

BULLETIN
OF THE
CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

No. 24

1964

Preface:

By direction of the Society, the Bulletin is to be revived after a five year interlude! This action is prompted by a desire on the part of the members able to attend the annual meetings, to provide more distant members with some tangible reward for their support. To provide full coverage, the Executive has instructed the Secretary to include: I) The full text of the Presidential Address, II) Abstracts of all papers presented, III) A transcription of the proceedings of the Society.

I am happy to report that assembling the materials has been a pleasant task. All necessary information was in my hands within one week of the time of meeting, a record which I hope will be matched in subsequent years. For such cooperation I am most grateful.

Waterloo Lutheran University
Waterloo Ontario

Norman E. Wagner
Secretary-Treasurer

I. THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Divine Sovereignty and Missionary Strategy

Prof. E. Cyril Blackman

In this consideration of the meaning and relevance of Romans 9-11, I beg to set aside at the outset three views of these classic chapters:

- (1) The Calvinist, which finds in them the basis for a theology of determinism. (I admit that some solid material is provided!)
- (2) The view that we have here a philosophy of history. This is typical of Liberalism, and is represented in Dodd's commentary, but it is not confined to scholars of the 19th and 20th centuries, because it links back at least as far as Augustine.
- (3) The view, advocated at length recently by J. Munck, and in my view incredible, that Romans 9-11 are the justification of an evangelistic strategy which envisaged the completion of the Gentile mission and also the final ingathering of Israel (i.e., the culmination of God's purpose for mankind), within measurable time from the date of Paul's writing.

Our understanding of this passage must begin with the recognition that Paul is wrestling with the fact of Jewish opposition to the Church. This, however, was not simply a practical matter, affecting ecclesiastical strategy, but inevitably raised questions concerning the divine purpose, and it thus carried Paul into the consideration of the ultimate destiny of both Jew and Gentile, and also--though this is disputed (it turns on the interpretation of pantass in 11:32)--of the ultimate salvation and/or rejection of individuals.

To venture a parallel: take the position of negroes in the United States. This is not simply a question of segregation (the practical arrangement that has obtained until now). It is really a question of the meaning of the Constitution and citizenship, of human rights, and--in Christian judgment--of the will of God for man.

What we are dealing with in this section of Romans is the baffling experience of the rejection of revelation by a people whose religious dimension was inexplicable apart from revelation. This experience is baffling in proportion to the faith of the reader and his concern that divine revelation be known and heeded.

Who has not felt, on first reading Romans 9-11, what many of Paul's Gentile readers in the early Church must have felt, that it is arid rabbinical stuff, digestible only by those who start from Jewish presuppositions and are used to having Old Testament passages torn from their context and linked with other passages similarly uprooted? This strikes most reasonable people as illogical in method and illegitimate as exegesis. Why doesn't Paul state his views about overcoming Jewish scruples (as he does in Chapter 14, for example, in another connection) without dragging in so many quotations? We moderns find it hard to admit that it was necessary for the refutation of Jewish objections, and that, as Michel points out, the quotations are the heart of Paul's argument.

I suggest that though our own exegesis of these chapters cannot but be aware of this antipathy, we have to set in relief this underlying theme of lack of response to revelation, which is the Church's continual problem. God is revealed in Christ: Christ is the truth. This the Church exists to proclaim. But so far from it being acknowledged by all who are concerned to know the truth--so far from revelation being progressive--it runs up against resistance even in the minds of those who might have been expected to welcome it most eagerly. There is regress as well as progress in the matter of man's confrontation with divine revelation. It does not fit in with earlier accepted truth and tradition; the new is regarded as the enemy of the old, instead of its complement or culmination.

This, in relation to divine omnipotence, is the underlying issue. Generalized as above, it lacks the intense personal tone of Paul's discussion, and the zeal which he attributes to his fellow-Jews and exemplifies in himself. Yet it was such zeal that largely constituted the problem as Paul faced it. Is there any like it on the modern horizon? Our analogues to the Judaism which caused the challenge in the 1st century are the challenge of the non-Christian religions' Communism and "scientism". But the underlying parallel is man's preference of his own systems or nihilisms to what is offered as divine revelation.

Paul starts--it has been on his mind since Chapter 3:1-8--with Jewish failure to respond to the Gospel. The contrast between this and their original response to God's call, in the persons of Abraham and Moses, is most baffling. That original response is implied in the honorific attributes of Chapter 9:4-5: sonship, glory, covenants, law, temple, promises, patriarchs and the Messianic hope, which in Paul's affirmation as a Christian has been realized. In Chapter 10:2 he refers to their "zeal for God". This has been a notable feature of their life all down the centuries in the wilderness and in Canaan, in freedom and persecution, and the Christian centuries bear their own testimony to this. But zeal for God must be directed to a worthy goal.

Before we proceed with Paul's argument we may connect it with our modern responsibility as Christians in the "post-Christian" era by labelling the factor of Jewish recalcitrance which Paul was up against a special form of the problem of the rejection of Christ, the scandal or unbelief (Mark 4:1-12; 6:1-6). To generalize further: it focuses the opposition of secularism to the idea of revelation.

To come back from generalization and modern parallels to the problem as it pressed on Paul. His personal references in Chapters 9:2 and 10:1-3 express more than perplexity: this is a kind of shame. He is writing out of long and intense reflection; he is not writing objectively, as in I Thessalonians 2:14-16.

Still less is he viewing it with the objectivity of the Gentile Luke (See Acts 6:7, and 13, especially 13:46). Luke's apparent assumption that the newness of the Gospel could only be appreciated by "progressive" Gentiles, the Jews being too conservative (if this is a fair comment of Luke's editorial expansion of the parable of the new wine and the old bottles, Luke 5:39), is no doubt the kind of Gentile attitude which Paul rebukes in Romans 11:17-21.

Israel's sin is incomparably worse than human failure generally. There can be no parallel to it because Israel's privilege as a recipient of divine revelation was without parallel. The oddness of God in choosing the Jews should

have been matched by enough sense of that oddness in the Jews to make them aware when the divine choice is operating again in history, in the coming of the Messiah and the extension of revelation to new recipients.

The intenseness of Paul's perplexity is due to the fact that this obtuseness of the Jews does not merely reflect discredibly on them, but causes the critical to doubt the veracity of God, and His ability to achieve His purposes with mankind. Paul has overheard this if 9-11 reflects actual debates with Jews (or can logically conceive it), and its blasphemy prompts the firm denial in Chapters 9:6 and 11:1, and the confident assertion of Chapter 11:29. This is the second, and main, premise: the sole supremacy and righteous control of God. (Chapter 9:6, 13-18, 21.) (The first premise was Jewish opposition (10:21), stumbling (9:32), insensitivity (11:7-8).

The divine will is sovereign in human affairs, however inscrutable; it is above human criticism. This is difficult for the modern man and even the modern Christian; you have to be a Calvinist, perhaps even a 16th century Calvinist, to take this argument, as stated by Paul.¹ But we must be willing to be faced by the challenge of it. It is helpful to concentrate on verse 16 and 11:6. God is in charge all the time. His chief characteristic is mercy, and the goal He is aiming at is salvation for all (Chap. 11:32). Man's opposition cannot ultimately obstruct or defeat God. The "hardening" which Paul also attributes to God is not his final mode of dealing with refractory humanity. Mercy has the last word. But that is to anticipate; we must not rush fences.²

Paul's assertion of God's sovereign control and repudiation of man's right to question it does not commend his argument to modern individualism. The analogy of the potter (verses 19-21) is not very illuminating in a century which does not believe in the right of absolute rulers and has had too much experience of totalitarian ruthlessness. To the ancient world the analogy was more convincing. This is not to say that the point of the analogy is no longer true. But it does remind us that the modern man has more barriers to climb before he can get close to the thought of the Apostle, and the value of a commentary may be measured by the extent to which the commentator helps his reader to surmount these barriers (or is frank enough to say if he regards them as insurmountable).

If questioned, Paul would presumably see the point about Free Will: the difference between a human being and a pot. But he seems unaware of the great moral issue his reasoning in the middle of Chapter 9 opens up:

Divine control : human freedom;
if absolute --- then no guilt.

Nevertheless, in reply to the perplexities his argument causes to us men of greater logic and lesser faith, he might call our attention to three points in the total context of these three chapters:

- (1) He is not dealing with individuals primarily, as we unconsciously assume. [This must be borne in mind at Chapter 11:32.]
- (2) The problem of determinism versus freedom is not soluble in logic or philosophy, but is soluble in the Christian experience of the relationship between man and God. This relationship is inaugurated by God's eleos (Chapter 9:16-18) when responded to by faith on the human side (Chapter 10:5-17).

- (3) "Consider the latter end." For Paul this counsel of the Psalmist means: take account of the total plan of God, not merely of its temporary interruption. God is cognizant of Israel's obtuseness, and has in some sense caused it (Chapter 11:8 Katanuxis); but the final working out of the divine eleos must be the gathering in of the recalcitrant: Chapter 11:32. T. W. Manson calls this "Paul's deepest eschatological conviction".

To return to his emphatic denial that Israel's disobedience means a failure of God's purpose (This must be the meaning of "the word of God" in Chapter 9:6; the verb is ekpeptoken). The problem stimulates him to offer two corollaries:-

- a) There are distinctions within Israel, Chapter 9:7-13. God's principle of selection continues to operate even after Israel has been separated from the mass of nations. It operates within Israel, working through Isaac rather than Ishmael, and Jacob rather than Esau. The principle is clear enough and is not only a matter of Rabbinic citation of texts, but reveals Paul's true insight into the meaning of the Old Testament. [On the level of texts, 23 ff.--the invitation to Gentiles--could be taken as equivalent to preference of Esau over Jacob, and thus a contradiction of verse 13.] This insight comes through again in what he says about the Remnant in Chapters 9:27 and 11:1-6; and the principle of faith in Chapter 9:30-33, 10:10 ff.

The reference is much broader than in verse 13. The operation of divine mercy is not confined to distinctions within Israel. God is not the God of Jews only. This is an observable fact of history, verse 24, and reveals a meaning latent in Hosea which Hosea was not conscious of, verses 25-6.

- b) We have now embarked on our second corollary:

God's will to elect Gentiles; bring them within his saving purpose (vessels of mercy, verse 23).

For Paul this was no theologoumenon, a dream of the future; but a fact of his own, and the Church's, experience. It was as observable as the defection and obstinacy of Israel. The Gentiles, in spite of their uncircumcision and alleged "abominations", were there, as baptized believers, in Antioch and Corinth and Rome. This incontrovertible fact necessitated a widening of the concept of divine election, (ekloge). It was not enough to infer that the Gentiles had got their chance because the Jews had thrown theirs away (Acts 13:46; Luke 14:21-24); it must be part of God's plan, no less. There are no contingencies in Paul's conception of history. This assumption, that the response of the Gentiles had not taken God unawares, must be supported by Scripture evidence, and Paul proceeds to do this; in Rabbinic fashion he finds a proof in Hosea (verse 25, in spite of the apparent contrast with verse 13). He does even more; he relates it to his own main theme, viz., righteousness, divine and human, in this Epistle. He goes so far as to describe the new standing of the formerly godless Gentiles in terms of achieving righteousness. We recall, of course, that this term means primarily right relationship with God, experience of His saving power; not righteousness in the sense of moral attainment.

The problem was intensified for Paul by the fact that for many Jews election was not simply the Old Testament conception of election to responsibility and the ultimate inclusion of Gentiles (Genesis 12:3; Isaiah 66:18; Jonah); but a more rigid conception which limited even God's freedom in controlling it. Yahweh, in fact, as well as Israel was bound by it.

This new Gentile status is due on their part to faith, not desert or superior attainment either intellectual or moral. We already know from Chapter 4 what Paul means by faith in contrast to works, but it is so essential to his argument here that he devotes part of Chapter 10 to the demonstration that it is primary because implied repeatedly by the Law itself. [This is the point of Chapter 10:6-11 quoting Deuteronomy and Isaiah.] Faith means readiness to respond to God's invitation and fit in to His plan, rather than persist in a traditional way of life, even when, as in the case of the Jews, that way of life was orientated towards the will of God and generated great moral seriousness.

In Chapter 9:31 the verb diskon is a strong word, not adequately rendered "follow after" (KJV), or even "pursue" (RSV). NEB is better with "made great efforts after". It connects with the Jews' zeal for God, Chapter 10:2. But zeal is not enough; there must be an adequate concept of God, Chapter 10:3 (cf. John 4:22). Without that even a theonomous ethic degenerates into an ethic of self-regard.

On this understanding of faith we can see that

- a) God has not been unfair in including Gentiles among his elect. His purpose is beyond the reproach of human logic. It has not "fallen to the ground" (Chapter 9:6), nor is God chargeable with injustice (Chapter 9:14).
- b) Christ is the awakener of faith: Chapter 10:4 and 9 (cf. Hebrews 12:2). I take the view that telos in Chapter 10:4 means "end" in the sense of "termination," not in the sense of climax or fulfilment. No other sense fits Paul's argument about Christ's significance in relation to the Law in Romans and Galatians. (If he had meant "fulfilment" in Chapter 10:4, he would have said pleroma as in Chapter 13:10).

Curiously, the positive implications of this concept of Christ's work are not drawn out. Israel's lack of faith becomes the centre of the argument again at Chapter 10:16, and the beginning of Chapter 11 makes use of the Remnant idea to show that God's grace is at work even when men see no signs of it. A nucleus of elect is always visible to God and they may be said to obtain what God has to offer (Chapter 11:7). But the argument does not proceed in terms of divine grace any more than in terms of the activity of Christ. Instead the theme of Israel's jealousy being aroused is introduced at Chapter 11:11 and 14. The sharing by Gentiles in the privileges of election is envisaged as wakening the "zeal" of the former elect people, which was inoperative when the Messiah appeared, and needed to be directed with new stimulus to that highest of privileges, viz., functioning as the true society now at last constituted under the lead of God's vice-regent. We should not attach too much importance to these verses, even though Paul becomes lyrical (verses 12 and 15). As reasoning it is not impressive on

the great theme of how the final response of Israel is to be achieved ("all Israel," verse 26, as contrasted with the elect remnant, verses 5-7). In fact, it is not reasoning at all, but a fancy, and we need not waste time paying lip-service to it or pretending that it still has to happen. In our modern responsibility for the Gospel we have no time for that kind of literalism. Nevertheless, we must not dispense with some considerations that were present to the Apostle in this passage:-

- (1) The zeal of the Jew, even the obdurate Jew, was a fact. Basically it means concern for the things of God. Thus there is strength in Paul's argument in so far as it implies that while this feature of Judaism persists the Jew cannot remain insensitive to the acceptance--by Gentiles--of Jesus as the Messiah, and its development as faith, institution, and missionary crusade. If this is of God the Jews will in the end voluntarily join in, and so "all Israel will be saved" (verse 26). There is ultimately only one people of God, not two. The practical difficulty for Christians today is that the life of the Church is not able to challenge Judaism--or any other religion apparently--or stir it to emulation. The ancient Jewish obduracy is now paralleled by a Christian obduracy. The question whether the purpose of God has failed (Chapter 9:6) still presses itself on our attention.
- (2) We must face it in its relevance to our situation, but learn from Paul to do so in the framework of what we know, through Christ, about God's purpose and word, and their ultimate realization. Our temptation is to consider it too anthropologically, in terms of existential involvement. Paul is writing in the strict sense theologically. We are tempted to criticise him for it, but we should learn from him precisely here, even though he is not addressing our situation. We tend to forget God; Paul never does. We are justified in pointing to his deficiency on human free will. But we must hold on to Paul's "God has the power" (Chapter 11:23; cf. 9:16).

Paul's main answer to the problem of Jewish opposition to the Gospel is not verses 11-16 or 17-24 of Chapter 11, but verses 25-32. When we have registered our dissatisfaction with the jealousy argument (verses 11-16), we wonder how God is to be understood as carrying out His will. The analysis Paul has given in 7 and 8 is too serious a diagnosis to be dealt with by the jealousy theory, or by the analogy of the ingrafting, (verses 17-24). The terms "hardening" and "stupor" have been used of the plight of Judaism, and Paul even affirms that these are of divine causation, not simply the effects of persistence on man's part in wrong acts and choices. Let us give Paul credit here for refusing to make the problem out to be simpler than it is. Those who follow Sanday and Headlam interpret the hardening as the result of human sin, but this, as I said, does not dig down as deeply as Paul does, to the roots of the problem in an interweaving of divine and human factors. Consider the following samples of exegetical opinion:

Calvin on Chapter 11:7 - "not those were blinded who so deserved by their wickedness, but who were rejected by God before the foundation of the world . . . the cause of eternal reprobation is so hidden from us, that nothing remains but to wonder at the incomprehensible purpose of God . . . they reason absurdly who, whenever a word is said of the proximate causes, strive by bringing forward these to

cover the first, which is hid from our view, as though God had not, before the fall of Adam, freely determined to do what seemed good to him with respect to the whole human race . . ."

Leenhardt, ad loc., takes the "hardening" to mean divine judgment, in which God is active, not passive. (edoken, 3, cf. the triple paredoken, Chapter 1:24 ff.)

Barrett, p.210: "It is impossible here to distinguish between 'hardened because disobedient' and 'disobedient because hardened'; the two processes are concurrent."

F. W. Beare (I.D.B. Romans) "Israel's rejection of the Gospel must be attributed in the last analysis to the will of God."

Michel sees the divine and human as interrelated (auf einander bezogen) and speaks of "ein Unheilsweg in der Geschichte," the reverse side, as it were, of Heilsgeschichte.

Paul is bold enough to affirm that Israel's hardening was foreordained as much as the hardening of Pharaoh (Chapter 9:20), the oppressor of Israel. But he goes on to make this part of a total scheme in which the temporary hardening ("partial", Chapter 11:25, in a temporal sense) is transformed into an ultimate response to divine grace (Chapter 11:32) after non-Israelites have been included. The illogicalities and new starts in the Apostle's thought are not weakness; it has a conception of divine control which does not depend on the accidents of history or the element of human opposition. And this divine control is also beneficent. It means that man is never beyond God's concern however far he goes in his defiance and however much he may become depersonalized in--shall we add?--modern involvements such as atheism, secularism or the tyranny of the machine. If it were not profanation to attempt to improve on the end of Romans Chapter 8, we might say that nothing can separate the unbeliever from the love of Christ!

But what of the Heilsgeschichte? This is still operative because God is still God, however many of his chosen on earth prove insensitive to His call. We want to know what Paul has to teach about this after his unsparing reference to Israel's plight in verses 7-8. How is the remnant (verse 5) to become co-extensive with "all Israel" (verse 26), and "all Israel" to be united with "the fulness of the Gentiles" (verse 25)? How will the divine mercy transform the "hardening"? How can the "reconciliation of the world" (verse 15) become reality, and a more inclusive goal than the reconciliation of present believers referred to in Chapter 5:10-11, in fact, a fulfilment of Jeremiah's vision of a new covenant (verse 27)?

The main statement is verses 25-32. It is not as full as we could wish. Paul is as conscious as anyone that the "How?" in the questions just posed must remain unanswered this side of eternity. But they are proper questions to pose and ponder, as also are the assertions he feels able to make, out of his own insight into God's will, to lessen our ignorance of this great "mystery" (verse 25). In spite of the compression of his thought and the peremptoriness of his language here, it is clearly his considered judgment which is conveyed, and verse 32 makes a moving climax.

He conceives of the final re-ordering in two consecutive stages: the entry (into the Kingdom, or final salvation) of the "full number (pleroma) of the Gentiles" (verse 25b), and then the salvation of "all Israel" (verse 26). The precise meaning of this terminology is still uncertain. "All Israel" must mean every individual Israelite presumably. Sanhedrin 10:1 is quoted as a Rabbinic parallel, "All Israel has a share in the Age to Come". The Age to Come means after the general resurrection and pre-supposes, according to Billerbeck, purification in the fire of Gehenna in the period between death and resurrection. We need not wrap up our interpretation in a nice phrase like "Israel in its eschatological fulness" (Michel), which leaves the question of the individual unanswered. On the other hand, there is reason to believe that Paul is here thinking mainly in terms of entities: Israel, Gentiles, (cf. also Illyria, 15:19). We can hardly accept the interpretation of "all Israel" as equivalent to the "Israel of God" (Galatians 6:16), which includes Gentiles. (So Barth, following Calvin.)

For the "pleroma of the Gentiles" we have no Rabbinic parallel to help us, but behind it is the apocalyptic notion that God in His sovereign control has everything planned in detail, the precise number of the saved and the damned, the exact date of the end of history, the correct measurement of the eternal city, and so on. The martyrs crying for vengeance in the New Testament Apocalypse are told to be patient until the full tally of martyrs is made up (Revelation 6:11) and the number is later given as 144,000 (Revelation 7:4-8, 13-14). This particular Christian author has limited the number of the "elect" to Christian martyrs, but the concept itself was originally without such limitation, and it is that concept which Paul is using.³

The idea behind Revelations 6 and 7 is that the number of the elect is strictly limited. At some point the notion crept in that it was the precise equivalent of the number of the fallen angels. Augustine had this notion and argued that it was a mark of God's grace. It is not injustice on God's part so to limit the elect, because mankind being massa perditionis deserves utter rejection. If God then "elects" some to a better destiny, that is free grace on his part.⁴

Paul does not go so far. His point is that Gentiles as well as Jews are to make a contribution to the redeemed society which God purposes. The surprising feature which he feels he has to argue for the sake of Jewish readers is that the Gentiles are to precede the Jews. This was a necessary inference from the response of Gentiles to the preaching of the Gospel. Man must not be surprised if God in His mercy invents new methods.

The climax of the argument (11:32) would seem to be an affirmation that ultimately all will be saved, and that the mysterious operation of divine mercy will dissolve human obduracy. Paul knows better than to speculate on how this can come to pass. Such speculation belongs to a realm above human logic. Paul's mind takes wings in 11:33-36; praise in such a context is more fitting than argument or quotation.

I favour the universalist interpretation of "all" in verse 32; i.e., I take it to mean every individual, not simply Gentiles and Jews in a general sense, allowing for individual exceptions, still less the Gentiles and Jews of the generation to which Paul belonged--assuming that he regarded them as the last generation. The full universalist conclusion is the only

one which does justice to the Biblical Kerygma of God's redemptive purpose. It is mercy in its total and ultimate implications.⁵

Romans 9-11 may be regarded as a philosophy of history in so far as it proceeds from the axiom of God's control of history and takes history more seriously than Greek and Eastern thought. For Paul, as for the whole Bible, history is the sphere of divine action, choosing and refusing, setting up and throwing down the actions of men and nations. When he speaks of God loving Jacob or hardening Pharaoh, or of an "election of grace", he has in mind historical events, actual deeds and policies and consequences which figure in the history books. The divine action interwoven with human factors is not arbitrary, but logical and purposive. For history is moving toward the attainment of a goal set by God, whether with or without human understanding and co-operation. This is the Biblical dynamism, and its anthropomorphic expression must not be allowed to obscure its proper logic and seriousness. It sustains the conviction that the ultimate power behind phenomena is not chance or fate or wave mechanics or nuclear energy.

Paul's ignoring of secondary causes, his failure to distinguish cause and effect and his minimizing of free will leave question marks (or exclamation marks) in our minds as we read, and exegesis such as Calvin's on Chapter 11:7 (quoted above) will strike us as uncritical. But the way in which Paul keeps the divine mastery in the centre of the argument is something our faith needs to follow.

Why does he not develop his thought more definitely with reference to Christ? Christ is "the end of law" indeed; but why is this not positively emphasized? Christ is the communicator of the divine righteousness, and the means of sin's expiation (1:17 and 3:24). Should he not also be presented in Chapters 9-11 as gatherer of the new Gentile section of the people of God, and also as shepherd of Old Israel still, both the ninety-nine safely in the fold (even though reduced to the remnant, 11:5) and the minority lost in the wilds? It is curious that the Apostle is content to refer to the restoration of Israel in terms of revived zeal (11:11), regrafting (11:24), rather than in terms of Christ's claim and compassion, or in any of the strong metaphors of Chapters 5-8.

To conclude, we may reconstruct as follows the scheme of salvation resulting from the incursion of divine energy into history in Christ, which Paul had in mind:

- (1) Arrival of Messiah, or incarnation of God's Son: Galatians 4:4.
His Resurrection: Romans 1:4, Ephesians 1:20.
What Jesus called the coming of the Kingdom Paul speaks of as the revelation of righteousness: Romans 1:17.
- (2) The New Israel, or Messianic community, is now constituted: Romans 1:5, 6:3-4, 8:26-30; Galatians 3:26-29.
- (3) Old Israel temporarily in opposition: Romans 9:31, 10:21, 11:7-8, 25 (Mark 6:1-6; Acts 13:46).
- (4) Non-Israel gathered in: Romans 9:23-30, 10:12-13 (Matthew 8:11-12, 28:15-20; John 4:26-42).
- (5) Regathering of Old Israel: Romans 11:24-26.
- (6) Mercy for all: Romans 10:12, 11:32.

We can hardly fall in with Paul's view that (4) is consequent on (3). We must regard the inclusion of the Gentiles as part of God's plan from the beginning (as Paul really believes himself). For Christ is not simply the new Abraham or Moses, but the New Adam.

¹Even Barth admits (*Kurze Erklärung*, p. 142) that a doctrine of bare sovereignty makes God no more than a "tyrannical demon".

²Notice my exegetical method here: I am assuming that the precise exegesis is clear enough, but partly (in places) incredible, though few commentators admit that. I nevertheless urge that our weak individualistic modern faith needs to grapple with it.

³Charles' and Lohmeyer's commentaries on the Apocalypse refer to the parallels in Jewish apocalyptic, e.g., IV Ezra 4:36-7; II Baruch 23:5. See also Bousset-Gressman, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 248. Speculation could vary about the duration of the present Age: did it depend upon a certain number of men being born, or a certain number of righteous men? The less optimistic (e.g. IV Ezra) might doubt whether a single righteous man had been born (cf. Rom. 3:19-20). The thought behind Rev. 6-7 is of preordained martyrdoms.

⁴Kelly: *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 368. Calvin shows no trace of this. He explains fulness of the Gentiles as the majority of the Church.

⁵This exegesis follows Dodd, Barth, Beare and T. W. Manson. The more cautious commentators are Sanday-Headlam, Anderson Scott, Michel, and Althaus. Among the most subtle in this cautious category are Barrett and Leenhardt.

II. ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS

1. "Recent Discussions of Oral Style in the Old Testament"

Three recent works have treated oral style in the Old Testament: William Whallon, "Formulaic Poetry in the Old Testament", Comparative Literature, 15 (1963), pp. 1-14; Stanley Gevirtz, Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, No. 32; and a doctoral thesis by the writer, "Oral Formulaic Language in the Biblical Psalms", submitted to the University of Toronto in 1963. The problem is to establish the devices which Hebrew poets may have used in composing poetry orally and which might appear in some of the poems which have come down to us. Gevirtz and Whallon suggest that the main device was the fixed pair of words used in parallel cola. The writer suggests that the main devices were the formula and the formulaic phrase as in many other traditions of oral poetry. This is not to say that the fixed pair did not play a part in oral composition, but the determination of its exact role must await further study of the phenomenon.

R. C. Culley, Montreal

2. "The Twelve in the Early Church"

The aim of this paper is to examine the role of the Twelve in the early Church and point to possible results for source criticism. In an examination of Elliott-Binns' theory of apostolic Christianity in Galilee in opposition to that of Jerusalem, it was pointed out that early Christianity was a Galilean movement centred in Jerusalem. I am dubious of the continued adherence of Jesus' Galilean supporters. Either the theory of K. Lake, about a flight to Galilee and return, or that of J. Weiss, that the resurrection appearances occurred in Jerusalem, is preferable to that of Elliott-Binns.

In the events of Acts, individual Christians seem to assume a dominant role from the beginning (e.g. Peter and James). Examination shows that Luke's theory of the College of the Twelve breaks down. Some of the eschatological significance of the Twelve in the ministry of Jesus may have led to a tendency to assume the role of prince-regents. The large number of apostles and the leading role assumed by some of them must have broken down this idea very quickly. The Twelve, therefore, did not become a focal point around which tradition concerning the ministry of Jesus gathered. One might go on to examine the role of individuals and groups in the formation of tradition groupings.

Harry Kuntz, Brantford

3. "A Progress Report on the Peshitta Project"

Four translations, based on the Hebrew text, appeared within the first 450 years A.D. The Peshitta and the Targums still require critical editions. The present 5 extant editions of the Peshitta (Paris Polyglot, London Polyglot, Lee, Urmia, and Mosul) can all be reduced to one, namely the edition prepared by G. Sionita for the Paris Polyglot. In 1959, P.A.H. de Boer was appointed general editor by the International Organization for the Old Testament. He collected an international group of

collaborators to prepare individual books of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. All known manuscripts available in America and Europe were ordered on microfilm. DeBoer has made several trips to visit monasteries in the Near East where manuscripts were procured to add to and supplement what was already in Europe. The Codex Ambrosianus of Milan, a 17th Century complete text, is to be used as the basic text. By the end of 1964, a proof volume will appear including Song of Songs (J.A. Emerton), III Maccabees (W. Baars) and Ezra (R.J. Bidawid). The planned edition will have its first volume ready in 1966. The whole project is expected to be completed in 1970. Subsequent to that the editor plans a concordance and a volume(s) on the history of the manuscripts.

E. G. Clarke, Toronto

4. "The Trial of Jesus"

I

This paper draws attention to three books on the Trial of Jesus which have appeared in recent years: "The Trial of Jesus" by Joseph Blinzler (1959); "On the Trial of Jesus" by Paul Winter (1961); "The Death of Jesus" by Joel Carmichael (1963). That books on this subject continue to be written illustrates that the Gospel narratives about the Trial are ambiguous and unsatisfactory. The only points that one can be reasonably sure about are that Jesus was crucified by the Romans, that the inscription on the cross read "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews", and that Pontius Pilate had some responsibility for the death sentence. The points on which there is uncertainty are, Who arrested Jesus in the first place, and why? Did he appear before the Sanhedrin, and if so what happened? Was Jesus presented to Pilate, and if so with what indictment? And so on. That we cannot answer these questions is due to the fact that the early Church had no or very little first-hand evidence about what had transpired at the Trial.

Carmichael's book is an extravaganza. Its thesis is that towards the end of his career Jesus decided to embark on an activist programme, part of which was the cleansing of the temple, whereby Jesus incurred the hostility of both the temple authorities and the Romans. He was subsequently put to death by Pilate as an insurrectionist.

Blinzler, who is a Roman Catholic, offers a good defence of the traditional ideas of the Trial. He claims that Jesus appeared before the Sanhedrin where the main issue was the Messianic claim of Jesus. Jesus was then sent on to Pilate, but here the indictment was that of sedition. Both the Sanhedrin and Pilate are therefore responsible for the Crucifixion.

Winter takes the line that while the Sanhedrin had the power to inflict capital punishment, Jesus was not formally tried before that body. What happened was that some members of the Sanhedrin examined Jesus privately with a view to framing an indictment that could be presented to Pilate.

II

1. Against Carmichael and Winter, who tend to suggest that the controversy narratives (re. tensions between Jesus and some Jewish leaders) are unhistorical, it can be argued there were strong differences between Jesus and his contemporaries on a number of issues.

2. There is little evidence that Jesus' ministry showed signs of being the focal point of a popular uprising.
3. There is no satisfactory explanation of why Jesus was arrested in the first place. If Jesus was presented to Pilate as a political agitator, this was a false charge, and it makes Jesus' subsequent death a judicial murder. The parallels with Socrates' death and with Josephus' explanation of why Herod Antipas put John the Baptist to death at once spring to mind.

W. S. McCullough, Toronto

5. "A Criticism of von Rad's Treatment of the Idea of Expiation"

I

He confuses "expiation" with other terms:-

- With propitiation, as in 2 Sam. 24:25, Mic. 6:7, and in references to a "soothing odour" which please Yahweh.
- With removal of uncleanness: Ex. 29:36-37, 30:10; Levit. 16 passim, Ezek. 43:20-26, 45:20 et al.
- With pardon: Deut. 21:8; Psalm 65:4(3), 78:38, 79:9; Jer. 18:23; Ezek. 16:63; 2 Chron. 30:18.

The term expiation is correctly used in relation to 2 Sam. 21:3; 1 Sam. 3:14.

II

The idea of "expiation" is derived from two distinct but unrelated domains of thought. These are:-

- i The domain of sin-guilt-punishment, which works its baneful nemesis on sinners.
- ii The domain of the holy or the clean, which being violated incurs defilement.

The results of this double derivation are seen in the means of expiation, which are juxtaposed but not intrinsically related. These include:-

- i Punishment as "making good" a status quo.
- ii Transference as removal.
- iii Purification.

von Rad does not apply this double derivation - as he might have - to the meaning of KIPPER. It may be suggested that originally its domain was forensic, and that later it was baptized into ritual. Possibly, since the verb is a denominative, its derivation relates to the judicial use of KOPHER, and its usage was determined by the ceremonial ethos of P. This combination occurs in the ASHAM.

III

The correlation of "expiation" with the sacrificial system seems defective.

1. It is doubtful if MINHAH alone has an expiatory sense.
2. The use of MINHAH and ZEBAH in 1 Sam. 3:14 in a correct expiatory sense should be connected with their similar occurrence in Amos 5:25.
3. It can be argued that the OLAH is not exclusively expiatory.
4. The claim that prayer is focal in such "expiatory" (=propitiatory) sacrifices as the OLAH seems slight in view of the cited cases: 1 Sam. 13:9; Micah 6:6.
5. No comment is made on the impersonal passive WENISLAH LO.

Robert Dobbie, Toronto

6. "The Silent Years of St. Paul"

This paper deals with the question of Paul's activities during the so-called "silent years", which the author designates as from A.D. 37 to A.D. 45. Evidence is found in Gal. 1:22 for Paul's preaching in Syria and Cilicia. This is supported by the use of the present tense in Gal. 2:2. Two other passages give some clues about these "silent years", viz., II Cor. 11:23 ff. and II Cor. 12:1-6. The first passage cannot be confirmed by the narrative of Acts. Where, for example, are we to place the "imprisonments" of v. 23? the "39 strokes" of v. 24? and the "3 shipwrecks" of v. 25? Acts records not a single example with the exception of the beating with rods at Philippi - Acts 16:22. Again up to this point in Paul's career only one short imprisonment at Philippi is mentioned (Acts 16:19 ff.). Acts says nothing about shipwrecks since the shipwreck on the voyage to Rome had not yet occurred. The author finds the case for the origin of the "imprisonment epistles" from some place other than Rome somewhat strengthened. He also suggests that the reference to Illyricum in Rom. 15:19 may provide a clue to the locale of some of the shipwrecks. In the second passage he sees in the use of the term "14 years" a reference to a religious experience which Paul underwent in the midst of these silent years, assuming that the Cor. passage was written around A.D. 55. Finally, the Pastoral Epistles are searched, and two passages identified by P. N. Harrison as genuine Pauline fragments, viz. Titus 1:5 and 3:2 are used as supporting evidence for a possible missionary tour in Illyricum and a shipwreck on Crete. The author's thesis queries the traditional view which places these events after a hypothetical release from captivity in Rome. Instead he suggests that the catalogue of sufferings - II Cor. 11:23 ff. represent the Apostle's experiences before the conventional career in Acts begins, i.e., before A.D. 45, which means that when we meet Paul in Acts he is already an experienced missionary with missionary journeys already accomplished.

R. E. Osborne, Toronto

7. "The Problem of Redaction and the Promises to Hagar"

Since the days in which the "New Documentary" theory which sought to explain the literary origin of the Pentateuch was accepted, the activity of redactors has been regarded as a vital link in the literary growth of the narratives. Generally, however, redactors have been looked upon as a necessary evil, capable of little or no originality and generally contributing only to a confusion of the original narratives.

More recent studies in this field have shown that the "post-history" of the sources is as complex as their pre-history, and "redactors" should be credited with attempting to create a consistent product. Hans Conzelmann and others have approached sections of the New Testament in this fashion with refreshing results.

This paper attempts to examine a short block of material, Gen. 16:10-14, with a view to determining the role played by these verses in the Abraham story as a whole. It is shown that verses 10-14 may be considered as a unit, but that their full significance can only be seen when it is realized that they are based on the narrative in Ch. 21, often called, E. This necessitates a complete re-investigation of the terminology and sequence of the sources, since these verses clearly the work of a J writer, are actually post-E.

It is suggested that the "redactor" or editor responsible for the pre-P Book of Genesis is a late J writer who has incorporated a number of written and oral sources into his work.

Norman E. Wagner, Waterloo

8. "The Three Versions of Solomon's Dream (I Kings 3:4-16; II Chron. 1:1-12; Wisdom of Solomon, 8:17-9:18.)"

A detailed study of the concept of wisdom in the three versions of Solomon's Dream - I Kings 3:4-16; II Chron. 1:1-12; Wisdom of Solomon 8:17-9:18; shows that the basic story has been presented at different times and from different points of view. The manifest differences in religious outlook in these separate accounts provides clear evidence for a theory of literary re-interpretation of existing narratives.

A. M. Brunet, Montreal

9. "The Egyptian Background of the Joseph Story"

J. Vergote in his book, Joseph en Egypte, has endeavored to show that the Egyptian elements in the Joseph tale reflect Ramesside Egypt. Over the past century, however, certain Egyptologists - Steindorff and Griffith to name two of the foremost - have expressed the opinion that a much later period of Egyptian history is reflected by the narrative. A re-examination of the older material as well as presentation of hitherto unused evidence bolsters the position of Steindorff et al. A mass of evidence points to the Saite, rather than to the Ramesside age, as the backdrop to the Joseph narrative. The absence of any genuinely ancient substratum in the story together with the fact that the story is fitted artificially into its Pentateuchal context, increases the likelihood that it is a late composition, thrust at a late date into the corpus of Patriarchal traditions.

D. B. Redford, Toronto

10. "David's Throne - Patterns in the Succession Story"

This paper examines the so-called 'Story of the Succession to David's Throne', isolated by L. Rost (Die Ueberlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids, BWANT, 1926) in II Sam. 6:9-20 and I Kings 1 & 2, and studied by von Rad as "the oldest form of the ancient Israelite history-writing" (Der Anfang der Geschichtsschreibung im alten Israel", Ges. Studien, pp. 159-188).

It is true as von Rad has said that the story manifests a new approach to history-telling, in that the action of God is concealed behind human affairs rather than revealed in specific miraculous interventions into human history, but the distinction is a theological rather than a literary one. For recent study of the stories just on the other side of the borderline between legend and history-writing have shown how carefully the legends were formulated (cf. Alonso-Schökel, Erzählkunst im Buche der Richter, Biblica 42 (1961) pp. 143-172). The Succession Story, as the earliest and best example of Hebrew historiography, also exhibits the marks of deliberate selection and ordering of material.

The purpose of the Succession Story is not simply to explain how Solomon, at least tenth in line, finally triumphed over his rivals, although this question is answered by the story. It is to display, in all their richness and depth, the varied relations of men who no longer walk by faith in the cultic religious symbols of the past but contend for temporal power and freedom of self-expression in the mundane world of daily, i.e. secular life.

The narrator made use of the external structure or public features of the plot as a framework for the expression of the internal design or private dimension. He sought to utilize the outline of the historical events of the struggle within David's court as the medium for the delineation of character. This he did not by lengthy descriptions or his own commentary, but through the acts and words of the men and women who fill the tale.

The author inherited and improved the techniques of earlier narrative composition and added some of his own, so that the resulting whole is a masterpiece of the story-teller's art, fashioned and polished in every detail, the structure imposed upon the events exactly fitting and giving perfect expression to the internal design of his work. The paper offers examples of his art and its techniques in demonstration of his freedom and surehanded skill in the presentation of his material.

Jared J. Jackson, London

III. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY

The 32nd annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies was held concurrently with the 25th annual meeting of the Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature, May 11-13, 1964, at Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Ontario. Also meeting at this time were the Canadian Society of Church History and the Canadian Theological Society.

The President, Cyril Blackman, presided at a business meeting held at 9:00 P.M., May 11, 1964.

The minutes of the 1963 meeting were adopted as read.

Regrets were acknowledged from: J.D.F. Beattie, E.M. Checkland, R.H. Armstrong, E.J. Revell, W.O. Amy, M. Newby, G. Cotter, D.W. Anderson, S. Jellicoe, E.L. Simmonds, A. Legault, J.A. Morrison, W.A. Irwin, G.P. Couturier, J.B. Hibbitts, R.E. Wolfe, F.H. Cosgrave, W.R. Marttila, E.R. Hay, U.S. Leupold, R.B.Y. Scott, M.R.B. Lovesey.

The Secretary presented the following report:

- 1) An attempt was made to bring the mailing list up to date. At present, approximately 60 members have paid their dues, but the mailing list is still close to 200. After 4 years of inactivity, a name is dropped.
- 2) Tribute was paid to the members of the Executive who travelled at considerable expense to themselves in order to plan the present meetings.
- 3) As Secretary of the Canadian Section of SBL, an informal report was made regarding plans for the 100th meeting of SBL in New York, December, 1964. Activities of the Council of SBL were also briefly reviewed.
- 4) The drastic need for improving the efficiency of the secretarial duties was noted. At present, the entire mailing list is notified four times during a calendar year.

On a motion by W.S. McCullough, seconded by George Johnston, the Secretary was thanked for his efforts, and the Society authorized the new Executive to consider the use of some Addressograph equipment.

On a motion by John Macpherson, seconded by George Johnston, it was decided that some travelling expenses are to be paid to executive members for the purpose of planning the annual meetings.

A nomination committee consisting of: W.S. McCullough, George Johnston and Cyril Blackman was appointed.

E.G. Clarke and R.C. Culley were appointed auditors.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 P.M.

May 12, 5:00 P.M., a second business meeting was held.

Bob Culley presented the report of the auditors indicating that the Treasurer's account was accurate. This report was adopted. A summary follows for information:

Carried forward	121.35
1963 dues	42.00
1964 dues (to date)	87.00
Interest	3.15
	<u>253.50</u>
Expenses	<u>60.12</u>
Bank Balance	193.38.

The following individuals were received as new members:

Rev. R. Sheldon MacKenzie, Montreal, Que.
Rev. Donald Redford, Islington, Ont.
Principal E.S. Lautenschlager, Toronto, Ont.
Rev. Leslie Avery, Harrowsmith, Ont.
Prof. Eugene Combs, Hamilton, Ont.
Fr. Julien Harvey, Montreal, Que.
Canon J.D. F. Beattie, Saskatoon, Sask.
Miss Phyllis Smyth, Montreal, Que.
Rev. Kenneth M. Ballas, Montreal, Que.
Rev. Gordon Nodwell, Toronto, Ont.

Officers elected for 1964-65 were:

President - Pere Adrien M. Brunet, Montreal
Vice-President - Principal Elias Andrews, Kingston

Secretary-Treasurer - Prof. N.E. Wagner, Waterloo
At Large - Prof. G. Parke-Taylor, London
Dr. R. C. Culley, Montreal

Tentative invitations for 1965 meetings were received from Huron College (London) and Carleton University (Ottawa). The Executive was instructed to decide on the site for the next meeting.

A letter from Prof. T.J. Meek was read and the Society returned greetings to him, requesting Prof. McCullough to do so also in person.

The Society was unanimous in expressing sincere thanks to Queen's, especially Principal Andrews and Professor Parker whose efforts made the stay most enjoyable.

The retiring Executive was thanked for planning an extremely successful program.

Respectfully submitted,

N. E. Wagner,
Secretary-Treasurer.

List of registered participants at the joint meetings:

F.N. Allen	J.T. Forestell	J. Macpherson	W.E.L. Smith
E. Andrews	J.W. Grant	H.J. McAvoy	W.E. Staples
W.L. Avery	R.B. Green	W.S. McCullough	A.A. Stephenson
G. Baum	A.R. Gualtieri	J.C. McLelland	R.D. Tannahill
J. Beaudron	D. Hall	F. Meadows	N.E. Wagner
C. Blackman	G.G. Harrop	J.S. Moir	H.H. Walsh
T.C.B. Boon	P.K. Hawkes	D.F. Murray	R.J. Williams
D. Bowen	D.W. Hay	G. Nodwell	F.V. Winnett
A. Brunet	H. Hill	B. O'Keefe	
E.G. Clarke	L. Humphreys	R.E. Osborne	
P.R. Clifford	J.J. Jackson	C.H. Parker	
E. Combs	G. Johnston	R.S. Paul	
H. Crawford	A.E. Kewley	D.B. Redford	
R.C. Culley	H. Kuntz	W.H. Reid	
D. Demson	P. Letellier	A.G. Reynolds	
R. Dobbie	R.T. Lutz	E.R. Riegert	
A. Farris	S. Mackenzie	M. Rumscheidt	
W.O. Fennell	I.F. Mackinnon	N.G. Smith	