. Cohérence de Dieu dans le Psautier." Communication au congrès de l'ACEBAC, 5 juin 1979.  
"Perception de Dieu et comportement moral chez les Sages d'Israël." Communication au congrès de la SCT, 13 octobre 1979.  
"Le langage sur la mort à Qumrân." Communication au séminaire de recherche sur la mort, Université de Montréal, 10 novembre 1979.
- Fraikin, D.  
The ethics of "setting oneself as an example" in Paul and Epictetus.
- Griedanus, S.  
The Bible and Christian Scholarship; Biblical Theology.
- Hobbs, T.R.  
Critical commentary on the text of II Kings, for the series "Word Biblical Commentary", to be published in the early 1980s.
- Hubbard, B.J.  
"Jesus for Atheists and Christians: A Critical Reflection on M. Machovec's A Marxist Look at Jesus." Presented at the "Future of Religion" Conference, Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, April 14, 1978.
- Hurtado, L.W.  
"Beyond the Interlude: A Proposal for Late 20th Century New Testament Textual Criticism." Presented at the New Testament Textual Criticism Section, SBL annual meetings, New York, Nov. 1979.  
"The Doxology at the End of Romans." In the forthcoming Festschrift for B.M. Metzger, Oxford University Press.  
"Codex Washingtonianus in Mark: Text Critical Methodology and the Caesarean Text." Ph.D. thesis reworked for publication in Studies and Documents (Eerdmans), presently in the final stages of editing.

- "The Formation of Belief in Jesus." A research project being conducted over the next few years.
- Johnston, G.  
"Jesus: Deacon of God and Man." In the forthcoming Festschrift for H.K. McArthur.  
"Archegos." Accepted by NTS.  
"Discipleship and Christian Character in the New Testament." Book MS in the final stage of preparation.
- Jobling, D.  
"The Leadership of Israel 'Between' Joshua and Saul: A Structural Analysis." Presented at the CSBS annual meetings, Saskatoon, May, 1979.  
"The Quest of the Historical Jeremiah: Hermeneutical Implications of Recent Literature." Forthcoming in USQR.  
"'Post-Structuralism' in Biblical Exegesis?" Forthcoming in USQR.
- MacKenzie, R.S.  
"Phonological Peculiarities in the Latin Column of Codex Bezae." Forthcoming in JNTS.  
Theological Tendencies in Bezan Additions to Sermons in Acts.  
Church and Synagogue Dialogue in John.
- McEvenue, S.  
"Brevard Childs Revisited: Some Reflections on the Current Crisis in Biblical Theology." Presented at the Catholic Biblical Association congress in San Francisco, August, 1978.  
"The Role of Samaria in the Restoration." To be presented at the Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions, Winnipeg, August, 1980.
- Mosca, P.G.  
"The Structure of Psalm 8: Chaos and Creation." Presented at the Catholic Biblical Association meeting, 1979, and accepted for publication in CBQ.  
"Who Seduced Whom? A Note on Josh. 15:18 // Jdg. 1:14." A paper being revised for publication.  
Final publication of Punic inscriptions from the ASOR and British Academy excavations at Carthage.



Revision of Ph.D. thesis on child sacrifice in Israel and Canaan. Accepted for publication in the Harvard Semitic Monographs series.

Richardson, P.  
Commentary on I Corinthians.

Paul's ethics.

Rollmann, H.  
"Recent German Publications on Roman Catholic Modernism."  
Forthcoming in The Downside Review.

"Paulus alienus: William Wrede's Interpretation of Paul." To be presented at the annual meeting of the CSBS, Montreal, 1980.

"'Early Catholicism': An Examination of Recent Scholarship." For the McMaster Project on Normative Self-Definition in Judaism and Early Christianity.

Monograph on the life and work of William Wrede.

Anthology on the history and methodology of the Religions-geschichtliche Schule in biblical studies (jointly with Gerd Ludemann, Vanderbilt University).

Runnalls, D.R.  
Josephus' biblical interpretation in the Antiquities of the Jews. A project undertaken in Jerusalem with the help of a SSHRC Grant for 1979-80.

Scobie, C.H.H.  
Research in early Christian art, Italy and Britain, June - August, 1979.

Segal, A.F.  
"Hellenistic Magic: A Question of Definition."  
"The Meeting of the Soul with the Self in Heavenly Ascent."  
"Isaiah as Martyr in Jewish Tradition and Christianity."  
Heavenly Journeys: The Structure of the Ascent Motive in Hellenistic Judaism.

Trites, A.A.  
Research into some early experiments in higher education in New Brunswick.

The use of witness themes in the 2nd century A.D.

#### 4. NEW APPOINTMENTS

Carson, D.A.  
Associate Professor of New Testament, Trinity Evangelical School, Deerfield, IL., U.S.A.

Clark, E.G.  
Graduate Secretary, Dept. of Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto.

Couturier, G.  
Consultor of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, Vatican City.

Cox, C.  
Interim Assistant Professor of Hebrew Bible, Dept. of Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto, 1979-80.

Craigie, P.C.  
Dean, Faculty of Humanities, University of Calgary.

Davis, P.G.  
Assistant Professor of Religious Studies, University of Prince Edward Island.

Dion, P.E.  
Associate Professor of Old Testament Literature and History of Israel, Dept. of Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto.

Dressler, H.H.P.  
Academic Dean, Northwest Baptist Theological College and Seminary, Vancouver, B.C.

Professor of Biblical Studies.

Duhaime, J.L.  
Professeur, substitut (demi-temps), Théologie études bibliques, Université de Montréal.

Fraikin, D.  
Associate Professor, Queen's University.

Greidanus, S.  
Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies, The King's College, Edmonton, Alberta.

- Hawkin, D.J.  
Elected member of Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas.  
  
Associate Professor, Dept. of Religious Studies, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Hobbs, T.R.  
Professor of Old Testament Interpretation, McMaster Divinity College.  
  
Director of the Wm. Messecar Centre for the Study of Biblical Backgrounds at McMaster Divinity College. The centre is a collection of resource, slides, library, etc. for use in the teaching of biblical courses at McMaster.
- Horsnell, M.J.A.  
Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies, McMaster Divinity College.
- Hurtado, L.W.  
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Religion, University of Manitoba.
- Jobling, D.  
Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, St. Andrew's College, Saskatoon, Sask.
- McCready, W.O.  
Assistant Professor, Department of Religious Studies, University of Calgary.
- McEvenue, S.  
Principal of Lonergan University College, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec.
- Newton, M.  
Lecturer, Dept. of Religious Studies, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Quammie, R.A.  
Sessional Lecturer of Old Testament, Dept. of Religious Studies, University of Windsor, Summer Session, 1979.  
  
Minister of Seeley's Bay United Church Pastoral Charge.
- Riegel, S.K.  
Assistant Professor of Religious Studies, Trinity Western College, Langley, B.C.
- Rollmann, H.  
Research Associate, Judaism / Early Christianity Project, McMaster University, 1979-80.

- Steering Committee Member, Roman Catholic Modernism Seminar at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion, 1980.  
  
Assistant Professor of New Testament, Dept. of Religious Studies, University of Toronto, 1980-81.
- Sanders, E.P.  
Part-time Visiting Professor, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City, 1980.
- Segal, A.F.  
Associate Professor, Dept. of Religious Studies / Centre for Religious Studies, University of Toronto.
- Weir, G.A.  
Assistant Professor of New Testament, Huron College, London.
- Wishart, V.R.  
Minister, Erskinis and American United Church, Montreal, Quebec.
5. THESES AND DISSERTATIONS
- Aufrecht, W.E.  
"Surrogates for the Divine Names in the Palestinian Targums to Exodus" (Ph.D. dissertation completed, Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto, 1979).
- Bound, J.F.  
"Paul's View of Celibacy as presented in I Corinthians 7:25-40" (Faculty of Theology - Études bibliques, Université de Montréal).
- Cox, C.  
"The Textual Character of the Armenian Version of Deuteronomy" (Ph.D. dissertation completed, Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto, 1979).
- Davis, P.G.  
"Truly This Man was the Son of God': The Christological Focus of the Markan Redaction" (Ph.D. dissertation completed, Religious Studies, McMaster University, 1979).
- Neumann, K.J.  
"The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Statistical Analysis of Style". In progress.
- Quammie, R.A.  
"Iranian Influence in the Book of Daniel: An Assessment of the Evidence" (M.A. thesis completed, Religious Studies, University of Windsor).



"The Concept of Sin and Atonement in the Biblical Wisdom Literature" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of London). In progress.

Rollmann, H.

"The Historical Methodology of William Wrede" (Ph.D. dissertation completed, Religious Studies, McMaster University, 1979).

#### NOTICES

C.S.B.S. members are reminded of the biblical issue of Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses planned for the spring of 1982. To commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, the journal Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses will devote one issue in 1982 to biblical studies. Preparation of this issue is the responsibility of the C.S.B.S., working in cooperation with the journal's Editorial Committee.

Members of the C.S.B.S. are invited to submit articles written in French or English for this special issue of Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses to the Chairman of the Research and Publications Committee:

Professor C. M. Foley  
St. Thomas More College  
1437 College Drive  
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan  
S7N 0W6  
(306) 343-4561

Members interested in contributing to the issue may consult past issues of Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses, from Vol. 6/1 on, for the preferred style (e.g. Vol. 8/3 (1979), 357-8 for instructions in French and Vol. 8/4 (1979), 477-8 for instructions in English). It is an editorial policy of the journal that articles not exceed 4,000 words (20 double-spaced, typewritten pages). In preparing material, contributors are asked to bear in mind the varied interests of the journal's readers.

Further information may be obtained from the Chairman of the Research and Publications Committee at the address listed above.

Pour commémorer le cinquantième anniversaire de la Société Canadienne des Etudes Bibliques, la revue Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses entend consacrer un numéro en 1982 aux études bibliques. La préparation de ce numéro fera la responsabilité de la S.C.E.B. avec le concours du comité de rédaction de la revue.

Aux membres de la S.C.E.B. l'invitation s'offre de soumettre des articles écrits en français ou en anglais pour ce numéro special de Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses; que l'on s'adresse au Président du Comité de Recherches et Publications:

Le Professeur C.-M. Foley  
 Collège St-Thomas-More  
 1437 College Drive  
 Saskatoon, Saskatchewan  
 S7N 0W6  
 (306) 343-4561

Les membres qui entendent contribuer à ce numéro sont invités à consulter les anciens numéros de Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses, dès le Vol. 6/1, pour ce qui touche au style préféré (voir le Vol. 8/3 (1979), 357-8 pour les instructions en français, et le Vol. 8/4 (1979), 477-8 pour les instructions en anglais). Les rédacteurs rappellent une règle de la revue: que les articles ne dépassent pas 4.000 mots (20 pages à double interligne, écrites à la machine). On demande aux collaborateurs de ne pas oublier, au cours de leur préparation, les intérêts diversifiés des lecteurs de la revue.

Pour tous renseignements supplémentaires, prière de s'adresser au Président du Comité de Recherches et Publications noté ci-dessus.

Members also are reminded of the following Newsletters which were initiated under the auspices of the Society. One is produced in Canada, while the other is currently produced in the United States.

"NEWSLETTER FOR UGARITIC STUDIES"

For full information write:

The Editor  
 Newsletter for Ugaritic Studies  
 Dr. P. C. Craigie  
 The University of Calgary  
 Calgary, Alberta, T2N 1N4

"NEWSLETTER FOR TARGUMIC AND COGNATE STUDIES"

For full information write:

The Editor  
 Newsletter for Targumic and Cognate Studies  
 B. T. Viviano  
 Aquinas Institute  
 Dubuque, Iowa  
 52001 U.S.A.