

BULLETIN
OF THE
CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

No. 28

1968

Preface:

The 1968 Bulletin is finally ready for distribution. May it serve as a reminder of the very fine meeting held at St. Michael's College in May. To those members who were unable to attend, may it serve as enticement for personal participation another year.

As has become our custom, the Bulletin includes (1) the full text of the Presidential Address, (2) abstracts of other papers, (3) the proceedings of the Society.

Many thanks to the members who furnished this material.

Waterloo Lutheran University
Waterloo, Ontario

Norman E. Wagner
Secretary-Treasurer

I PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

First Century Aramaic and the Targums - Ernest G. Clarke

Since the textual discoveries at Qumran and at other Palestinian sites the question of the languages spoken in Palestine in the First Century A.D. has become much more complex. No longer is it possible to argue for the exclusive use of either Hebrew or Aramaic as did Segal and Dalman.¹ The discoveries bear witness to the common use of four languages in first century Palestine. Greek was the speech of the educated and hellenized: "the medium of cultural and commercial intercourse between Jew and foreigner."² Latin was the language of law and the military. Hebrew continued to be the language of Scripture. Aramaic was the language of some groups in Palestine (i.e. in Judaea and Galilee).

Segal (in 1927) argued³ strongly, against Dalman, that there was not enough valid textual evidence in Aramaic to conclude that Aramaic was the exclusive language of the Jews in Judaea during the time of Jesus. His conclusion was that the most the evidence could prove was that during this period Aramaic was understood and used in Palestine. Segal maintained that the people of Judaea spoke a vernacular Hebrew while the Galilaeans spoke Aramaic. He made no distinction between vernacular Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew both of which developed naturally from the language of the Old Testament. Segal rejected the thesis that the Hebrew of the first century was exclusively an artificial language, developed out of classical Hebrew under Aramaic influence for the use of the rabbis.

Harris Birkeland⁴ presented the thesis that Hebrew was the language of the ordinary people (am ha'ares) in both Judaea and Galilee. In contrast to the uneducated Jew the upper classes spoke Aramaic and Greek. He maintained that this Hebrew dialect was close to but different from Mishnaic Hebrew.

In the Old Testament itself we find second century B.C. books such as Koheleth in Hebrew. Daniel from the same general period is preserved in both Hebrew and Aramaic. At Masada⁵ a Hebrew text for Ecclesiasticus consisting of 26 fragments has been recovered by Yadin's expedition. The majority of the texts from Qumran, which cannot be dated later than 70 A.D., are in Hebrew. Hebrew was certainly much more extensively used in first century Palestine than we were often prepared to admit previously. M. Wilcox⁶ comments in this connection: "With regard to the matter of language, we ought to note that the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has now placed at our disposal information of a highly interesting and relevant nature.... The non-biblical texts show us a free, living language, and attest the fact that in New Testament times, and for some considerable time previously, Hebrew was not confined to rabbinical circles... but appeared as a normal vehicle of expression."

The Mishnah, from 200 A.D., was written in Hebrew, with some Aramaic words and phrases. Jewish commentaries on the Pentateuch such as Bereschit Rabba are written in Hebrew but with many passages in Aramaic.⁷

The textual evidence which we are now able to assemble sustains the position held by Segal. It is not a question of either Hebrew or Aramaic being the spoken language of the time of Jesus. Hebrew maintains a viable position. In fact, Grintz⁸ has put forward the thesis that Hebrew remained a living language most likely until 135 A.D. Although, certainly the use of Aramaic was increasing. Aramaisms continued to infiltrate in an increasingly greater way into the world of the Old Testament.⁹

The argument that Hebrew was preserved only as a book language has been refuted by the non-sacred textual evidence from such sites as Qumran. At Murabba'at we have letters written by Bar Koseba in both Hebrew and Aramaic (5 in Hebrew and 10 in Aramaic).

There is still much research to be done on the type of Hebrew we find in these new texts in order to understand its development and relationship to late biblical Hebrew, on the one hand, and to Mishnaic Hebrew, on the other hand.

At the same time we must recognize the extensive use of Greek in the first century. In the nineteenth century A. Roberts and T.K. Abbott argued that Christ spoke Greek.¹⁰ In this century S. Lieberman¹¹ and others have extended the thesis. In the world of trade and commerce Greek was an economic necessity.¹² The ossuary inscriptions from "Dominus Flevit" number 7 in Hebrew, 11 in Aramaic and 11 in Greek.¹³ The same facts are to be noted at Murabba'at where letters of Bar Koseba are in Greek as well as Hebrew and Aramaic. Also found at Murabba'at are ostraca in Greek and Greek papyri one of which is dated 124 A.D.

Apropos of the question of Latin in Palestine this was probably confined to the army and its services. Latin inscriptions on milestones and direction indicators on road signs in the Jerusalem area have been uncovered.¹⁴ We also find Latin loan words in the Mishnah and in the New Testament.¹⁵

In actual fact, however, although we may speak of a tri-lingualism among the ordinary people for all practical purposes we find a bi-lingualism of Hebrew and Aramaic. This is exactly the same situation as existed in the time of Nehemiah.

In turning to consider Aramaic we find that its use as a spoken language is not new in the first century. Already in the pre-exilic period of the eighth century B.C. we know that Aramaic was known at least among the upper classes. In II Kings 18:26-28 (cf. Isaiah 36:11-13) we have recorded an incident in the reign of Hezekiah when the Jerusalem official Eliakim requested Rabshakeh, Sennacherib's emissary, to speak in Aramaic rather than in Hebrew so that the common people ('am ha'ares) would not understand.

By the time of E'ra-Nehemiah in the fifth century B.C. there was a strong bilingualism in evidence. Nehemiah 13:24 condemns the children who spoke the language of Ashdod (possibly an Aramaic dialect) but not the language of the Jews.

Much interest in earlier generations was focused on the question of the language Jesus spoke and on the possibility of an Aramaic original for the Gospels and Acts.

The names of Wellhausen and Nestlé¹⁶ come immediately to mind. Wellhausen thought Mark to be a translation from an Aramaic original but was less certain of the Gospel of John since it was so different from Mark. Dalman, Burney, and Torrey¹⁷ continued these earlier studies but with greater emphasis on the linguistic evidence. Dalman narrowed his analysis to the words of Jesus. He selected certain main concepts such as Kingdom of God, Father in Heaven and elucidated them in the light of Jewish antecedents and parallels. Burney made a detailed study of the language of the Fourth Gospel in order to prove that it was virtually a translation into Greek. Torrey, on the other hand argued that the Fourth Gospel was actually translated into Greek.

I do not intend to become involved, in this paper, with the question of what language Jesus spoke. The new textual evidence of the past twenty years does provide us with precise controllable material for re-opening the discussion.¹⁸

At the same time we now have available some excellent Aramaic textual material. Before 1947 there was no extended literature in Palestinian Aramaic except the Megillat Ta'anith.¹⁹ There were also ossuary inscriptions from Jerusalem, many of which consisted of proper names only. There was the Uzziah slab from the first century A.D. and the Qorban inscription on an ossuary lid. In addition, we had the letters of Gamaliel^{II} (ca. 110 A.D.) written to Jews living in Judaea, Galilee, and Babylon concerning the observation of religious feasts.

Now, after 1947, we have much more material in Palestinian Aramaic. It is not only more extensive in form but it is religious in genre. This new material is certainly more useful in many ways than the isolated proper names on ossuary lids. Furthermore, the texts are dateable to a period roughly first century B.C. to first century A.D. We are certain that the locale is Palestine. Not only is this material valuable for the linguistic study of Aramaic but it is very important for the ideas it contains-ideas contemporary with the New Testament.

From Qumran we have four documents in Aramaic, belonging to the genre of commentaries. The Genesis Apocryphon (1Q Gen. Apoc) is valuable in any study of the history of Targum and Midrash and the relationship between these two genre. M.A. Lehman²⁰ writes: "This scroll fits squarely into the mainstream of Targumim and Midrashim, and probably represents the oldest prototype of both available to us." There are five complete columns preserved and seventeen others in a fragmentary state. In the first part of the text the discussion centres on Genesis 6-9. Lamech becomes concerned whether his son Noah has been begotten by him or by some supernatural power such as the Watchers. Methuselah and Enoch are consulted for an opinion on the paternity. This section has many parallels in the Book of Enoch 106-107. The second part of the text deals with Genesis 12 and 14-15. Column XIX begins with Abram's flight to Egypt. He had a dream in which he saw

"a cedar very beautiful; and some men came intending to cut down and uproot the cedar but leave the date-palm by itself" (XIX 14-15). The date-palm (Sarah) intercedes for the cedar (Abram). Abram urges Sarah to say that he is her brother. Example 1 on the accompanying paradigm shows that the Targums agree with the MT whereas the IQ Gen. Apoc. agrees with the phrasing in the Abimelech incident in Genesis 20:13. In column XX there is an extensive description of Sarah's beauty²¹ which finds no parallel in the Old Testament. This is the type of haggadh with which we are familiar in rabbinic writings. Parallels to this second section are to be found in the Book of Jubilees.

The second Aramaic text is from Qumran cave 11. It is a Targum of Job 17:14-26:33 and 37:10-42:11. It is the most extensive targum to date and is very old. The cave 11 targum is literal without long paraphrases. And yet it is not merely translation because there is also interpretation. We see this when we compare the MT and Targum to Job 38:7:

MT

When the morning stars sang together
and all the sons of God shouted for
joy?

11 Q Tg Job

When the morning stars were
shining together and all the
angels of God were shouting
together?

The third Aramaic text is another Job Targum in two fragments from cave 4.

Finally, from Qumran cave 4 we have another targum. This time Leviticus 16:12-15, 18-21. Other Aramaic texts from Qumran represent extra-biblical religious material which is valuable for linguistic as well as religious studies.

Kutscher²² asked the question: "what did the Aramaic written (and spoken?) in Palestine at a certain period preceding Middle Aramaic look like?" This material from Qumran helps us answer that question and to describe the character of first century Aramaic. Both grammar and vocabulary of the Aramaic of this period is becoming more fully known. Eventually it will be possible for those scholars who would like to reconstruct the language(s) spoken in Jesus' day to do so with much more surety.

Another valuable contribution drawn from this material concerns the character of the first century targums. The Leviticus targum from Qumran refutes the arguments that the writing of an Aramaic version of the Pentateuch was late. Vermes²³ underlines this fact in reference to IQ Gen. Apoc. which he says "offers important evidence of the early targumic versions of Genesis" dating before 70 A.D. The Qumran targumic material for the Pentateuch supports a position taken by Olmstead²⁴ in 1942 when he maintained that since we have evidence of an early targum to the Hagiographa there would most likely be even earlier targums to the Pentateuch and Prophets. Furthermore, both the Job and Leviticus targums from Qumran demonstrate how literal early targums were although

they also included interpretation of the Hebrew text. This in turn throws into perspective the whole question of the formation and transmission of the several extant targums which we possessed before Qumran.²⁵

Before Qumran we had available the Targum Onkelos on the Pentateuch published in the Rabbinic Bibles and in the Polyglotts. This was the official targum to Torah. Dalman used Onkelos as the basis for his discussion of Palestinian Aramaic. We now know the problem not to be so simple and straight forward. The present text of Onkelos reflects a Babylonian recension which probably did not reach Palestine much before the end of the first millennium A.D.²⁶ The idea that Onkelos having originated in Palestine was revised in Babylon is argued by Kutscher, Wernberg-Møller, Diez Macho and Vermes.²⁷ In contrast Kahle, taking his lead from Geiger, argued for a Babylonian origin for Targum Onkelos and therefore, he dismissed any merit in using Onkelos as evidence for Palestinian Aramaic. Recently a lively debate ensued between Kutscher and Kahle.²⁸ Kahle objected to Kutscher's method of dating IQ Gen. Apoc. and his rejection of the Palestinian targums as containing first-rate evidence for Palestinian Aramaic of Jesus' time.

We now recognize the importance of the Palestinian targumic material along with the Qumran texts for any study of Palestinian Aramaic. At the same time the nature of the contents of Targum Onkelos and its relationship to the Palestinian oriented traditions²⁹ of the Palestinian targums is ripe for renewed study. The change in emphasis is easily observed in the three editions of Matthew Black's An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. First published in 1946 his third edition in 1967 contains an extensive new chapter on the new Palestinian targum material available.

In addition to Onkelos there is the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (Ps.J), the Fragmentary Targum of Jerusalem 11 (Fg.T 11) and the targumic texts from the Cairo Geniza. These all reflect a Palestinian origin. Pseudo-Jonathan is an authentic Palestinian targum. The language is Palestinian Aramaic which was later influenced by Onkelos. It is also a complete targum to the Pentateuch. It is less a translation than a paraphrase containing long and extensive digressions. It contains much haggadic material and reflects an exegesis of the Old Testament contemporary with the New Testament. At the same time we argue for the antiquity of this targum³⁰ we recognize many later additions which had persuaded scholars of an earlier generation to date the whole targum late.

The problem of the relationship of Pseudo-Jonathan to Onkelos has vexed scholars. Many³¹ have argued that Pseudo-Jonathan is simply Onkelos with Palestinian targumic fragments inserted in order to preserve them. A second group, including Ginsberger, Block and Diez Macho have argued³² that Pseudo-Jonathan is an authentic Palestinian targum which has been retouched under the influence of Onkelos. Vermes³³ representing a third position has written a very valuable study of the problem based on Genesis 4:3-16 which is represented in several Palestinian targums. He has argued that Onkelos is a revised version of a proto-Pseudo-Jonathan. Hence Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan have developed from a common Palestinian targum tradition.

Further witness to Palestinian targum tradition is found in the Fragmentary targum (Fg.T 11) preserving some 800 verses of the Pentateuch. This was

Jerusalem. In Hebrews 7: 1-2 Melchizedek is described as "king of peace" (*Βάσιλευς εἰρήνης*). We cannot be sure whether the author of Hebrews knew a midrashic tradition or did he recognize *slm* as an adjective.⁴⁵

All the Palestinian targums, as well as 1Q Gen. Apoc. identify Melchizedek as King of Jerusalem which M. Black⁴⁶ finds to be an anti-Samaritan attitude. It would be inconceivable to have Melchizedek, priest of the Most High God, worshipping at Salim north-east of Nablus. Next, Melchizedek offered "bread and wine" which 1Q Gen. Apoc. reads "food and drink" suggesting to us that this was an offering of sustenance and had no sacrificial implications. The author of Hebrews, who was interested in the idea of the priestly sacrifice of Christ, also seems unaware of any sacrificial nuance in Genesis. Cyprian was the first to introduce the sacrificial idea.⁴⁷ The use of the word *khn* in 1Q Gen. Apoc. is evidence against Zeitlin's argument that *khn* is a Hebrew loan word.^{47a} Onkelos, on the other hand, avoided the use of this word which leads M. Black⁴⁸ to explain it as another anti-Samaritan trait. Be that as it may, the use of *khn* is important in the Palestinian targums since Abram received Melchizedek's blessing.

Finally, a significant contribution is gained from the comparative study of the Palestinian targums in the light they shed on the background of New Testament exegesis. We cite two examples: Genesis 6:8 and 9:6. In Genesis 6:8 (example 8) Noah finds grace and favour because there is "none other righteous man in his generation." In the Palestinian targums verse 8 is tied in more closely with verse 9 than in the MT. This seems to be the background of 11 Peter 2:5 saying that Noah was "a preacher of righteousness" and Hebrews 11:7 writing "heir of the righteousness."

Genesis 9:6 (example 9) is closely related to Matthew 5:21: "You have heard that it was said to men of old: 'You shall not kill, and whoever kills shall be liable to the judgment.'" The first part of Jesus' words are clearly identified with Exodus 20:13 (cf. Deuteronomy 5:18). The sanction expressed in the second part of the phrase cannot be directly identified with any Old Testament text. Scholars have made reference to Exodus 21:12, Leviticus 24:17,21, Numbers 25:16ff where the murderer is said to pay for his crime by being put to death. But where is this reference to "judgment"? The sources quoted by Strack-Billerbeck⁴⁹, at this point, are all from the third and fourth centuries A.D. Mekilta, Bahodesh 8⁵⁰ on Exodus 20:13, explains the command "You shall not kill" by Genesis 9:6. Murder is comparable to destroying the image. Philo⁵¹ and R. Akiba in Bereschit Rabba³⁴ take exactly the same position based on Genesis 9:6. When we turn to the Palestinian targums and Onkelos we find Matthew 5:21 fully explained. According to the targums the murderer is to be brought to judgment. In Matthew 5:21 "he is liable to the judgment". I submit that the targums, at this point, retain an interpretation contemporary with the New Testament.⁵²

Footnotes

1. M.H. Segal: A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew (Oxford, 1927); G. Dalman: Die Worte Jesu (Leipzig, 1939²).
2. M. Black: An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (Oxford, 1967³) pg. 15.
3. Segal, op. cit., pg. 16.
4. H. Birkeland: The Language of Jesus, Avhandlinger utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps Akademi i Oslo II Hist.-filos. Klasse, no. 1 (Oslo 1954)
5. Y. Yadin: "The Excavation of Masada", Israel Exploration Journal, 15 (1965), pg. 1-120
6. M. Wilcox: The Semitisms of Acts (Oxford 1965), pg. 14.
7. H. Odeberg: The Aramaic Portions of Bereschit Rabba, Lunds Universitets Arsskrift N.F Avd.1 Bd 36 Nr. 3, vol. I & II, (Lund 1939).
8. J. M. Grintz: "Hebrew as the spoken and written language in the last days of the Second Temple", Journal of Biblical Literature, 79 (1960), pg. 32-47.
9. M. Wagner: Die lexikalischen un grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebraisch, Beihefte ZAW 96 (Berlin 1966).
10. A. Roberts: The Language of Christ and his Apostles; T.K. Abbott: Essays on the Original Text of the Old and New Testaments, pg. 129-182.
11. S. Lieberman: Greek in Jewish Palestine (Philadelphia), pg. 67.
12. B.M. Metzger: The New Testament: its background, growth and content (Nashville 1965), pg. 32.
13. R. de Vaux: review of B. Bogatti and J. T. Milik: Gli Scavi del "Dominus Flevit" La Necropoli del periodo romano (Jerusalem 1958), RB, 66 (1959) pg. 299-301; and A.H. Gundry: "The Language Milieu of First Century Palestine", JBL, 83 (1964), pg. 404-408 (405).
14. Lieberman: op. cit., pg. 67.
15. C.F.D. Moule: An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge 1963), pg. 192; G. Dalman: Jesus-Jeschua (Leipzig 1929²), pg. 2; Birkeland, op. cit., pg. 16; Josephus, The Wars of the Jews 111 5.4.
16. J. Wellhausen: Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien (Berlin 1911²); E. Nestle: Philologica Sacra (Berlin 1896).
17. G. Dalman: op. cit.; C.F. Burney: The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel (Oxford 1922), The Poetry of our Lord (Oxford 1925); C.C. Torrey: The Fourth Gospel: A New Translation (Harpers 1933).
18. Black: op. cit., pg. 47 and all of chpt. III.
19. "The Scroll of Fasting" was a list of days of the year, arranged by months, when it was not lawful to mourn or fast because these days recorded events in Jewish history when celebration was proper. The text, in its present form, is probably from the time of Hadrian.
20. M.R. Lehman: "1Q Genesis Apocryphon in the light of Targumim and Midrashim", R de Qumran, I (1958) pg. 249-263 (251).

Footnotes (cont'd)

21. "How splendid and beautiful the form of her face and how.... and how soft the hair of her head; how lovely are her eyes and how pleasant is her nose and all the radiance of her face.... how lovely is her breast and how beautiful is all her whiteness! Her arms, how beautiful! And her hands, how perfect! And how attractive all the appearance of her hands! How lovely (are) her palms, and how long and dainty all the fingers of her hands. Her feet, how beautiful! How perfect are her legs! There are no virgins or brides who enter the bridal chamber more beautiful than she. Indeed her beauty surpasses that of all women. Her beauty is high above all of them. Yet with all this beauty is much wisdom in her; and whatever she has is lovely". (IQ Gen. Apoc. XX 2-8).
22. E. Y. Kutscher: "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon", Scripta Hierosylimatana IV (1957), pg. 3.
23. G. Vermes: Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (Iedien 1962), pg. 111.
24. A. T. Olmstead: "Could an Aramaic Gospel be written?", JNES I (1942), pg. 41-75 (pg. 59).
25. M. McNamara: The New Testament and the Palestinian Targums to the Pentateuch (Rome 1966), pg. 65.
26. M. Ginsburger: Das Fragmententhargum (Berlin 1899), pg. XV.
27. Kutscher: op. cit.; P. Wernberg-Møller: Studia Theologica 15 (1961), pg. 128-180; A. Diez Macho: "La Lengua hablada por Jesucristo", Or Ant 2 (1963), pg. 103; G. Vermes: "Haggadah in the Onkelos Targum", JSS, 8 (1963), pg. 159-169.
- 27a. P. Kahle: The Cairo Geniza (Oxford 1959²), pg. 194.
- 27b. A. Geiger: Urschrift un Uebersetzungen der Bibel (Frankfurt a/m 1928²), pg. 453.
28. P. Kahle: "Das palastinische Pentateuchtargum und das zur Zeit Jesu gesprochene Aramaisch" ZNTW 49:1/2 (1958), pf. 115ff; E. Y. Kutscher: "Das zur Zeit Jesu gesprochene Aramaisch" ZNTW 51:1/2 (1960), pg. 46-54; Kahle's reply in ZNTW 51:1/2 (1960), pg. 55.
29. R. le Déaut: Introduction à la littérature rabbinique (Rome 1966), pg. 84.
30. A. Marmorstein: Studien zum Pseudo-Jonathan Targum, I: Das Targum und die Apokrypha Literatur (Posen 1905); A.T. Olmstead: op. cit.
31. P. Winter: "Luke 2:49 and the Targum Yerushalmi", ZNTW 45(1954), pg. 145-179.
32. M. Ginsburger: Pseudo-Jonathan (Berlin 1903), pg. XXI; R. Block: "Notes sur l'utilisation des fragments de la Geniza du Caire pour l'étude du targum palestinien", REJ, 14(1955), pg. 31; A. Diez Macho: "The Recently discovered Palestinian Targum: its antiquity and relationship with other targums", Vetus Testament Supplement 7 (1960), pg. 239-245.
33. G. Vermes: "The Targumic Version of Genesis 4:3-16", The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society 3 (1961-2) pg. 98.

Footnotes (cont'd)

34. P. Kahle: Masoreten des Westens, vol. II, (Stuttgart 1930).
35. A. Diez Macho: "The Palestinian Targum", Christian News from Israel, 13:2 (July 1962), pg. 19-25.
36. The Ms was prepared for Egidio i.e. Gilles de Viterbe, vicar-general of the Augustinian Order; cf. G. E. Weil: Elie Lévitā, humaniste et massorète (Leiden 1963), pg. 81-82 and F. X. Martin: The Problem of Egidio da Viterbo: A Historiographical Survey (Louvain 1960).
37. McNamara: op. cit., pg. 63.
38. Le Déaut: op. cit., pg. 122.
39. M. C. Doubles: "Toward the Publication of the extant text of the Palestinian Targums", VT, XV:1 (1965), pg. 16-26 (25).
40. Block: op. cit.
41. ibid
42. LXX: κιβωτὸν ἐκ ξύλων τετραγώνων ; Vulg.: de lignis laevigatis.
43. McNamara: op. cit., pg. 51-52.
44. R. Block: "Notes methodologique pour l'étude de la littérature rabbinique", RSR, 43 (1955) pg. 194-227; and G. Vermes: Scripture and Tradition in Judaism.
45. P. Winter: "Notes on Salem, Jerusalem" NT, 2 (1957) 151-152.
46. M. Black: NTS, 3 (1956-7) pg. 312.
47. J. A. Fitzmyer: The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I (Rome 1966), pg. 156.
- 47a. Zeitlin: JQR, 47 (1957), pg. 249.
48. Black: NTS, 3 (1956-7), pg. 312.
49. H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck: Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Munich 1922ff), vol. I, pg. 254.
50. "'Thou shalt not murder'. Why is it said? Because it says 'whosoever sheds man's blood, etc.' (Gen. 9:6). We have thus (Gen. 9:6) heard the penalty but have not heard the warning; therefore it says here 'Thou shalt not murder'."
51. De Decalogo 132ff.
52. McNamara: op. cit., pg. 126-131.

II. ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS

(a) The Supposed Adoption - Marriage of Jacob

Several years ago C. Gordon suggested that there was a strong similarity between the marriage customs of Nuzi and Jacob's marriages, based on a comparison between texts of Nuzi (Gadd 51 and HSS 67) and the Genesis story. The Nuzi texts are basically adoption texts to which marriage between the adopted son and the daughter of the adopter is incidental. In the Biblical story of Jacob, however, there is nothing which explicitly suggests that Jacob was adopted by Laban. In fact the following points indicate that Jacob was not adopted.

- a) He paid a bride-price of seven years service for each wife. In no case in the legal texts does an adopted son pay a bride-price.
- b) He has a separate household, but adoption always means that there is only one household until the division of the inheritance. Otherwise the property of the adopted son belongs to the adoptive father's household!
- c) Jacob continues to recognize Isaac as his father and Canaan as his homeland. Laban is never addressed as his father but only as the father of his wives. Adoption implies a complete break with one's natural father and native land.

Since Jacob's adoption cannot be demonstrated the whole comparison with the Nuzi material is without foundation.

John Van Seters, Newtonville, Mass.

(b) The Herald of Good Tidings in Second Isaiah

The figure of the "herald of good tidings" (Heb. = m^ebaššer, piel participle from root BSR) occupies a position of crucial importance in Isaiah 40-55 for it is he who announces the climactic core of the prophet's message: the imminent salvation of exiled Israel and the inauguration of the eschatological reign of God. A careful study of the three passages in which he appears (40:9; 41:27; 52:7) shows that this herald is none other than the prophet Second Isaiah himself. This interpretation is especially important for a proper understanding of 40:9 where the predominant view holds that the herald is Zion-Jerusalem. The identification of the prophet as the herald who announces this ultimate good news to the people raises the question of the Sitz im Leben of Second Isaiah, and it is tentatively suggested that the prophet was a kind of cultic prophet who pronounced his oracles within the context of the worshipping congregation.

Robert W. Fisher, Waterloo, Ontario

(c) Romans 6:23a and 6:7

Paul was not a Hellenist. He did not use the Aristotelian category of efficient causality. He was a Hebraist in every fibre of his being. He used the Biblical category of expiation. Death is the EXPIATION of sin. (Romans 6:7). Death is the expiation of SIN (Romans 6:23a). The difference is one of emphasis only. Romans 6:23a does NOT contradict Romans 6:7.

Roy Mason Pounder, Montreal, Quebec

(d) Once Again, "The Religion of Israel"

It is remarkable that in the three decades following the appearance of W. Eichrodt's *Theology of the Old Testament*, very few works on the history of the religion of Israel were produced. In the past seven years four major studies of the latter subject have been published: by Pfeiffer, Renckens, Ringgren, and Vriezen. The paper comments upon this turn of events, briefly evaluates the four books, and reflects on the prospects for future work in the area.

Jared Jackson, Pittsburgh, Penna.

(e) A Twofold Christology in John?

This paper examines the ways in which John attempts to understand the mystery of the person of Jesus. The conclusion is that when the evangelist uses the "Son of Man" figure, and terminology associated with it ("ascending" and "descending", "glorification", and "I am") he is reflecting a primitive, Jewish-inspired Christology notably different from other passages of the gospel in which vertical and automotive language is avoided, the notion of pre-existence absent, and divine indwelling substituted for the divine Name. Such divergent Christologies presuppose a process of developing reflection and theologizing still discernible in the pages of the gospel and evident inter alia in the evangelist's twofold eschatology. John often reworks an event or a discourse as his understanding of it progresses. It is suggested here that the twofold stoning of Jesus, the one at 8,59 and the other at 10,31 furnishes us with another doublet illustrative of the two Christologies.

J. E. Bruns, Toronto, Ontario

(f) The Problem of Eschatology in the Old Testament

The study of eschatology in the Old Testament is circumscribed at the present time by divergence of opinions and disagreement among scholars concerning the definition of the concept and its application to the Old Testament. In order to overcome this difficulty, what is needed is an approach that distinguishes between the two aspects of the problem: the definition of eschatology, and the application of this definition to the study of available material. Our present concern will be only to establish a definition.

Due consideration of the present state of scholarly opinion, as well as other factors, suggests that the basic definition of eschatology should be established as: any system of thought that deals with what is ultimate or final. This statement is then further to be limited by the proviso that the concept refers only to the experience of human beings as individuals or societies; and that two other characteristics are tension and absolute change between the present and the future in expectation of the eschaton. These characteristics are expressed in two forms:

- (1) Negative eschatology marked by the termination of the present age in total destruction.
- (2) Positive eschatology marked by the replacing of the present age by one totally different.

P. F. Gilbert, Toronto, Ontario

(g) The Death of Josiah: A Conspiracy of Silence

The death of Josiah was a crushing blow to Israel's hopes, politically and religiously. There was a marked reluctance on everybody's part to comment on the event. Reference in Kings is terse to the point of obscurity, no reference in Lamentations, no pertinent reference in Jeremiah. Even Zech. 12:11 and Rev. 16:16 on examination prove irrelevant. Only the Chronicler re-writes Kings, but draws heavily on the account of the death of Ahab to do so.

The ominous silence that follows the death of Josiah, however, is that of the Hebrew historiographers. Hebrew history had been written on the premise that Yahweh was at work in the events of time, effecting his purpose to establish Israel by rewarding loyalty and punishing defection. Moses and Saul illustrate the difficulty of always making the facts fit the theory; Uzziah and Manasseh provide further examples. But Josiah's death was too blatant and too contemporary an event to be treated in this way (centuries later the Chronicles tried the old formula for meeting the difficulty, but most unconvincingly). History had caught up with Heilsgeschichte and had discredited it. History-writing ceased in Israel. When it resumed (I and II Maccabees) it was on the Greek model. Christian historiographers

took up the task (Eusebius to Bossuet) but faltered in the glare of the Enlightenment. Perhaps the time is ripe to suggest that this generation now has the scientific and historical resources to restate the Hebrew 'premise to historiography' as the clue to the meaning of the universe with a new persuasiveness.

S. B. Frost, Montreal, Quebec

(h) The "Hypostasis of the Archons" - A Gnostic Genesis Midrash

Among the hitherto unpublished materials of the Nag Hammadi Gnostic find is a document entitled "Concerning the Hypostasis of the Archons", forming part of the same codex as The Gospel of Thomas and The Gosepl according to Philip.

Together with these two "gospels" this document presumes some knowledge of the biblical material, which it seeks to twist the suit its own ideological purpose. The Hypostasis is remarkable in that it follows its biblical Vorlage, parts of the Primaeval History in Genesis, far more closely, though with the express purpose of setting forth Gnostic ideology.

It falls into three parts -

- 1) A Prologue, in which the author's basic thesis is stated, the conflict between the Powers (exousiai) and the world of the Incorruption, and in which the rebellion and expulsion of their leader, Samuel, is narrated.
- 2) The Genesis Midrash begins with the creation of man by the rebel Archons, then that of Eve, after whom the Archons lust. The serpent is introduced as the deliverer, and Eve and Adam assert their freedom against the usurped dominion of the Archons, who cast them out of paradise in order to retain their power over them. After narrating the Fratricide of Oain and the birth of Seth, the birth of Norea is related. She it is who comes into conflict with Noah when he builds the ark. The archons turn on her and attempt to tyrannize her.
- 3) The angel Eleleth delivers Norea, and delivers a summary of the Ophite "party line". It is suggested that this may have been a separate document, since Norea disappears from sight in it.

C. J. deCatanzaro, Peterborough, Ontario

(i) Historicity and Oral Tradition: A Study of the Nature of the Problem and Its Implications

This paper deals with the question of the historicity of prose narratives, like the Patriarchal legends, which have been transmitted orally. First, the most important discussions and comments on the subject of the historicity of oral tradition are reviewed, mainly the work of Liestl, Vansina and Dorson. The picture is far from complete, but the impression gained is that one must be cautious. However, it seems that one may not prejudice the historicity or lack of historicity of oral narratives with an argument based on the nature of oral tradition. Oral tradition cannot be characterized as necessarily reliable or necessarily unreliable. Secondly, the paper asks whether the question of historicity legends like the Patriarchal narratives has been set in the proper context in Biblical scholarship. It is suggested that to employ a strongly historical approach to the text may unnecessarily or even wrongly predetermine the role of history in the interpretation of the text. If a legend among other things is a literary work which is understood and appreciated and understood in many contexts other than the "original" setting, some attention should be paid to the appropriate way of interpreting literary works before articulating the relationship of such works to the "original" context in which they may have arisen.

Robert C. Culley

(j) Acts 2: The Solution to a Problem

The writer adopts the stance that Luke may be a better historian than is commonly believed. The hermeneutical principle, that in any apparent discrepancy between Paul's epistles and Luke-Acts the former must always be correct, is challenged. As an example an examination is made of the problem of "glossolalia" as it is found in I Cor. 12-14 and Acts 2. In the latter Luke is commonly said to have recast his sources to suit his theological purpose since Paul refers only to ecstatic utterance and Luke says that foreign languages were also a part of the experience at Pentecost. Illustrations from current examples of glossolalia which include both forms are cited to support the view that Luke, may be as accurate a reporter of what happened in tongue-speaking, as Paul.

R. E. Osborne, Toronto, Ontario

(k) New Parable Interpretation

With reference back to Julicher's important work on the parables, the work of Dodd Parables of the Kingdom, 1935, is suggested as marking a new era in parable interpretation. This is supported by quotations from Jeremias Parables of Jesus, E.T.1953. A new line of treatment seems to be indicated by appeal to the parables by Fuchs as original with Jesus and containing an implicit Christology. This is made much more definite in D.O.Via's, The Parables 1967 which speaks of an existential interpretation distinguishable from, but continuous with, the historical interpretation of Dodd, Jeremias and orthodox Gospel research. This existentialist interpretation is the real end-term of the process, and the historical interpretation is only a halfway house. Reference is also made to G.V.Jones, The Art and Truth of the Parables, 1964, which has much in common with Via, though not so subservient to Heidegger and Bultmann. The tendency of this new methodology to de-historicise should be watched, but full credit must be given for its acquaintance with the attention studies in general literature are giving to metaphor and symbolism. Amos Wilder has expertise here, but N.T.scholars ought not to leave him so isolated in this field.

Cyril Blackman, Toronto, Ontario

III. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY

The 36th annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies was held concurrently with the 29th annual meeting of the Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature, May 14-16, 1968, at St. Michael's College, Toronto, Ontario. Also meeting at this time were the Canadian Society of Church History and the Canadian Theological Society.

The business meeting was opened by the President, Professor Ernest G. Clarke, at 9:00 p.m., May 14, 1968.

The minutes of the 1967 meeting were adopted.

The following members had sent regrets at not being able to attend: Charles P. Anderson, Elias Andrews, J.D.F. Beattie, John R. Cameron, Robert M. Clark, Edward J. Crowley, Paul-Eugène Dion, Eldon R. Hay, J. B. Hibbitts, Morley F. Hodder, Jan A. Huntjens, D. R. Huston, J. G. Janzen, Sidney Jellicoe, Hanna E. Kassis, Harry Kuntz, Margot Lads, André Legault, M. R. B. Lovesey, Hubert J. McAvoy, V. E. McEachern, Kikuo Matsuwaga, Helen Milton, Gerald E. Moffatt, Roy Pounder, Mary E. Russell, R. B. Scott, Doreen Smith, Phyllis Smyth, Rolland E. Wolfe.

Professors Macpherson, Hurd and North were appointed to the Nominating Committee.

Professors Lutz and Osborne were appointed Auditors.

Professor Robert Funk, Executive Secretary of SBL was recognized and welcomed as a guest. Professor Funk was invited to address the meeting, bringing the members up-to-date information on developments in SBL.

The Secretary offered an extended report on activities of his office and future prospects for the Society.

1) The Secretary congratulated President Clarke on the receipt of a Canada Council grant to represent CSBS at the Old Testament Congress in Rome, 1968.

The award reflects well on the Society as well as on Professor Clarke.

2) The sale of Canadian Biblical Studies during the year was noted by the Secretary. Initial response to an ad in JBL was not impressive, although requests have continued to trickle in.

3) Relationships with other sections in SBL and with other Learned Societies in Canada are to be re-examined. Prior to the 1968 meeting in California, the Secretary plans to meet in Winnipeg and Vancouver to obtain first-hand knowledge of the views of members across the country.

An ad-hoc committee consisting of Professors Winnett, Culley, Clarke, Funk and Wagner was appointed to make a recommendation re meeting with other Learned Societies in Canada. The recommendation adopted by the Society at a subsequent session was that the Executive seek to enter into joint meetings on a trial basis with the general Learned Societies.

On a motion by Professor McCullough, seconded by Professor Macpherson, the Executive was instructed to invite SBL for the 1969 meeting on the best date available.

On a motion by Professor Osborne, seconded by Professor Van Seters, Dean U. S. Leupold was nominated to the Editorial Committee of The Canadian Journal of Theology.

Professor Osborne presented the Auditors' report indicating that the books are in good order. Seconded by Professor Culley, the report was adopted and is included here for information.

Carried forward	\$213.22	
1967 dues	52.00	
1968 dues	156.00	
<u>Canadian Biblical Studies</u>	8.00	
Interest	8.32	
Exchange	.16	
	437.70	\$437.70
Expenses		
Ad in <u>JBL</u>	\$ 27.13	
Stencils & production	48.75	
Secretary's expenses	25.00	
Typing-		
<u>Canadian Biblical Studies</u>	40.00	
Mailing	22.47	
	163.35	<u>\$163.35</u>
Balance		<u>\$274.35</u>

- Mrs. Libby Garschowitz, Downsview, Ontario.
- Mr. John S. Holladay, Jr., Toronto, Ontario.
- Dr. John C. Hurd, Jr., Toronto, Ontario.
- Dr. Martin Kessler, Potsdam, New York.
- Mr. Keith Knights, Waterloo, Ontario.
- Mr. James McLean, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Rev. Robert Reid, Toronto, Ontario.
- Mr. J. Immanuel Schochet, Downsview, Ontario.
- Professor Larry Toombs, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Dr. Allison Albert Trites, Wolfville, Nova Scotia.

The above individuals were received as new members.

Professor Macpherson presented the report of the Nominating Committee resulting in the election of the following Executive Committee:

President-	Professor George Taylor, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
Vice-President-	Professor Robert Schnell, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.
Secretary-Treasurer-	Professor Norman E. Wagner, Waterloo Lutheran University, Waterloo, Ontario.
Members-at-Large-	Professor R. C. Culley, Montreal Professor J. E. Bruns, Toronto.

A motion thanking the hosts at St. Michaels and Victoria Universities was unanimously adopted. It was generally agreed that a very worthwhile meeting had been held.

Respectfully submitted,
Norman E. Wagner,
Secretary-Treasurer.

MT	O	Fs.J	Fg.T	N	I Q Gen. Apoc XIX 20
1) Gen.12: 13 Say, I pray thee that you are my sister	Say, I pray thee that you are my sister	Say, I pray thee that you are my sister	Say, I pray thee that you are my sister	Say about me that you are my sister	Say about me that he is my brother
2) Gen.6: 13 ...an ark of gopher wood (גפר)	...an ark of cedar trees (קדרים)	...an ark of cedar wood (קדרין)	...an ark of cedar trees (קדרין)	...an ark of cedar trees (קדרין)	<u>Ngl</u> ...an ark of cedar trees (קדרין)
3) Gen.13: 7 And there was a quarrel between the herdsmen of Abram's cattle and those of Lot's cattle -	Now there was a quarrel between the herdsmen of Abram's cattle and the herdsmen of Lot's cattle	Now there was a contest between the herdsmen of Abram's flock and the herdsmen of Lot's flock for Abram's herdsmen were commanded by him not to go among the Canaanites and Perizzites for up to then they had no authority in the land and they were muzzling their cattle lest they eat stolen food until they came to their grazing place Now Lot's herdsmen were letting the herd graze unmuzzled going and eating in the fields of the Canaanites and the Perizzites	Now there was a quarrel between the herdsmen of Abram's herds and the herdsmen of Lot's herds for Abram's herdsmen were muzzling their cattle until the time came when they reached the grazing place Now Lot's herdsmen were not muzzling their cattle but were letting the cattle graze unmuzzled in the farthest fields but the herdsmen of Abram the righteous were muzzling with their bridles and were not fighting either the Canaanites nor the Perizzites for unto then they were in possession of the land.	Now there was a contest between the herdsmen of Abram's cattle and the herdsmen of Lot's cattle Abram's herdsmen were muzzling their cattle until the time when they reached the grazing place Now Lot's herdsmen were not muzzling their cattle but were letting their cattle graze unmuzzled and going but Abram's herdsmen were command by Abram their Lord saying: you shall not encamp with the Canaanites and Perizzites until then they were in possession of the land.	quarrel flocks muzzling on the march for until
the Canaanites and the Perizzites were then dwelling in the land.	the Canaanites and the Perizzites were then dwelling in the land.	for unto then they were dwelling in the land.	for unto then they were in possession of the land.	until then they were in possession of the land.	for until

4) Gen. 14:4

Twelve years they served Chedor-laomer and in the thirteenth they rebelled.

Twelve years they served Chedor-laomer and in the thirteenth they rebelled.

om

Twelve years they served Chedorlaomer and in the thirteenth they rebelled against him.

against him.

...they rebelled.

5) Gen. 14:14

...that his kinsman has been taken captive, he mustered his retainers born into his household, numbering 318, and went in pursuit as far as Dan.

...that his kinsman was taken captive

...that his kinsman was taken captive, then he armed the lads who were trained for war from the numbers of his household. But they did not wish to go with him and so he chose from them Eleazar bar Nimrod who was comparable in strength to all of them.

om

...that Lot his nephew was taken captive, then he armed the lads, lads reared in his household

Ngl

from the increase of his household. But they did not wish to go with him and so Eleazer was chosen from them for he was from Dan equal to 318.

6) Gen. 14:18

And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought out bread and wine

Now Melchizedek, the king of Jerusalem, brought out bread and wine

Now the upright king, that is Shem, son of Noah, King of Jerusalem went out before Abram and brought out for him bread and wine

Now Melchizedek, king of Jerusalem for he was the great Shem, was priest of the Most High, brought out food and wine and was standing and serving as high priest God Most High.

Now the upright king, king of Jerusalem, that is the great Shem,

he was a priest of God Most High.

and he was serving before God Most High.

at that time he was serving before God Most High.

brought out bread and wine he was a priest serving as high priest before God Most High.

giving food and drink to Abram and to all the men who were with him. And he was a priest to God Most High.

7) Gen. 15:1

After these things

After these things

After these things when the kings

After these things when all the kings of the earth and all the rulers of the provinces

After these things when all the kingdoms of the earth

were gathered together

were gathered together to make war with Abram the righteous

were gathered together and had drawn up in battle lines before Abram and had fallen

and had fallen before Abram and he had killed them and he restored 9 of the princes Abram repented in his heart and said: "Woe now to me lest I receive a reward in this

and he (!) had fallen before him and he had killed 4 of their kings and had restored 9 of the princes Abram the righteous repented in his heart and said: "Woe now upon me lest I receive a reward

before him and he had killed 4 of their kings and had restored 9 of the princes Abram repented in his heart and said: "Woe now upon me lest I receive a reward in this

world for charity and I have
no portion in the world to
come; or, lest the brothers
and relatives of these killed

come and join with legions
and come against me;
or lest in that time he find
with me a reward of little
merits
and they fell before me;

and in the second time he
did not find with me the
reward
and so the name of heaven
is profaned through me
and therefore

the word of Yahweh was with
Abram
in a vision saying
"do not fear, oh Abram
although they are

joining with legions and
coming against you

my word is a shield to you
and even though they are
falling before you in
this world

a reward for your doing good
worth observing and they are
being established before me
the world to come very much.

in this world for charity
and I have no portion in
the world to come; or,
lest the brothers and
relatives of these killed

come and join themselves
with many legions;
or lest he find for me
merit
in the former time when
they fell before me;

or lest he did not find
for me, in the second
time,

the word came from before
Yahweh with Abram the
righteous saying
"do not fear, oh Abram
although the brothers and
relatives of these killed
come

and join with themselves
many legions

my word shall surround you
in this world
and a shield upon you all
the day
however

your reward and good deeds

are being established for you
in the world to
come.

in this world for charity
and I have no portion in
the world to come; or,
lest the brothers or
relatives of these killed
who fell before me and were
in their villages and in
their provinces come and
join themselves with many
legions and come or, lest
(there be) little charity
which was in my hand in
former time when they fell
before me and were lifted
up for me;

or lest he did not find in
my hand charity in the
second time
and so the name of heaven is
profaned through me

the word of the prophecy was
from before Yahweh to Abram
the righteous saying
"do not fear, oh Abram
although they are

joining many legions
and coming against you to
kill those who are haughty
to you

for he is to shield to you
in this world

and even though I hand over to
you men who are speaking evil
against you in this world
the reward for your good deeds

are being established for you
before me in the world to come.

the word of the
Yahweh came to Abram
in a vision saying:
"Fear not, Abram

the word of Yahweh was to
Abram
in a vision saying
"do not fear, oh Abram,

I am a shield to you

my word is a shield to you

your reward

your reward is

shall be very great.

very much.

8) Gen. 6:8

But Noah found favour
with the lord.

Noah found favour before
Yahweh.

Noah who was righteous
found grace before
Yahweh.

And Noah, because he was
gracious in his generation,
found grace and hesed before
Yahweh.

And Noah, because there was
none righteous in his gen-
eration, found grace and
hesed before Yahweh.

Ngl

he

9) Gen. 9:6

Whoever sheds the blood
of man

Whoever sheds the blood
of man,
with witnesses, according
to the sentence of the
judge,

Whoever sheds the blood
of man,
with witnesses the judges
shall declare him guilty
of murder.

Whoever spills the blood
of man

Whoever spills the blood
of man

by man shall his blood
be shed;

shall his blood be shed;

And whoever (sheds the
blood of man) without
witnesses, the Lord of the
world shall require
recompense from him on the
great day of judgement;

by the hands of man shall
his blood be spilt;

by the hands of man shall
his blood be spilt;

for in the image of
God was man created.

for in the image of God
He made man.

for in the likeness of God
He made man.

for in the likeness of
Yahweh
He created man.

for in the likeness of Yahweh
He created man.