B U L L E T I N

OF THE

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

No. 26 1966

Preface:

As directed by the Society, this Bulletin includes: (1) The full text of the Presidential Address, (2) Abstracts of all papers and (3) the proceedings of the Society.

The task of preparing the Bulletin has been made easy once more by the cooperation of all concerned.

Waterloo Lutheran University
Waterloo Ontario

Norman E. Wagner
Secretary-Treasurer

I. THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Some Reflections on the Interpretation of Genesis 22:1-19

G.H. Parke-Taylor

"There was once upon a time a man who had listened in his childhood to the beautiful story of how God tempted Abraham and of how Abraham withstood the test and kept the faith and received his son the second time against all expectation. When he grew older, he read the same story with even greater wonder: for life had separated what had been united in the pious simplicity of the child. The older he grew, the more often did his thoughts return to this story and each time his enthusiasm increased and yet he understood it less and less. At last he forgot everything else. His soul knew only one desire: to see Abraham; only one regret: that he had not been a witness of the event. ... His wish was to have been present at the moment when he sent the asses away and climbed the mountain, alone with Isaac: for his mind was busy, not with the delicate conceits of the imagination, but with the terrors of thought."[1]

So wrote Johannes de Silentio, better known as Soren Kierkegaard, in 1843, in his book, Fear and Trembling. In a remarkably penetrating way, only fully to be appreciated against the background of his perplexed love-affair with Regine Olsen, Kierkegaard explores the meaning of faith, of sacrifice, of ethical demands and responsibilities. What, indeed, are the full implications of Abraham's testing, in which he is called upon by God to sacrifice the very son in whose life the Divine promise for the future lay? In his existential approach, Kierkegaard seeks to recover the thoughts which assault the minds of an Abraham and an Isaac, and in exposing the terrors and ambiguities of the situation, he opens up for us afresh the hermeneutical problem.

If we ask what this ancient and powerful dramatic account has to say to us in our day, we must be prepared to ask prior questions. What were the purposes and background of the original narrative? What will careful literary analysis and linguistic examination reveal? What was the Sitz im Leben which gave rise to the narrative in its earliest form? How has the account been modified and adapted before arriving at its present form? How has this passage been interpreted and reinterpreted in the course of time?

These are formidable questions. The purpose of this paper is to draw together some of the views and insights which have been put forward over the years, and to offer some reflections upon them.

Gerhard von Rad has rightly stated, in relation to Genesis 22: 1-19, "There are many levels of meaning, and whoever thinks he has discovered virgin soil must discover at once that there are many more layers below that".[2] In the attempt to uncover these layers, we must first ask questions about the literary analysis and background. In the traditional analysis, this passage, in the main, together with most of the preceding chapters, 20 and 21, has been assigned to E, the Elohistic source. There is quite general agreement that verses

1-13 and verse 19 are to be attributed to E. Verse 14, with its aetiological statements regarding the name of the place where the ram is offered in place of Isaac, is more problematical. S.R. Driver regards this verse and verses 15-18 (the promise of numerous descendants) as an addition due to the compiler of JE. J. Skinner, on the other hand, regards at least verse 14a as part of the E source, for "The naming of the place is an essential feature of the legend, and must therefore be assigned to E."[3] H.Gunkel[4] includes verses 1-14 (in toto) and verse 19 as the basic E source. So also does G. von Rad, who describes this narrative as "the most perfectly formed and polished of all the patriarchal stories".[5]

The reasons advanced for regarding the passage as largely from the Elohist are linguistic and stylistic. The Divine name Elohim predominates, yet we must note the fact that the name Yahweh occurs not only in the supplementary section, verses 15-18, but also in verses 11 and 14. Indeed, George Knight[6] regards the entire section, verses 11-18, as from J. Otto Procksch[7] has drawn attention to the use of the verb nissah, to test (with God as subject) in other passages which he also attributes to E (e.g. Exod. 15:25; 16:4; 20:20; Duet. 33:8). Abraham's name is repeated twice in 22:11 ("Abraham, Abraham!"), a stylistic feature which we find also in Gen. 46:2 ("Jacob, Jacob!"), and Exod. 3:4 ("Moses, Moses!"), both assigned to E. The revelation by night (deduced from verse 3 "Abraham rose early in the morning"), and the Angel calling from heaven, are also characteristic motifs of E.

Verses 15-18, usually regarded as redactional, contain in verse 16 the word yahid, "only son", already employed in verses 2 and 12, and a further reference in verse 15 to the "angel of the Lord" (of verse 11). The language of these verses is comparable to J passages where the promise of a Divine blessing is given, e.g. Gen. 12:2,3; 26:2-4. The formula in verse 16 ne'um Yahweh, "oracle of the Lord", which occurs elsewhere in the Pentateuch only in Numbers 14:28 (in a passage usually assigned to P), seems especially strange in the mouth of the Angel. The subject matter and style of verses 15-18 indicate that they are supplementary (e.g. the Angel of the Lord calls to Abraham a second time), yet as we shall see subsequently, their bearing on the interpretation of the whole chapter is crucial.

We are left with the conclusion that verses 1-14 are largely Elohistic, verses 15-18, supplementary and redactional. Yet, in spite of the homogeneity of the narrative, some uneasiness remains over regarding verses 1-14 as from E. The narrative, so superbly told, has the characteristic pungency and psychological overtones of J. The hands may indeed be the hands of Esau, and yet the voice seems to be that of Jacob! Indeed, E.A. Speiser[8] has drawn attention to the problematic nature of the stylistic argument in remarking that "the style of the narrative is far more appropriate to J than to E, and the ability to paint a vivid scene in depth, without spelling things out for the reader, is elsewhere typical of J. What this amounts to, therefore, is that on external grounds, J was either appended to E, or E was superimposed upon J ... On internal evidence, however, based on style and content, the personality behind the story should be J's ... The issue is thus not a closed one by

any means. But no such documentary perplexities can disturb the total impact of this unique narative".

We shall return to some other aspects of the literary composition of Genesis 22, later on. There are values, however, in considering further the question of style. Erich Auerbach, in his Mimesis,[9] has brilliantly contrasted the style of Homer's Odyssey with that of Genesis 22. He reminds us that in book 19 of the Odyssey, we are told how the old nurse of Odysseus recognizes him on his homecoming by a scar on his thigh. At this dramatic point in the narrative a long digression follows going back to the hunting accident in Odysseus' boyhood, from which the scar was a legacy. The purpose of this lengthy interruption is not to keep the reader in suspense, but rather to relax the tension. In the Homeric style nothing is left cryptic or unexternalized. On the other had, the Biblical narrative in Genesis 22 introduces the Divine command to Abraham in an unexpected and mysterious fashion, with no reasons given. The three day journey may be thought of as "a holding of the breath, a process which has no present"; the initial setting out "early in the morning" is not primarily a temporal indication, anymore than "the land of Moriah" is a geographical indication: rather we have here ethical significance; in Auerbach's words, "the resolution, the promptness, the punctual obedience of the sorely tried Abraham". The description of Isaac is in terms of relationships, not appearance: "your only son, whom you love". Speech does not serve to externalize thoughts, as in the Odyssey, but to indicate thoughts which remain unexpressed. This imparts an overwhelming element of suspense. The narrative requires to be understood in its context, from which it gains perspective. To quote Auerbach again: "Abraham's actions are explained not only by what is happening to him at the moment, nor yet only by his character (as Achilles' actions by his courage and his pride, and Odysseus' by his versatility and foresightedness), but by his previous history; he remembers, he is constantly conscious of, what God has promised him and what God has already accomplished for him - his soul is torn between desperate rebellion and hopeful expectation; his silent obedience is multi-layered, has background."

These stylistic features contribute to the powerful effect of Genesis 22 on the reader; in themselves, they do not tell us very much about earlier forms in which the narrative was cast, or the purposes for which it was used.

Two themes, both cultic in orientation, would seem to belong to earlier stages of the tradition. One has to do with human sacrifice; the other, with theophany.

In all probability, the earliest form of the narrative contained a cultic tradition repudiating child-sacrifice in favour of the sacrificial offering of an animal. Human sacrifice, as practised by the Canaanites, was rejected. This accords with the legislation in the Code of the Covenant, Exod. 22:29b 30a (EVV.), with which we may compare Exod. 34:20 (J) and the Priestly legislation with regard to the redemption of the first-born in Exod. 13:2, 13. There is not yet a consensus among Old Testament scholars regarding the place of

human sacrifice within primitive Yahwism. C. Eissfeldt indeed affirms that "originally child sacrifices had a legitimate place in the cult of Yahweh".[10] Roland de Vaux, on the other hand, repudiates the view that the Israelites ever lawfully practised human sacrifice, on the grounds that, "It would indeed be absurd to suppose that there could have been in Israel or among any other people, at any moment of their history, a constant general law, compelling the suppression of the first-born, who are the hope of the race".[11] As R. de Vaux has reminded us concerning Jepthah's offering of his daughter in fulfilment of his oath (Judges 11:30-40), "the story is told as a quite extraordinary and shocking incident; so, too, was the action of the king of Moab, when he immolated his only son upon the rampart of his capital while it was being invested by the Israelites (II Kings 3:27)".[12] The Deuteronomistic historian castigates Ahaz (II Kings 16:3) for offering his son as a burnt-offering; likewise Manasseh (II Kings 21:6) is guilty of a similar offence. Jer. 19:5 makes it clear that the practice of child-sacrifice was widespread in the Valley of Hinnom (at Topheth, the "Firepit") in Jeremiah's day, in spite of Josiah's reforms (II Kings 23:10). As to the question asked with such passion in the Book of Micah (6:7), "Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?", the context shows that the idea that human sacrifice avails with God is vehemently rejected. At some time in Israel's history, the temptation to accomodate to the alien idea of human sacrifice had been met and resisted. The Abraham-Isaac narrative bears witness to this, and at the same time points to the essential inwardness of sacrifice. The inward disposition of the will of the offerer is more significant than the overt act; the willingness to surrender that which is most costly, for which the holocaust of the ram becomes symbolic.

What is abundantly clear, however, is that the narrative as it stands in Genesis 22 is not primarily concerned with questions of child-sacrifice. In its present position, the concern is rather with Abraham's posterity, through Isaac, and the fulfilment of the Divine promise. G. von Rad has expressed this persuasively, "Israel is to realise that in situations where God seems most unbearably to contradict himself, it is a matter of his testing her faith. This is where the 'authentic element' of the story lies, not in the traces telling of the way in which child-sacrifice was abolished from the cult. The latter are latent in the traditional material, but are hidden deep down, far below the stratum that now speakes to us in the story, and in which its whole present kerygma is anchored. The two strata are widely separated. The oldest and deepest of them, which we can barely recognize, told the story of the abolition of child-sacrifice from the cult. But even a child can see that the story of Genesis XXII is not about child-sacrifice at all, but about problems inherent in the promise of Jahweh, the God of Israel. In no case may interpretation of Gen XXII be divorced from the matter of the promise, which... became the basic thing for the way in which these stories are to be understood once they had been systematically re-edited".[13]

The theme of theophany, likewise, may belong to an early form of the narrative. A trace of this remains in the use of the Niphal form of ra'ah ("he will be seen", "he will appear"), in the aetiological

statement in verse 14. Verse 14 is textually confused, because an attempt has been made to explain the name of the place where Abraham was to sacrifice Isaac in terms of verse 8, "God will provide (Qal of ra'ah)... the lamb for a burnt-offering". It seems to me more likely that the earliest aetiology had to do with God's appearing at a particular place in a theophany. The reference to "the third day" in verse 4, also accords with this view, since frequently elsewhere (e.g. in Exod. 3:18 and especially in Exod. 19:11, 16) the third day is the occasion for a theophany. The way in which the versions render the enigmatic "Moriah" in verse 2 suggests some connection with the verb ra'ah "to see" (e.g. Symmachus: tes optasias, Vulgate: terram visionis; of. Sam. Targum). Edwin Good finds a concentrated tragic irony in Abraham's answer to Isaac's question regarding the lamb for a burnt'offering, and Abraham's reply, "God will see to the offering, my son". Indeed, Abraham himself, in the climax of the narrative, eventually sees (i.e. understands), for "Vision, the seeing that produces understanding, is a central theme in the story, but, in the shadow of the all but unbearable beginning, Abraham is blind to it until the surprising end".[14]

The use of paranomasia, e.g. the play on the verb ra'ah "to see", coupled with the problem of the original text of verse 2, indicates the probability that an early account of a theophany has been used in different ways. As to "the land of Moriah", we could easily throw up our hands in despair with Skinner, who writes, "All attempts to explain the name and identify the place have been futile".[15] Gunkel deduced from the paranomasia in the narrative (Elohim yir'eh, "God will provide", verse 8; yere Elohim "a fearer of God", in verse 12; and wayar' followed by 'ayil, he saw... a ram", in verse 13) that originally a place name such as Jeru'el (of.II Chron. 20:16) or Jeri'el (of.I Chron. 7:2) stood in verse 2.[16] One of the more interesting identifications is that of Eduard Nielsen,[17] who suggests that Moriah conceals a reference to the "Marah" of the Sinai-Kadesh desert-wanderings tradition. Here the verb nissah "to test", "to prove", is also prominent, for God is proving his people (e.g. Exod. 15:25, 16:4, 20:20). In Exod. 16, God makes provision for his people with the manna and the quails. Certainly, there are some striking similarities here. The theme of God's providential oversight is common to Gen. 22 and to the wilderness traditions, yet one hesitates to accept Nielsen's conclusion that in the case of the former "the story would be a sort of prefiguration of Israel's wanderings in the desert". The mountain with which the theophany of Genesis 22 is connected is rather vaguely described in verse 2 as "one of the mountains of which I shall tell you", and is referred to again in verse 14 as "the mount of Yahweh". Abraham, then, like Moses, has his mountain and his place of revelation. O. Procksch[18] hints at a connection with Moreh, in the vicinity of Shechem, and points to the statement in Gen. 12:6, "Abram passed through the land to the place at Shechem, to the oak of Moreh". One might be tempted to suggest that there is a word-play on Shechem in the use of the verb "rose early" (wayyashkem) in Gen. 22:3, although this is unlikely in view of the use of this verb twice over in the preceding Elohistic passages, Gen. 20:8 and 21:14, without any suspicion of paranomasia.

Is it possible, then, that we have a northern tradition or interpretation of an account of a theophany to Abraham, in which once Moreh (i.e. Shechem, in the shadow of Mt. Gerizim) was claimed as the locus of Abraham's sacrifice? (This claim may be supported by the Samaritan version, according to G.E. Barrois,[19] although it is probable that in keeping with the other versions, we have here a play on the verb ra'ah, "to see".) A southern tradition, or interpretation, identifying Moriah with Jerusalem, finds expression in II Chronicles 3:1. This southern tradition was eventually to win the greater acceptance.

The book of Deuteronomy offers a parallel situation. The phrase which occurs so frequently in Deuteronomy (e.g. 12:5, 11, 21; 14:23,24; 16:2, 6, 11, etc.), "the place which the Lord your God will choose to make his name dwell there" may very well reflect originally a northern provenance. G.E. Wright states, "...it is difficult now to deny that Deuteronomy has a stylistic tradition behind it which stems from north Israel"[20] G. von Rad is even more specific when he writes, "Deuteronomy stands in the tradition of the old Jahweh amphictyony of Shechem"[21] and, "In contrast with the later Deuteronomic histories (I Kings 11:36, 14:21; II Kings 21:4, 7) Deuteronomy never speaks of the city of Jerusalem, but only the place at which the name will dwell".[22]

In Genesis 22, twice over (in verses 3 and 9) the phrase "the place of which God had told him" is used. In verse 4, Abraham "saw the place afar off" and in verse 14, "Abraham called the name of that place Yahweh yir'eh". The Chronicler identifies the place as Jerusalem in II Chronicles 3:1, "Solomon began to build the house of the Lord in Mount Moriah, where the Lord appeared (nir'ah) to David his father, at the place that David had appointed, on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite". The temple site in Jerusalem is to the Chronicler the very site where Abraham sought to sacrifice Isaac; furthermore, by using the Niphal of the verb ra'ah (as in Gen. 22:14), the Chronicler regards the site as a place of theophany ("Mount Moriah, where the Lord had appeared to David"). Various factors may have combined here. Abraham may have become associated with Jerusalem through the tradition in Genesis 14 in which Melchizedek, king of Salem, is prominent. J. Myers[23] thinks that the Chronicler may have been influenced by the concept of the "mountain of Yahweh" in the prophets, e.g. Isa. 2:2, 3 (of. Micah 4:1); Isa. 65:25, 66:20, Joel 3:17, Aech. 8:3. The view that Abraham sought to sacrifice Isaac at Jerusalem became definitive, as Josephus (Antiquities 1, 13, i), the Book of Jobilees (18:13), and Rabbinic tradition, attest.

We now raise the question as to the time when the Abraham-Isaac episode would be most meaningful within Israel's history. To my mind, this remarkable story would become luminous with meaning during the dark days of the Exile, when men no longer had the heart to sing the songs of Zion, and when the flame of hope for the future flickered only fitfully. No approach to any of the Patriarchal narratives can do justice to them unless there is a recognition that the patriarchs are not so much individuals as a corporate entity. There is a very real sense in which Abraham is Israel, just as indeed his grand-son Jacob was so named. It is for this reason that the promise of posterity is of utmost significance. The Abraham narratives have to do with the

destiny of a people, whose mission is ultimately to the world; in Isaac and in his offspring all the nations will eventually bless themselves. B.D. Napier gets at the heart of this when he writes, "...Israel holds her one and her many to be indivisible. Israel knows her own repeated, irrepressible acts of unfaith, her own unceasing disposition to deny the response of faith in which she was created, by which she is sustained, and through which alone her existence has order and meaning. What she knows to be true of herself, she knows also to be true of her fathers and her heroes; and she records their stories in the realistic awareness that faith always exists in tension with unfaith".[24] The themes implicit in Genesis 22: God's providential ordering of events, the bringing of hope out of despair, the fulfilment of the Divine kerygmatic promise - these are the themes also of Deutero-Isaiah. In the lyrical outbursts of the prophet of the Exile, we find a vibrant faith in the providential purposes of God for his people. They are indeed a people with a destiny, and if the Servant Songs are taken into consideration as well, the servant-nation will indeed be a light to lighten the Gentiles. The relevance of this is seen in Isaiah 51:1,2, "Hearken to me, you who pursue deliverance, you who seek the Lord; look to the rock from which you were hewn, and to the quarry from which you were digged. Look to Abraham your father and to Sarah who bore you".

The cultic legend of Genesis 22 has now been transformed into a parable. God does not abandon his people irrevocably for He is the sovereign Lord of history. As Isaac was rescued from the very jaws of death, so will Israel be rescued in order to rediscover her destiny, for "I am the Lord, your Holy One, the Creator of Israel, your King" (Isa. 43:15).

Genesis 22 from this time on increasingly has a message of hope for the individual who wrestles with problems of faith and doubt. In this respect, Abraham's test of faith may be viewed as an eloquent theodicy. Righteous Abraham undergoes trial as does Job and the sufferer who has left us Psalm 22 as his enduring memorial. Gerhard von Rad has valuable insights to share when he writes, "The story of the offering up of Isaac goes beyond all the previous trials of Abraham and pushes forward into the realm of faith's extremest experience where God himself rises up as the enemy of his own work with men and hides himself so deeply that for the recipient of the promise only the way of utter forsakenness by God seems to stand open. Such forsakenness Israel had to experience in her history with Jahweh, and the result of such experience is made articulate in this story".[25]

The New Testament, as we might well expect, contains a number of references and allusions to Genesis 22. Paul makes much of Abraham's faith in Romans 4, and in another notable passage in the same letter, echoes the language of the Septuagint (Gen. 22:16, LXX) when he declares, "He who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all, will he also give us all things with him?" (Rom. 8:32). The words, "Behold the Lamb of God", put into the mouth of John the Baptist by the author of the Fourth Gospel (John 1:29) point back to the Old Testament, possibly to the Passover lamb (cf. I Cor. 5:7), or to the Servant of the Lord (Isa. 53:7), and perhaps also to Genesis 22. In a recent article entitled "Jesus, Isaac, and the 'Suffering Servant'", Roy

Rosenberg has reminded us that in Jewish tradition "Isaac is the prototype of the 'Suffering Servant' bound upon the altar as a sacrifice".[26]

In the Epistle to the Hebrews 11:17-19, we have what C. Spicq has called "la parabole de la resurrection".[27] Abraham's faith is to be seen in the fact that "He considered that God was able to raise men even from the dead; hence, figuratively speaking, he did receive him" (Heb. 11:19). The restoration of Isaac to Abraham is viewed as a kind of resurrection. Certainly the use of the Perfect tense in Heb. 11:17 (By faith Abraham, when he was tested, offered up Isaac") suggests that the sacrifice was already fait accompli in Abraham's mind, as H.W. Montefiore has pointed out.[28] In what B.F. Westcott, following the early Fathers, regards as a typological application to the resurrection of Christ, he finds also an approach to the understanding of John 8:56, "Your father Abraham rejoiced that he was to see my day; he saw it and was glad".[29] There is also a quite different reference to Genesis 22 in James 2:21ff., where Abraham's offering of Isaac is looked upon as an example of justification by works, or at least as an instance of faith "completed by works" (James 2:22)

The early Fathers make extensive use of the Genesis 22 narrative. In a very thorough study, Isaaks Opferung christlich gedeutet (J.C.B. Mohr, Tubingen, 1950), David Lerch has demonstrated that Jewish interpretation, as exemplified by Philo, Josephus, and the Rabbinical exegetes, has been very influential.

According to the Mishnah, Aboth 5:3, Abraham was tempted ten times and stood steadfast. The faithfulness of Abraham under trial is indeed a theme of the intertestamental literature, e.g. Ecclesiasticus 44:19, 20, and Wisdom of Solomon 10:5, where Wisdom is credited with keeping him strong "in the face of his compassion for his child". IV Macc. 16:18-20 praises not only Abraham, but also Isaac, who "seeing his father's hand lifting the knife against him, did not shrink".

Philo, in De Abrahamo (167ff.), deals at length with the interpretation of Genesis 22, and is especially interested in Abraham's motives, which are not those of "custom or love of honour or fear" (188), but of "obedience to God" (192), commendable since "one who gives his only darling son performs an action for which no language is adequate, since he concedes nothing to the tie of relationship, but his whole weight is thrown into the scale on the side of acceptability with God" (196). Josephus, also, (Antiquities, I 222-236) deals at length with the incident, likewise regarding this as a Divine test of Abraham's obedience, but also putting considerable emphasis on Isaac's willingness to comply with the Divine command (232). Isaac is regarded by Josephus as twenty-five years of age at the time.

More and more in the Rabbinical expositions the focus is on Isaac rather than on Abraham's Anfechtung. He voluntarily offers himself for sacrifice, and according to rabbinical chronology is thirty-seven years old. The 'Aqedat Yitshaq' or "Binding of Isaac" becomes the dominant theological motif; the merits of Isaac were considered to have atoning value (see Exod. Rabba 32[13]) and indeed according to R. Kahana, "through the deserts of Isaac, who offered himself on the altar, the Holy One, praised be His name, will eventually raise the dead".[30]

The Midrash Rabba on Genesis contains much of the traditional Talmudic and other material. Here again, much is made of Isaac's voluntary submission to Abraham, e.g., "R. Isaac said: When Abraham wished to sacrifice his son Isaac, he said to him: 'Father, I am a young man and am afraid that my body may tremble through fear of the knife and I will grieve thee, whereby the slaughter may be rendered unfit and this will not count as a real sacrifice; therefore bind me very firmly." Forthwith, he bound Isaac: can one bind a man thirty-seven years old without his consent?" (Midrash Raba, LVI.8).

Isaac's merits are extolled in the Babylonian Talmud (Rosh ha-Shanah, 16a) in the following passage, referring to the ram caught in the thicket (Gen. 22:13), "R. Abbahu said: Why do we blow on a ram's horn? The Holy One, blessed be He, said: Sound before Me a ram's horn so that I may remember on your behalf the binding of Isaac the son of Abraham, and account it to you as if you had bound yourselves before Me."

An interest in theodicy lies back of Sanhedrin, 89b: "And it came to pass after these words, that God did tempt Abraham. What is meant by 'after'? R. Johanan said on the authority of R. Jose b.Zimra: After the words of Satan, as it is written, And the child grew, and was weaned: (and Abraham made a great feast the same day that Isaac was weaned). Thereupon Satan said to the Almighty: "Sovereign of the Universe! To this old man Thou didst graciously vouchsafe the fruit of the womb at the age of a hundred, yet of all that banquet which he prepared, he did not have one turtle-dove or pigeon to sacrifice before thee! Hath he done aught but in honour of his son! Replied He, 'Yet were I to say to him, 'Sacrifice thy son before Me;, he would do so without hesitation! Straightway, God did tempt Abraham...And he said, 'Take, I pray thee thy son'". Likewise, in the Zohar, a similar view is found: "The evil tempter thus came to accuse Abraham on the ground that he could not be said to have perfected himself until he should have exercised rigour against Isaac".[31]

From the point of view of the early Christian Fathers, Isaac is a type of Christ, and Genesis 22 is therefore interpreted typologically. The earliest reference outside of the New Testament is in the Epistle of Barnabas, where Christ is offered as a sacrifice for our sins "in order that the pattern set up in the case of Isaac, who was offered upon the altar, might be fulfilled: (7^3, Goodspeed). In the third of the four Melito-fragments, a parallel is drawn between the sacrifical animal and Christ, the place of sacrifice and Jerusalem, the thorn-bush and the Cross. Irenaeus regards Abraham and Isaac as examples to be followed by Christians when he states (Against Heresies, IV:5:4), "Righteously also do we, possessing the same faith as Abraham, and taking up the cross as Isaac did the wood, follow Him".

Incomparably the most influential contribution to the exegesis of Gen. 22 on the part of the early Fathers was made by Origen in his Homilies on Genesis, VIII & IX. Origen examines the text of Gen. 22 very closely, and is clearly interested in both the psychological and theological aspects of the testing of Abraham. The test is a real threat to Abraham's faith, and the time factor of the three days of inner conflict is emphasized. By asking questions regarding Abraham's

state of mind, Origen heightens the tension. At the outset, by referring to Abraham's natural inclination towards the son of his old age, and even more to his knowledge that the hope and promise for the future was in Isaac, Origen prepares the reader to appreciate the severity of the testing. The conflict between the Divine promise and the command to sacrifice Isaac is resolved by referring to Hebrews 11:19, Abraham "considered that God was able to raise men even from the dead". Abraham's actions exhibit a faith pointing to and in a sense anticipating the death and resurrection of Christ. The reality of the test is not to be minimized. Although Gen. 22:5 ("I and the lad will go yonder and worship, and will come again to you") is interpreted as meaning that God is indeed able to raise the dead, nevertheless that Abraham really intends to offer his son is seen in the fact that Isaac must carry the wood. The question, "Where is the lamb for a burnt offering?" is indeed a vox tentationis. Throughout there is a genuine struggle between amor Dei and amor carnis. Typological and allegorical applications are made in the course of the exposition. Isaac carrying the wood typifies Christ carrying the Cross. In the interpretation of Genesis 22:17, Origen, like St. Paul before him commenting on Gen. 12:7 in Gal. 3:16, takes the singular form of the word "seed" (in MT and LXX) as pointing to a single descendant, namely Christ; the "seed" who shall possess the enemies' gate refers to Christ, in whom the promise finds fulfilment, when the apostolic word goes out into all the world. Allegorically, the climbing of the mountain is an abandonment of the earthly in order to ascend to the heavely (terrena delinquere...ad superna conscendere).

Augustine deals with Abraham's probatio fidei as a test of obedience in De Civitate Dei, Book 16, ch. 32. Augustine does not dwell on the psychological aspects of the testing. Rather, "Abraham is worthy of praise, because he all along believed that his son, on being offered up, would rise again; for God had said to him...'In Isaac shall thy seed be called'". Again, appeal is made to Hebrews 11:19, as confirmation of the fact that Abraham confidently believed that his son would be restored to him when he had offered him up. Isaac carried the wood for the sacrifice, just as Christ later carried His Cross. The ram caught by the horns in the thicket represents Jesus, crowned with thorns. Especially interesting is his treatment of Gen. 22:12, "Now I know that you fear God". This nunc cognovi means, "Now I have made to be known", for God was not previously ignorant of Abraham's faith. In fact, the purpose of the testing was to prove Abraham's obedience and to make it known to the world, not to God.

Both Luther in his Lectures on Genesis and Calvin in his Commentary on Gensis concern themselves with the interpretation of ch. 22. Luther's treatment of Abraham resulted in what amounts to a very extensive "biography". The lectures on Gen. 22, begun in Oct. 1539 are altogether different from the allegorical application characteristic of three sermons on the same subject, preached in December, 1523. In the lectures Luther stresses the uniqueness of the event, when God's new command is placed upon Abraham. We are to realize how deeply Abraham's heart is wounded, and what a barrier to understanding is placed upon him by the strangeness of the command.

The essence of the trial is, of course, the contradiction of the promise. Luther vividly puts before his readers the questions which

Abraham must have asked himself: Can this be a command of God; must it not be a trick of Satan? Has God withdrawn his promise because I have committed some extraordinary sin? Perhaps I have been too proud or ungrateful.

These psychological probings are continued in various ways - in the loneliness of Abraham, who does not dare to divulge to Sarah what is about to happen, and in the strained silence between father and son on the journey. Abraham himself has saddled the ass and cut the wood, concealing his grief.

Abraham is convinced that he has received from God a special and new command. Yet he cannot abandon belief in the Divine promise. Beyond the burnt-offering and the ashes of his son, there must be a fulfilment of the promise. Appealing then to Hebrews 11:19, Luther writes, "Abraham understood the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and through it alone he resolved the contradiction, which otherwise cannot be resolved".[32]

Abraham must have spoken to his son, a young man in his twenties, before he bound him upon the altar. What he said is unrecorded. Yet, "...it was the father's address to his son which reconciled these two contradictory propositions: Isaac will be the seed and father of kings and peoples: Isaac will die and will not be the father of peoples. These contradictory statements cannot be reconciled by any human reason or philosophy. But the Word reconciles these two, namely that he who is dead lives, and he who lives, dies."[32] Both Abraham and Isaac are obedient, and both win a victory over death.

Luther readily admits the intellectual difficulties entailed in the narrative. "We do not understand these things. Yet they must be thought about, in order that we may understand as much as we can."[34] He speaks of his dullness; he is like the donkey which stands below and cannot ascend the mountain.

Abraham is held up as an example to encourage all who face trials. He demonstrates the faith which reconciles opposites. Indeed, "...these things have not been recorded for the sake of Abraham, who is long since dead, but to encourgage and stimulate us, in order that we may learn that in the sight of God death is nothing".[35]

God's command to Abraham must be looked upon as unique. We are to understand that "this extraordinary example of Abraham should not be dragged along as a precedent to be followed; but we should imitate his obedience and his faith in the resurrection, in the killing of sin and death which takes place in Abraham and in his son".[36] Above all, in Abraham we see the necessity of mortification of the flesh and sin, a dying and a rising again to newness of life.

Luther believes that the ram was brought into existence at the angel's command, but not necessarily, as the Rabbis thought, from the beginning of the world. At the same time, he concedes the value of the view put forward by some of the early Fathers who followed the Rabbinical idea regarding the creation of the ram on the sixth day, and then interpreted the ram as a type of Christ, who exists from the beginning of the world. For all his strictures elsewhere regarding allegory,

Luther writes, "this is sufficiently good allegory. I do not disapprove of it".

As to the meaning of the place-name, Moriah, Luther concludes that the name is derived from the root yare, "to fear", and means "fear of God, reverence toward God, worship of God", or as "we unsophisticated Germans would probably call it, Holy Hill".[38] Other derivations are carefully examined, only to be rejected, although cautious approval is given to the derivation from yarah, "to instruct", i.e., "the Lord teaches me", and indeed, the mountain is to be conisdered as a place for oracles.

Like St. Paul and the Fathers, Luther regards the reference to the seed in Gen. 22:18 as a reference to Christ, who is the source of all blessing. He rejects a universalistic interpretation of this verse; rather, "Nowhere is there light, life, and salvation, except in this Seed".[39]

Calvin's treatment of Genesis 22 is much briefer than that of Luther.[40] Abraham's test arises from the conflict between the command and the promise of God. God assumes a double character, in which he appears to trample upon His own benevolence. However, "when he had come to the conclusion, that the God with whom he knew he had to do, could not be his adversary; although he did not immediately discover how the contradiction might be removed, he nevertheless, by hope, reconciled the command with the promise; because, being indubitably persuaded that God was faithful, he left the unknown issue to Divine Providence".[41]

Mt. Moriah signifies reverential fear, Calvin concludes, after examining alternative views. Abraham is not guilty of dissimulation, but rather of confusion, when he tells his servants that he will return with the boy. Isaac, who is of middle age, and did not resist being bound, voluntarily surrendered himself. Calvin emphasizes Abraham's readiness to trust in God's providence, in that he leaves events to God. The ram may indeed have been brought providentially from some other place, if not especially created at the time. Augustine's rendering nunc cognovi as "I have caused to know" he regards as forced. "Now I know" is a testimony to Abraham rather than a new understanding on the part of God. Once again, Heb. 11:19 is referred to; Abraham indeed had hope that God would fulfil his promise in Isaac, even out of the dead ashes of his son. Isaac is "the mirror of eternal life, and the pledge of all good things".[42] As with Luther, the purpose of the narrative is to give a clear example of mortification, for "since a ram is substituted in the place of Isaac, God shows us, as in a glass, what is the design of our mortification; namely, that by the Spirit of God dwelling within us, we, though dead, may yet be living sacrifices".[43] More subtle allegories are without foundation.

From the Reformers, we turn again to Kierkegaard. He freely admits that he cannot understand Abraham, he can only admire him. "There have been countless generations who have known the story of Abraham by heart, word for word, but how many have lost their sleep over it?".[44] In his desire to come to grips, existentially, with the Abraham of Gen. 22, Kierkegaard concludes that the story of Abraham involves a teleological

suspension of ethics. A father should love his son, but "this ethical relationship is...reduced to relativity, in contradistinction to the absolute relationship to God".[45] How illuminating, then, is Luke 14:26, "a remarkable doctrine on the subject of absolute duty towards God: 'If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple'";[46]

Kierkegaard dwells on the silence of Abraham; this silence reveals the agony of his situation; "Abraham is silent - but he cannot speak: and therein lies his anxiety and dread. For when if I speak, I cannot make myself understood, I do not speak, even though I speak without interruption, all day and all night. This is the case of Abraham."

It is an existential application of the Abraham-Isaac narrative that J.D. Smart develops in his book, The Old Testament in Dialogue with Modern Man (Westminster Press, 1964). We discover meaning in Genesis 22 insofar as we become involved in Abraham, and in the radical claim that God makes on him and on us. Abraham is "the bearer of Israel's consciousness of high destiny".[47] "Isaac was Abraham's hope. But God's greatest gifts can consiitute a man's most subtle temptation to unfaithfulness. Isaac, who was God's gift of a future to Abraham, could so easily become more dear to Abraham than God himself."[48] So it is that Abraham learns the costly obedience of faith, in his willingness to surrender all that was most precious to him.

Surely this narrative, which Dr. Smart describes as "such a superb example of the storyteller's art that the sheer fascination of it was sufficient to account for its survival",[49] speaks with particular vividness to our age. At the heart of Abraham's testing in Genesis 22, there lies a perplexity about God. Shallow and superficial thinking about God is here challenged, just as such thinking is challenged radically by the more responsible of the "new" theologians, today. In this existential situation, rather than abandon belief in God altogether should we not seek to recover a faith wide enough to encompass paradoxes and ambiguities? Like Abraham in his dilemma, we acknowledge the confusions and tensions of our age. Yet no modus vivendi is to be found for modern man by denying the past. Genesis 22 declares that faith and obedience and the loneliness of ethical decisions in a new situation are to be viewed in the light of a relationship with the living God who has declared Himself in the past. In the complex issues of our day, responsible ethical decisions will not be made without heart-searching and agony, as we enter the uncharted territory of the future. Yet, belief in a future which lies under the sovereignty of the God of Abraham will give modern man courage, and enable him to share, however,tentatively, in the triumph of an Abraham, who "when he was tested...was found faithful" (Ecclesiasticus 44:20).

FOOTNOTES

1 Soren Kierkegaard, Fear and Trembling, Oxford Univ. Press, 1946, p. 1
2 G. von Rad, Genesis, Old Testament Library, SCM Press, 1961, p. 238
3 J. Skinner, Genesis, ICC, 1910, pp. 228 ff
4. H. Gunkel, Genesis, HAT, 6th ed., 1964, pp. 236-242
5 G. von Rad, op.cit., p. 233
6 G.A.F. Knight, A Christian Theology of the Old Testament, SCM Press, 2nd rev. ed., 1964, p. 71
7 O. Procksch, Die Genesis, KAT, Leipzig, 1913, p. 305
8 E.A. Speiser, Genesis, Anchor Bible, N.Y., Doubleday & Co., 1964, p. 166
9 E. Auerbach, Mimesis, Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957, ch. 1. The quotations are from pages 8 and 9.
10 O. Eissfeldt, Molk als Opferbegriff, 1935, p. 55, quoted by R. de Vaux, Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice, Cardif, Univ. of Wales Press, 1964, p. 70n; see also Eissfeldt, Introduction to O.T., Eng. transl. P.R. Akroyd, Oxford, Blackwell, 1965, p. 411
11 R. de Vaux, Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice, Cardiff, Univ. of Wales Press, 1964, p. 71
12 R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1961, p. 442
13 G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. I, Oliver & Boyd, 1962, p. 174
14 E.M. Good, Irony in the Old Testament, Westminster Press, Pa., 1965, p. 95
15 J. Skinner, op.cit., p. 328
16 H. Gunkel, op.cit., p. 241
17 E. Nielsen, Shechem, Copenhagen, 1959, p. 334
18 O. Procksch, op.cit., p. 306
19 G.E. Barrois, article MORIAH, IDB, Vol. 3, p. 438
20 G.E. Wright, Deuteronomy, IB, Vol. 2, p. 319
21. G. von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, London, SCM Press, 1953, p. 41
22 G. von Rad, ibid., p. 38
23 J. Myers, II Chronicles, Anchor Bible, Doubleday, N.Y., 1965, p. 17
24 B.D. Napier, Song of the Vineyard, Harper & Bros., 1962, p. 68
25 G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. 1, Oliver & Boyd, 1962, p. 174
26 Roy A. Rosenberg, Jesus, Isaac, and the 'Suffering Servant', JBL, Dec. 1965, p. 385
27 C. Spinq, L'Epitre aux Hebreux, Vol. 2, Paris, J. Gabalda, 3rd. ed., 1952, p. 353
28 H.W. Montefiore, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, London, A. & C. Black, 1964, p. 198
29 B.F. Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews, Michigan, Wm. B. Eerdmans, repr. 2nd. ed. 1892, p. 367
30 J. Schoeps, The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology, JBL, 1946, p.390
31 The Zohar, transl. by Harry Sperling and Maurice Simon, Soncino Press 1933, Vol. 1, p. 372
32 Luther's Works, Vol. 4: Lectures on Genesis, Ch. 21-25, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Walter Hansen, Concordia Pub. Hous, 1964, p. 96
33 Ibid., p. 113
34 Ibid., p. 117
35 Ibid., p. 117
36 Ibid., p. 124
37 Ibid., p. 137
38 Ibid., p. 98
39 Ibid., p. 177
40 John Calvin, Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis.
41 Ibid., p. 563

42 Ibid., p. 565
43 Ibid., p. 571
44 S. Kierkegaard, Fear and Trembling, p. 24
45 Ibid., p. 91
46 Ibid., p. 93
47 J.D. Smart, The Old Testament in Dialogue With Modern Man, Westminster Press, 1964, p. 62
48 Ibid., p. 67
49 Ibid., p. 59

II. ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS

(a) The Wars of the LORD and their Ancient Near Eastern Background

The Wars of the LORD appear as a phenomenon sui generis in the history of amphictyonic Israel but are without parallel both in Old Testament traditions relating to the preamphictyonic period and in extra-Israelite ancient Near Eastern texts. This observation raises the question: What were the historical and ideological antecedents of early Israel's concept of Holy War?

In the present paper an attempt is made to trace such antecedents in ancient Near Eastern, especially Hittite, convenant formulae and in the Old Testament Patriarchal traditions, to throw light on the historical origin of the Israelite concept of the Wars of the LORD, and to re-affirm the basically defensive character of Holy War as understood and fought in amphictyonic Israel.

Wolfgang M.W. Roth, Chesley

(b) The Epistle from Laodicea -- who wrote it?

Pauline authorship of the letter from Laodicea (Col. 4:16) is much less certain that is often assumed. Certain factors, such as the inclusion in Colossians of Paul's greetings to the Laodicene church and our inability to discover a compelling reason why Paul should have written two letters rather than one to the churches there, make it improbable that Paul wrote a separate letter to the Laodiceans. An examination of the relationship of Paul and of those present when he wrote Colossians, to the churches of Laodicea and Colossae indicates that a stronger case can be made for Epaphras being the author of the letter from Laodicea than for Paul.

Charles P. Anderson, Vancouver

(c) Common Sectarian-Heretical Traits in the Qumran Community and in the New Testament Church

While there have been exaggerated claims made concerning the links between Qumran and the early Christian Church, it is to be noted that both communities did share in a position outside the mainstream of Jewish orthodoxy. The factors which made these two movements "sects" outside of the "establishment" are worthy of careful study. The priestly apocalyptic orientation of Qumran is compared with the New Testament Church in the following respects: (1) Justification by Faith; (2) the position of prominence given to the canonical Prophets; (3) the Covenant with Abraham, and consequently a diminishing in significance of the Sinai covenant.

Johannes Huntjens, Mulgrave, N.S.

(d) P-Covenant Characteristics in Gen. 1

The purpose of the paper is to show that the Priesterkodex formulates the creation of man in terms of covenant, even if the key-word berit is missing. The method used here is the word-constellation analysis (an

aspect of the uberlieferungs-geschichtliche Methode that has been neglected by the most recent study on Gen. 1: W.H. Schmidt, Die Schopfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift, WMANT 17, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964).

The result of the inquiry is that all five significant verbs of Gen. 1, 28-30, namely barak, para, raba, male' and natan, reappear together (except male') in six pericopes of the P-Genesis: 1) the creation narrative (Gen. 1); 2) the P-Covenant with Noah after the flood (Gen. 9, 1-17); 3) the P-Narrative of Abraham's covenant (Gen. 17, 1-27); 4) the transmission of the Abraham covenant to Jacob before his marriage (Gen. 28, 1-9); 5) the P-narrative of Jacob's covenant at Bethel (Gen. 35, 9-130: 6) Jacob's meeting with the Pharao when he enters Egypt (Gen. 47, 7-11. 27b-28).

In all those pericopes, the typical word-constellation is clearly connected with the covenant ideology; in two of them the key-word berit is used (Gen. 9 and 17); in the four other ones, the root barak appears instead. The conclusion is, therefore, that we may safely assume that the author of Gen. 1 thinks of man as created under covenant (of. the same findings for J in L.Alonso-Schokel, Biblica 43 (1962), 295-315); the basis for the Imago Dei doctrine, traditionaly interpreted as justitia originalis (cf. specially K.Barth, KD III, 1, p. 235-239), is therefore correct. Moreover, the P-covenant characteristics in Gen. 1 are typically those of the P-tradition (God-given, source of blessing and life, permanent even if given to sinful man, more fundamentally connected with Abraham covenant than with Sinai).

Julien Harvey, S.J., Montreal

(e) Metrical Analysis of Classical Hebrew Poetry

Many theories of metrical structure have been proposed for Classical Hebrew poetry. These reveal sharp differences of opinion. The problem is that we lack much of the information necessary to construct a theory which would be convincing to all. We do not know what this poetry sounded like in performance, nor does our text reproduce for us the original form of the language. In view of the diffuculties, it is suggested that a descriptive method might prove useful. Counting stresses, words, or syllables are three likely ways of describing poetic structure so that any configuration imposed upon the text by a metrical system might come to light. Although all three present difficulties, syllable counting might prove useful if the numbers of syllables in lines and cola were taken as approximations reflecting relative variations in length. If the results of syllable counting are to be taken as approximate, then the Massoretic text could be used as it stands. Fifteen examples chosen for testing revealed significant patterns and groupings. These results suggest that the procedure might be pursued further.

Robert C. Culley, Montreal

(f) Moses-Messiah typology and the New Testament

It seems to be a common assumption among New Testament scholars that there was a Moses-Messiah typology, or at least a Moses-Messiah parallelism in existence before the Christian era, and the New Testament

writers draw on this as they present their understanding of Jesus. In recent works, C.K. Barrett, W.D. Davies, T.F. Glasson and Teeple all appear to take this as established fact.

This paper suggests (a) that this is not the only, or necessarily the best interpretation of the evidence. We have no reliable information of a Messianic expectation in Mosaic terms coming from a definitely pre-Christian date. (b) that the New Testament may be said to reveal signs of a development of this parallelism, as for example, the way in which Mark's Transfiguration narrative is treated by the other synoptists. (c) that Paul may have been the first to interpret Jesus as a second Moses, thus beginning a line of interpretation which finds its New Testament culmination in the Fourth Gospel.

J.R.C. Perkin, Hamilton

(g) Dual Witness and Sabbath Motif in Luke

Two motifs are found to be central in St. Luke's Gospel: (i) the idea of 'dual witness' and (ii) the 'sabbath' motif. 'Dual witness' takes the form of parallel events or pericopes, of dual personages, groups, places or objects, and in his 'dual witness' method of composition, usually indicated by pairs of persons, places, clauses, etc. joined by kai, e.g. Lk. 6:14-16; 17:3-4. This method is not original with St. Luke but he seems particularly fond of it.

The 'sabbath' motif centers on the favorite Hebrew number--seven beginning with the 77 (11 x 7) weeks of generations in Lk. 3:23-38, and continuing with the seven key Sabbaths of 4:16, 31; 6:1,6; 13:10, 14:1 and 23;56; the seven table-talk incidents of chs. 5,7,10,11,14, 22,24; the significant 'today's found in 2:11; 4:21; 5:26; 13:32f.; 19:5,9; 22:61 and 23:43; and the six 'Amen's of 4:24; 12:37; 18:17,29; 21:32; 23:43.

Discovery of the 'sabbath' motif enables us to understand why Lk. 13:32f. is so located, to determine the most probable text in Lk. 6:1, and to grasp more fully St. Luke's method and plan of creative composition. The 'sabbath' motif is more subtle than that of 'dual witness', but nonetheless quite influential in St. Luke's redactional process.

Vernon E. McEachern, Windsor

(h) A Grossly Misunderstood Verse: Matthew 11:25 A.V.

This paper tries to show that Jesus meant to contrast the closed minds of the "wise and prudent" with the open minds of the "babes". While the Galilean peasants did not entirely understand Jesus they felt His power and responded accordingly.

Roy M. Pounder, Montreal

(i) Should Wedding Guests Fast? A Consideration of Mark 2:18-20

Since it is the disciples (not Jesus) who are attacked for not fasting, the presumption is that the pericope reflects a controversy in an early Christian milieu. Andform-critical investigations suggest that three phases in the life-history of the paradigm may be distinguished: 1. A possible traditional saying of Jesus which commended feasting or rejoicing as opposed to fasting on some particular occasion (v. 19a); 2. A utilisation of the saying in a conflict-story that was meant to justify the non-observance of fasts in the part of some sections of the apostolic church that had been criticised by followers of the Baptist (and certain Pharisees?) for their irregularity (vv. 18-19a); 3. An adaptation of the paradigm by the addition of verses 19b-20 to a Christian situation in which the practice of fasting had established itself, resulting in the formation of the story as it now stands (vv. 18-20). It appears that commentators generally have not recognised the importance in this connection of the christological Bridegroom as a presence and as an absence.

T.A. Burkill, Edmonton

(j) What did Jesus Write?

This paper offers a new answer to the old question found in the pericope adulterae of John 8: 1-11, i.e. What did Jesus write when he wrote with his finger on the ground? The author reviews the traditional answers and then suggests that the solution to the problem is to be found in the story of Susanna in the Apocrypha. It is pointed out that the two incidents have parallel features, i.e. adultery, dilemma, Mosaic Law, elders, and judgment. The story of Susanna, it is argued, would come more readily to Jesus' mind than any other because of the similarities in the two situations. The author thinks that the words (apo ton presbuteron) explain why it was that "they went away beginning with the eldest." Perhaps this mystery in the pericope adulterae is now solved in this first and greatest of all detective stories - Susanna.

Robert E. Osborne, Toronto

III. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY

The 34th annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies was held concurrently with the 27th annual meeting of the Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature, May 17-19, 1966 at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario. Also meeting at this time were the Canadian Society of Church History and the Canadian Theological Society.

The President, G. Parke-Taylor presided at a business meeting held at 9:00 P.M., May 17, 1966.

The minutes of the 1965 meeting were adopted as read.

Regrets were acknowledged from: William Amy, J.C. Carr, Edward M. Checkland, Eugene Combs, F.H. Cosgrave, Guy P. Couturier, S. MacLean Gilmour, R.B. Green, Julien Harvey, S.J., Jared J. Jackson, Sidney Jellicoe, R. Katerberg, MRB Lovesey, H.J.W. McAvoy, R.E. McCann, John A. MacKenzie, R. Sheldon Mackenzie, W.R. Marttila, J.A. Morrison, Gerald W. Paul, W. Harold Reid, R.F. Schnell, R.B.Y. Scott, Phyllis Smyth, Ronald F.G. Sweet, Rolland E. Wolfe.

An Auditing committee consisting of Charles Scobie and Donald Redford was appointed. The Nominating Committee consisting of Robert Lennox, A.M. Brunet and G. Parke-Taylor was also appointed.

A subsequent business meeting was held on May 18. The Secretary reported on the activities of the Society during the past year and drew attention to the invitation extended to members of the Society by the Rabbinical Assembly to participate in part of its program, especially a lecture by H.L. Ginsberg, held at Toronto.

The Secretary reported on behalf of the Executive Committee regarding a proposed project for 1967. The Executive had been entrusted with the task of making a recommendation concerning a possible volume of papers to be published to mark the Canadian Centennial. The recommendation of the Executive was that the Secretary reprint from six to eight important presidential addresses and/or papers which have been delivered to the Society in the years of its operation and that this volume be prepared for distribution by January 1967. It is understood that these papers are to be sent free of charge to all members of the Society and that they will also be available at a nominal cost to other interested parties. On a motion by John Wevers, seconded by E.G. Clarke, the Society voted a sum not to exceed $200 to this project.

On the recommendation of the Secretary, the honorarium for secretarial assistance was increased to $40.

Robert Lennox presented the report of the Nominating Committee:

President - Dean U.S. Leupold
Waterloo Lutheran Seminary
Waterloo, Ontario

Vice-President - Principal Elias Andrews
Queen's Theological College
Kingston, Ontario

Secretary-Treasurer - Dr. Norman E. Wagner
Waterloo Lutheran University
Waterloo, Ontario

Members-at-Large - Julien Harvey, Montreal
Robert Osborne, Toronto

On a motion by R. Lennox, seconded by J. Wevers, this slate was elected.

Moved by W.S. McCullough, seconded by C.P. Anderson, that the Executive seriously consider a prominent guest speaker for the 1967 meeting. Carried.

Don Redford presented the Auditor's report indicating that the accounts were in order. Moved by D. Redford, seconded by J. Wevers, this report was received.

A summary follows for information:

Carried forward	$251.69
1965 dues	73.00
1966 dues	133.20
Interest	7.13
	465.02
Expenses	65.19
Balance	$399.83

The following individuals were received as new members:

Professor Chas. H.H. Scobie, Presbyterian College, Montreal, P.Q.
Peter F. Gilbert, 281 Sheppard Avenue East, Willowdale, Ont.
Miss Mary Russell, 2070 West 62nd Avenue, Vancouver 14, B.C.
Rev. R.F. Sherwin, Durham, Ont.
Rev. R.M. Clark, Teeswater, Ont.
Dr. J.R.C. Perkin, McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, Ont.
Rev. G.E. Barton, 66 Transwell Ave., Willowdale, Ont.
Rev. W.S. Whitcombe, 1771 Pharmacy Ave., Agincourt, Ont.
Rev. C. Tipp, 15 Spadina Road, Toronto 4, Ont.
Miss Margot Lods, 217 St. George Street, Toronto 5, Ont.
E.G. Smith, R.R. #3, Thorndale, Ont.
Pere. H.M. Dion, Dominion Fac. of Theol. 96 Empress St., Ottawa 4, Ont.
Rev. J.W. Burbidge, 1035 Alexandra Avenue, Port Credit, Ont.

All members of the Society expressed sincere thanks to McMaster Divinity College for the hospitality shown. Prof. Harrop's efforts in making necessary arrangements are appreciated.

The Society was informed that an invitation for the 1967 meeting had been received from Montreal and a joint business meeting of the three participating Societies gratefully accepted this invitation.

Respectfully submitted,
N.E. Wagner
Secretary-Treasurer