

Archive

BULLETIN
OF THE
CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

BULLETIN
de la
SOCIÉTÉ CANADIENNE DES ÉTUDES BIBLIQUES

No. 33

1973.

C O N T E N T S

I.	Presidential Address (1973)	1
II.	Abstracts of Papers: Annual Meeting (1973)	13
III.	Proceedings of the Society	18

Note: With apologies for the delay in mailing the
Bulletin.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Isaiah's Curse According to Mark

John C. Hurd

Trinity College, Toronto

We live, as you are all aware, in an age of "Redaction Criticism," at least as far as the study of the synoptic gospels is concerned. It was not always so. "Textual Criticism" was a focus of interest and achievement which climaxed in the publication of Westcott and Hort's edition of the New Testament in 1881. Then "Source Criticism" occupied the attention of synoptic scholars. Their achievement received belated but classical expression in B.H. Streeter's The Four Gospels in 1924. The period between the world wars saw the rise of Form Criticism, whose development can be traced in the successive editions of Rudolph Bultmann's History of the Synoptic Tradition from the first in 1921 to the seventh in 1967. But the postwar world, in general and the ecumenical movement in particular demanded of New Testament scholars a constructive rather than an analytical treatment of the documents. In response there followed a stream of books and articles with titles taking the form: "The Biblical View of X." (substitute "Man," "Sin," "Grace," "Creation," "Spirit," "Love," etc.)

To this last movement Redaction Criticism constitutes a sober second thought. Clearly it is not possible to leave the minute analysis of fragmentary traditions and to jump to the synthesis of the whole biblical message. Yet it is equally clear that the more and more elaborate analysis of smaller and smaller pieces cannot remain an end in itself. Thus between the extremes of the largest whole and the smallest bits synoptic scholarship has come to rest--for the time being at least--in the study of the individual gospel as the meaningful unit.

You will have noted the extreme width of the brush with which I have been painting. It is necessary now to become a bit more precise in two respects. To begin with, I have used the term "redaction criticism" as though it were a unified movement. Yet actually a good number of those who study individual gospel

writers do not apply, or have not applied, the term to themselves, although their work is closely allied to those who do. Conversely the simple term "redaction criticism" covers a spectrum of opinion. At one end are those who think of the gospel writers as more or less free authors. In seeking to understand a given text they turn first to their reconstruction of the author's purposes. Only if the text stubbornly refuses to be related to these purposes is it assigned to the category of source tradition. At the other end of the spectrum are those who visualize the synoptic author more narrowly as redactor. For them the burden of proof lies precisely on the other, former group, who suggest that the author acted freely and creatively. They themselves limit the creative work of the gospel editor to his arrangement of the traditions and to his provision of brief narrative links to connect previously unrelated units. The former maximize the gospel writer's role; the latter minimize it. And there are many, and I include myself here, who occupy positions between these poles.

We need to make distinctions at another point as well. Notice the different status of Matthew and Luke as compared with Mark. If, as I unrepentantly believe, Mark was a source used independently by Matthew and by Luke, we have direct access to the details of a portion of the redactional work of the two later editors. Thus with these gospels the range of speculation about what the editor could or could not do, did or did not do is more limited. Here differences of opinion among scholars concern mainly the motives for the changes evident in the sources.

With Mark the situation is different. None of Mark's sources has survived independently of its use in this gospel. Thus to any tendency on the part of a scholar to help along the evidence in the direction of his own particular theory there is added a splendid opportunity for arguments of the "heads, I win; tails, you lose" variety. Evidence in Mark which supports a theory can be embraced as the real Mark; evidence which does not can be rejected as belonging only to his sources. Thus "redaction criticism" means different things to different people and involves different problems in different gospels, Mark being the most difficult to deal with.

I can vividly recall the lazy summer day on which I read Austin Farrer's A Study in St. Mark. What joy to find Mark's whole program revealed with all its majestic symbolism. What disillusionment to discover that Farrer takes back half of what he had said in A Study in St. Mark in the appendix to his sequel, St. Matthew and St. Mark. Or take Phillip Carrington, The Primitive Christian Calendar and its sequel, According to Mark. For him the church's need for a Christian lectionary built around the Jewish liturgical calendar motivated the production and determined the structure of Mark's gospel. Like Farrer he has a comprehensive theory that explains virtually every scrap of

Mark's gospel. Unfortunately these two theories have nothing in common with each other except that each concerns Mark's gospel. It is no wonder that sceptics carp and jeer.

I do not mean to suggest for a moment that this problem concerning redaction criticism in Mark is my own discovery and that the need for objectivity and verification is not widely recognized among workers in this area. Far from it. But recognition of the problem and the solution of the problem (to the extent that it may be solved) are very different things. We are still far from a satisfactory solution and from any consensus about Mark's purposes. I mention this state of affairs only by way of introduction to what follows and in an attempt partially to disarm criticism of it.

What I propose to do is to outline for you what I take to be Mark's major concerns in constructing that portion of his gospel we designate as chapters 4-8. Now, although I am convinced that the argument on this subject is not circular, I must freely admit that it is at least spiral. Its full presentation would be both repetitious and lengthy. It therefore seems best to plunge directly in and to plead that the acceptance or rejection of the final product should rest on the extent to which the total picture when fully assembled seems to fit the evidence of the text.

I begin by exposing some of my assumptions, that is, my preliminary stance. In the first place, it seems to be self-evident that Mark drew on traditional material and that he did not construct his gospel out of nothing. On the other hand, I do not shrink from applying to him the term "creative." It seems to me highly probable that some of the material in his gospel is not pre-Markan, but is Mark's own composition. We may agree, for example, that both tradition and Mark are present in Mk. 3:28-30:

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

Neither Mark nor his tradition knew, and neither you nor I nor anyone else knows, what the "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit" originally meant. Mark has taken a traditional saying whose original application had been forgotten and he has placed it in his narrative so that it serves as a solemn repudiation of the notion that Jesus' power over demons derived from that of the prince of demons, Beelzebub. Mark makes the matter clear by his own comment, "for they had said, 'He has an unclean spirit.'" There is no reason to suppose that the traditions about this supreme blasphemy and about Beelzebub were connected prior to the

composition of Mark's gospel. The probability is that the linking comment is Mark's own. This probability is increased when one notes other examples of the same technique in Mark's gospel. "Thus he declared all foods clean" (Mk. 7:19); "Let the reader understand" (Mk. 13:14).

Secondly, it seems clear that Wrede and his successors are right that Mark's major concern, at least in the first half of his gospel, was to reveal to his readers the secret identity of Jesus. Thus the Caesarea Philippi episode with Peter's confession "You are the Christ" climaxes the preceding narrative with its descriptions of the outspoken demons and the mystified disciples. Mark was, in other words, a theological apologist who molded together traditions available to him in order to produce a document calculated to persuade, to convince, perhaps even to convert his readers. What this widely accepted opinion means, it seems to me, is that it is short-sighted to do redaction criticism as if it were a new form of source criticism. It is at best of limited usefulness and at worst misleading to concentrate on the problem of whether a particular piece of text is Mark's own composition or whether it was found by him in one of his sources. For much of the material the answer is not "either/or" but "both/and" -- both traditional and Markan. The material, that is, had pre-Markan origin, meaning, and application. Mark, however, took the material and read into it a new meaning, a meaning consistent with his own purposes in constructing his gospel. The "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit" is a case already cited. Thus at most points to listen to the text is to listen to a chorus of voices. We must try to tune our ears to Mark's frequency in order to receive what he has to say.

Of course, it may turn out that a given piece of text seems to speak only with the voice of Mark and then we may say either that here Mark was acting as author in the full sense, or simply that earlier stages in the tradition have been drowned out. But the first question to ask is, "What did this mean to Mark?" not "Where did it come from?"

Now for Mark 4-8. If we ask ourselves, "What is the most important incident in this section, the answer should not be in doubt, although a poll of the present audience would undoubtedly produce a variety of responses. At least to me it seems clear that Mark centered his narrative on the twin stories of the feeding of multitudes. When I ask a class for the most important story in the book of Acts, I get a variety of responses. Usually, however, one or more students say correctly "the conversion of Paul." That story appears three times in Acts: once as narrative (9:1-19) and twice more (22:4-16; 26:9-18) as Paul retells it for the reader's benefit. It epitomizes Luke's message that the God who reveals his purposes in the life and death of the Jew, Jesus of Nazareth, has unexpectedly intervened by his divine power to

bring this message to the Gentile world. So Mark also repeats for emphasis.

Parenthetically we may note here the basic difference between source criticism and the variety of redaction criticism I am advocating. Source critics fresh from their analysis of Matthew, whose doublets are mainly the result of his multiple sources, have seized on this major doublet in Mark as the starting point for their attempt to isolate Mark's sources. One source, they say, had the feeding of 5000 persons. Another had an account involving 4000. Mark, not recognizing that the two are variants of the same tradition, and in his desire to leave nothing out, put them end to end.

But if we listen to Mark himself we hear something different. Just after the second feeding and just before Peter's Confession is a boat trip to Bethsaida.

Now they had forgotten to bring bread; and they had only one loaf with them in the boat. And he cautioned them, saying, "Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod." And they discussed it with one another, saying, "We have no bread." And being aware of it, Jesus said to them, "Why do you discuss the fact that you have no bread? Do you not yet perceive or understand? Are your hearts hardened? Having eyes do you not see, and having ears do you not hear? And do you not remember? When I broke the five loaves for the five thousand, how many baskets full of broken pieces did you take up?" They said to him, "Twelve." "And the seven for the four thousand, how many baskets full of broken pieces did you take up?" And they said to him, "Seven." And he said to them, "Do you not yet understand?" (Mk. 8:14-21)

Mark is here saying that there is something vital which the disciples should "perceive" and the reader should "understand" in the twin feeding narratives. Nor is this Mark's only reference to the feeding tradition. After the first feeding there is another boat trip to Bethsaida, this time the occasion for Jesus to walk on the sea. In the face of this revelation Mark describes the disciples as "utterly astounded." We are about to nod in agreement when Mark unexpectedly adds, "for they did not understand about the loaves, but their hearts were hardened." If, that is, they had seen what the feeding of the five thousand meant, then the sight of Jesus walking the waves and controlling the wind would have given them no difficulty. Clearly Mark attached the utmost importance to the feeding narratives. Source criticism assigns to Mark's traditions the duality of these

accounts and pictures Mark as somewhat pedantic or perhaps absent-minded. Redaction criticism alerts us to the tremendous significance of the feeding tradition for Mark and suggests that its repetition was a Markan achievement.

Let us examine this repetition more closely. I have already mentioned that each feeding is followed by a boat trip to Bethsaida involving private discussion between Jesus and his disciples about "loaves." If we set these two sections of Mark's text side-by-side in synoptic fashion, further similarities emerge. The section which immediately precedes the second feeding seems not to serve as preparation for it but rather as the close of what precedes it. Mark 8:1, which introduces the feeding of the four thousand appears to be a new beginning. Thus we have a section which closes with the healing of the deaf and dumb man and a section which begins with the feeding of a multitude. It seems reasonable to consider the first feeding also as a new beginning and thus to place the two feeding narratives at the head of parallel sequences. Further it seems natural to take the healing of the blind man which occurs after the second boat trip to Bethsaida as the end of the second sequence and to put it opposite the healing of the deaf and dumb man. We have therefore the following:

Feeding 5000	Feeding 4000
Boat trip	Boat trip
Healing deaf/dumb man	Healing blind man

What next? If we notice that there are actually two boat trips in the second cycle and if we place the first of them opposite the boat trip of the first cycle, we can bring into alignment two sections concerning controversy with Pharisees: controversy over the law in the first cycle; controversy over signs in the second. The only remaining sections are the incident with the Syrophenetian woman in the first cycle and the second discussion in the boat in the second cycle. We may note, however, that both passages concern bread: the Syrophenetian woman seeks "the children's bread" and in the boat the disciples are warned against "the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod." The result is the following:

Feeding of 5000	Feeding of 4000
Trip by boat	Trip by boat
Controversy with Pharisees	Controversy with Pharisees
Children's bread	Leaven of Pharisees/Herod
Healing of deaf-mute	Healing of blind man

At this point we have reached a formulation shared by many scholars over many years: J. Weiss (1903), C.H. Dodd (1921), E. Meyer (1921-23), A.E.J. Rawlinson (1925), M. Goguel (1932), E.

Klostermann (1950), V. Taylor (1952), and D.E. Nineham (1963). With this outline, however, scholarly progress seems to stop. Austin Farrer attempted to go farther. As mentioned above he proposed a much more elaborate construction, but the special pleading which his system requires has won it few friends. Many works on the redaction criticism of Mark ignore this parallelism altogether (e.g., W. Marxsen, T.H. Burkill, T.J. Weeden). The rest of the work on this point (as it is known to me) either seeks to show that the above parallelism is unsatisfactory (e.g., Taylor, Nineham, and Quesnell) or moves off into a discussion of the process by which these passages were compiled. Scholars taking the latter route may use the term "redactor" repeatedly, but what they really give us is a combination of source criticism and form criticism. Notice where source criticism leads us. In an earlier day C.H. Dodd and V. Taylor wanted to reconstruct an original series of events at the close of Jesus' Galilean ministry which gave rise to narrative sequences in two independent traditions each of which was used by Mark in composing his gospel. A third stream of tradition led, in their view, to the narrative of John 6. For them the common denominator among these three traditions was history itself. Other scholars are not so optimistic and place the point of origin of these divergent traditions somewhere in the oral period. But both agree that the similarities between these two cycles as we have outlined them is not accidental and that there is some sort of connection between them.

Now what is odd is that each of these scholars proposes to place this connection behind Mark's sources, a hypothesis for which there is no evidence beyond the passages in question. They overlook the one connection between these passages for which there is overwhelming evidence. Both passages are Mark's writing. Good method requires that parallelisms in a document be ascribed in the first instance to the document's author. We should "rather bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of." Further, in this case Mark has gone out of his way to underline the significance which the feeding stories held for him. Thus the brand of redaction criticism which I espouse requires that we should ask of this material what it meant to Mark and what it did to further his purposes, rather than to ask where it came from. We are really interested in the function of this material and its overall structuring or shape, rather than its specific content.

If we look primarily at content, observe what happens. As Vincent Taylor, Denis Nineham, and others have said, there is considerable similarity in content between the two feeding stories, but there are considerable differences elsewhere in the cycles. The pair of boat crossings is most unbalanced: nine verses in the first cycle (6:45-53) and one verse in the second (8:10). The argument with the Pharisees occupies all of Mk. 7:1-

23 in the first cycle but only two verses in the second (8:11-12). The healing of the Syrophenician's daughter and the discussion concerning leaven are only similar in their common reference to bread. The final pair of healings have some similarity, but they are clearly quite different stories and could not have sprung from the same original event. That is, if we are mainly attuned to the content of these sections the parallelism which we originally proposed seems to crumble away.

If, however, we look at these sequences from a functional point of view, a different picture emerges. As we have seen, Mark intends the feeding stories to reveal something which, if understood by the disciples, would have prevented their surprise at seeing Jesus striding across the water. How Mark moves from his twin moments of revelation to the point at which Peter is able to say, "You are the Christ" is our primary concern.

What I have to say next is to me so simple and clear that it seems hardly worth our attention. Yet only E. Schweizer's recent commentary and a few other scattered references in the literature seem to take note of it, and so I take courage. In the second cycle Mark uses the device of the boat trip to speak directly to the reader, and he asks, "Do you not yet perceive or understand? Are your hearts hardened? Having eyes do you not see?... Do you not yet understand?" And on reaching shore they meet a blind man and Jesus asks him, "Do you see anything?" (v.23). Then after Jesus has spit on his eyes and laid his hands on him, the man's sight was restored and he "saw everything clearly" (v.25). And the passage ends with Mark's characteristic command to silence which indicates that revelation has taken place: "Do not even enter the village" (v.26). All of which prepares for the moment that immediately follows when Peter at last sees who Jesus is.

The only other section in the second cycle is Jesus' argument with the Pharisees (8:11-13): "The Pharisees came and began to argue with him, seeking from him a sign from heaven." And what is a sign if not something that you see? Notice that Mark has here taken a traditional saying, "No sign shall be given to this generation," which we meet in a slightly different form in Q ("no sign but the sign of Jonah"), and he has built around it an argument with the Pharisees over visible signs. Thus from the revelation in the feeding of the 4000 through the healing of the blind man we have a continuous theme of eyes, sight, and insight: first the revelation, then those who cannot see, next those who do not see, and finally those who can see because Jesus touches them.

What of the first cycle? It closes with the healing of the deaf man who cannot speak correctly (mogilalos). Immediately we are reminded that in the boat discussion in the second cycle Mark linked sight and hearing: "Having eyes do you not see and having ears do you not hear?" (8:18). The man at the end of the second cycle had eyes, but he could not see until Jesus spat and touched

him. The man at the end of the first cycle had ears, but could not hear. When Jesus spat and touched his ears and tongue "his ears were opened, his tongue was released, and he spoke plainly" (7:35). Now comes the expected Markan command to silence: "He charged them to tell no one" (v.36). And the passage ends, "And they were astonished beyond measure (which indicates that revelation has occurred), saying, 'He has done all things well; he even makes the deaf hear and the dumb speak'" (v.37), a reference to Isaiah 35:5-6:

Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened
and the ears of the deaf unstopped
then shall the lame man leap like a hart,
and the tongue of the dumb sing for joy

Notice the association between hearing and speaking. In the healing story in particular the man's speech is distorted because he is deaf. When his ears are opened, he speaks plainly. Hearing and speaking are two sides of the same coin.

As we work our way backwards in the first cycle we come to the Syrophenician woman. Has her story anything to do with hearing? What is notable about this healing narrative is the woman's clever response, "Even the dogs under the table eat the children's crumbs" (7:28). To this Jesus answers, "For this saying (logos) you may go your way; the demon has left your daughter" (v.29). Here is a woman who speaks correctly. She says the right thing, and for this she is rewarded. How can she speak correctly? Mark is careful to let us know that she is not a Jew but a Greek, a Syrophenician by race. Further she has "heard" (akousasa) (v.25) about Jesus. Having heard, she is able to speak.

And what of the preceding section, the argument with the Pharisees over the Law (7:1-23)? Here I find commentators to be very far from what I believe was Mark's intention. Investigating the process by which these traditions were transmitted and pursuing the historical question of Jesus' attitude toward the Law are both fascinating endeavors but they carry us away from the question of Mark's purpose. The passage has three sections: (1) the ceremonial washing of hands before eating, (2) the "Corban" practice, and (3) the saying that defilement results, not from what enters, but from what leaves a man. Is there any unifying theme? I suggest that the theme which binds this chapter together is the theme of hearing God's word and speaking about God correctly:

And he said to them, "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written, 'This people honors me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; in vain do they worship me, teaching as

doctrines the precepts of men' (7:6-7=Isaiah 29:13).

Judaism neither hears what God is saying nor does it speak correctly about him. "Moses said, 'Honor your father and your mother;' . . . but you say. . ." (7:10-11). "The things that come out of a man are what defile him" (v.15).

Mark calls this last saying "a parable" and from 4:10-11 we can see that by "parable" he means a mysterious saying which conceals revelation:

And when he had entered the house, and left the people, his disciples asked him about the parable. And he said to them, "Then are you also without understanding?" (vv.17-18).

We are here back in the atmosphere of the discussion in the boat concerning leaven. The scene is private. The crowd is excluded. The disciples ask a stupid question. Jesus responds, "Do you not yet understand?" It is what comes out of a man that counts. Judaism is deaf to "the commandments of God" and thus from it come nothing but "the traditions of men" (v.8). From the Syrophenetian woman comes a saying which expresses her right hearing concerning Jesus. And the deaf man, when Jesus touches him, is able both to hear and to speak plainly (v.35).

A text-critical note: immediately after Jesus' pronouncement about defilement most manuscripts add as v.16, "If any man has ears to hear, let him hear," a floating saying that also occurs at Mk.4:9 and 4:23. Sinaiticus and Vaticanus omit the verse, however, and so the text is in doubt. Needless to say, redaction critical considerations make its inclusion most appropriate here, but I will not and indeed must not press the point.

The editorial summary of healings (6:53-56) which precedes the argument with the Pharisees does not mention either hearing or seeing but continues the general theme which Mark began as early as 1:28 that Jesus' healings attracted huge crowds. The Galilean people did not understand who Jesus was, Mark is saying, but they knew that he was different and they knew him as a miraculous healer. For this they are healed, in contrast to the Pharisees who seek to dispute and are rejected.

The only remaining episode in the first cycle is the walking on the sea pericope. Here both seeing and hearing are involved. "They all saw him" and cried out in mistaken terror (v.50). Then comes the tremendous pronouncement, "It is I" (ego eimi), which takes us back to the burning bush and the voice heard by Moses "ego eimi ho on" (Exod. 3:14). But although the disciples have ears, they do not hear what Jesus says to them. They do not understand about the loaves and their hearts are hardened.

What I am suggesting is that Mark's intention in presenting his reader with twin cycles of material each stemming from the feeding of a multitude is to show how, on the one hand, Jesus opens the ears of the deaf and, on the other, the eyes of the blind. These two figures for spiritual insight are juxtaposed in the discussion about leaven: "Having eyes do you not see and having ears do you not hear?" (8:18). Here Mark is drawing close to his climax in which Peter sees who Jesus is and says the right thing about him. Thereupon the veil is parted and the disciples as represented by Peter, James, and John see him as he really is, "transfigured before them" (9:2).

Not every smallest item in the first cycle concerns right hearing and speaking, nor are ears excluded from the leaven discussion in the second cycle but on the whole it is true to say that Mark has constructed the first cycle around the theme of hearing and speaking and the second around that of seeing. The cycles have the same functions and the same message: true insight is gained only through Jesus. He is the one who opens the deaf ears and the blind eyes.

Our Old Testament colleagues are wondering what happened to Isaiah's curse -- or perhaps, having seen what I am going to say, they have tiptoed away. You will remember that we have mentioned Isaiah twice already. The joyful proclamation that Jesus "makes the deaf hear and the dumb speak" (7:37) is very probably a reference to Isaiah 35:5-6 and its description of the Kingdom. And Jesus' rejection of official Judaism, "This people honors me with their lips but their heart is far from me" (7:6) is a quotation from the Septuagint of Isaiah 29:13. The Isaiah text, however, which is fundamental to our double cycle is, of course, the one quoted at Mk. 4:12,

They may indeed see but not perceive, and may indeed hear but not understand; lest they should turn again and be forgiven.

Mark has provided his readers with the parable of the sower (4:1-9). Then the disciples, as at 7:17, ask Jesus privately about the meaning of the parables. And Mark has Jesus say, "To you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God, but for those outside everything is in parables (i.e., riddles), so that they may indeed see. . ." (4:10-12). In explanation of the riddle Mark gives an early Christian allegory based on the parable (4:13-20), just as he later gives an early Christian list of vices (cf. Rom. 1:28-31; Gal. 5:19-21) as specification for what comes out of a man (7:20-23).

The material in 4:10-12 between the parable and its explanation is, it seems to me, clearly Markan. It is private discourse. It divides Jesus' hearers into stereotyped in-group and out-group. It expresses the strange idea that Jesus used

parables to conceal his meaning. It speaks of the Kingdom as a hidden mystery. And it quotes the Old Testament. I will not rehearse for you the long history of exegetical attempts to make Mark's quotation of Isaiah 6:9-10 mean the opposite of what the Markan text says. There is no reason to try to project this idea about the function of parables back into the mouth of Jesus, and there is every reason to connect it with Mark himself. Mark is saying that the reason why Judaism failed to understand Jesus and why it was responsible for his death is that Judaism lies under a curse, the curse of Is. 6:9-10. They are doomed to have deaf ears and sightless eyes. Their hearts have been hardened until the Kingdom comes. Then the lame will walk, the deaf will hear, and the blind will see. And, Mark is saying, through Jesus these things are already happening. When Jesus touches you, the spell is broken, the curse is void and we see and hear as if for the first time.

From Isaiah's report of his call in the Temple, therefore, comes the pattern with eyes and ears in poetic parallelism. Mark has adopted this pattern as the basis of his double sequence which presents Jesus as the one who reaches out to give hearing to the believer's ears and sight to his blind eyes.

ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS: ANNUAL MEETING, (1973)

I. PAPERS:

1. John Horman, (Hamilton, Ont.) "Space and Time in the Revelation of John."

Common sense models of space and time are not always adequate for the Book of Revelation. We normally think of time as linear and measurable, irreversible, and extending ad infinitum into the past and future. (Cullman calls this the Biblical view.) Space to us is equally measurable, extending ad infinitum in three dimensions. In this paper some passages in the Revelation will be examined which appear to use the concepts of time and space in a rather different way. Various ways of interpreting these passages will be investigated to see if it is possible to interpret such passages while keeping the common-sense concepts of space and time. If it is not, then it will be necessary to indicate how space and time is to be understood in the Revelation.

2. Martin Kessler (Potsdam, N.Y.): "Rhetorical Criticism in its Methodological Context."

This paper deals with rhetorical criticism as an exegetical method. By means of specific examples, both prose and poetry, an attempt will be made to delineate its scope, and its relationship to other methods in Old Testament scholarship.

3. Robert Osborne (Ottawa, Ont.): "Paul and the Mission to Spain."

According to Romans 15:24 & 28 Paul planned to visit Spain. It is uncertain whether Paul was acquitted and released from custody at Rome c. A.D. 62. The confident tone with which Luke closes his narrative in Acts suggest that he may have been, and references in Phil. 2:23,24, I Clement 5, the Muratorian Canon (lines 38-39) and the Acts of Peter support this viewpoint. On the other hand, II Tim. 4:6; Acts 20:25 and the absence of reliable evidence in Spain itself militate against this hypothesis. A balanced judgment is sought and recent scholarship on the topic is examined.

4. Arthur Patzia (Sioux Falls, S.D.): "The Deutero-Pauline Hypothesis."

This paper will be an investigation into the origin, employment and understanding of the term "deutero-Pauline" in contemporary scholarship. An attempt will be made to categorize the various factors which contribute to the deutero-Pauline hypothesis and to draw out the implications of this concept for Pauline studies, particularly in the areas of chronology and authorship. Considerable attention will be given to the existence of a Pauline school upon the "so-called" deutero-Pauline literature.

5. Benno Przybylski (Hamilton, Ont.): "The Role of Matt.3:13-4:11 in the Structure and Theology of the Gospel of Matthew."

[Student Prize Essay]

6. Charles Scobie (Sackville, N.B.): "Hebrews and Hellenists: The Earliest Theological Division in the Christian Church."

The very early division between Hebrews and Hellenists (Acts 6) is of fundamental importance for the study of Christian origins. It will be argued that the division was not basically a matter of arrangements for food distribution, nor was it on the basis of language; fundamentally it was a question of divergent theological viewpoints. A survey of some developments in recent scholarship casts new light on this theological division and especially on the nature of the Stephen-Philip group, and this in turn suggests a new approach to the study of early Christianity.

7. Phyllis Smyth (Montreal, P.Q.): "Qumran's Two Spirits - 'psychological,' 'metaphysical', or neither?"

This paper is based on an examination of the 173 occurrences of the word אֵלֹהִים in the now-published Hebrew, non-Biblical documents found at Qumran, with particular attention to the identity of the two spirits as mentioned in IQS 3:13-4:26.

The interpretation of this controversial passage set forth by K.G.Kuhn in 1950 was accepted by the majority of scholars: it was said to reflect the cosmic dualism of Iranian religion, the two spirits being the opposing principles of good and evil. In 1963 Wernberg-Møller challenged this position with the hypothesis that the two spirits reflected instead the 'psychological' use of אֵלֹהִים familiar to us from the Old Testament. In attempting to redress the balance of scholarly opinion, he swung the pendulum to the opposite extreme.

Exegetical study reveals all the traditional Hebrew uses of אֵלֹהִים in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with considerable overlapping of categories. The writer suggests that in IQS 3:13-4:26 we have also two developments beyond the known Hebrew usage of the term, both the result of Jewish theology having tempered Persian antithetical thought.

II. PANEL DISCUSSIONS, Working Papers, etc.

1. Donna Runnalls (Montreal): "Modular Instruction in the McGill Faculty of Religious Studies."

At McGill the number of modular courses used throughout the University has been growing rapidly because of the advantages of allowing the student to proceed at his own pace and to choose his own learning mode. For the purposes of these courses a module is defined as "a self-contained, independent unit of a planned series of learning activities designed to help the student accomplish certain well-defined objectives."

The Faculty of Religious Studies decided to develop modular instruction for two reasons:

1. We are being asked to provide a greater range of course offerings for our several degree programs, but have too limited a staff to do so. MI is one way to allow students to work largely on their own.
2. The availability of self-learning modules will free the teaching staff from the need to do 'remedial' or background teaching. As the level a student achieves through self-study can be measured through the built-in evaluation scheme, the teacher will easily know what can be expected following the MI course.

Because the content of a particular unit must be limited, with the learning goals clearly defined, we decided that this year we would introduce three modules on Methods of Biblical Criticism designed for first year students. The three modules are: (1) Literary Criticism, (2) Form Criticism, and (3) Tradition History/Redaction Criticism. Each module is carefully constructed to introduce the student to the theory involved and then to allow him to practise the method.

2. Elizabeth Bieman [Chair] (London, Ont.): "Literature and Revelation"

The topic "Literature and Revelation" provided parameters for a panel discussion by members of the Department of English, University of Western Ontario, before a joint meeting of the CSBS and CSSR. Many members of the Association of Canadian University

Teachers of English attended as well. After brief position papers the panellists engaged in discussion with each other and with the audience.

Constance B. Heatt examined the book of Revelation in the context of its genre, the dream vision, drawing analogies to mediaeval exemplars. Ross Woodman spoke of the interest the poets of the Romantic period took in the matter of prophecy and revelation: most understood themselves as participating in a line of prophecy which begins as far back as the Old Testament and does not end. James Reaney introduced a latter-day prophet, David Wilson, who founded a nineteenth century sect in Ontario, an offshoot of Quakerism, and built an architectural "Bible" in his Sharon Temple. Margaret Avison also concerned herself with the role of the prophet as she examined the book of Ezekiel.

Prophecy (and that ancient problem of distinguishing between the true and the false) provided a recurring focus in the discussion. Something like a consensus among the literary academics emerged: prophecy did not end when the canon was closed, and poets may indeed have reason to see themselves in a prophetic role. But the two poets on the panel (Reaney and Avison) denied vigorously that they, personally, regard themselves in such a light.

Awareness emerged, both during the discussion period proper and in informal encounters thereafter, that there is something of a language gap between members of departments of literature and departments of Biblical studies and religious knowledge. A significant number thought it worth exploring at some future meeting.

3. Sean McEvenue [Chair] (Montreal): "Method in Biblical Studies."

The Old Testament group met for an hour and a half on Saturday, June 2nd, to discuss "Method in Biblical Studies." The chairman, Sean McEvenue, had written a position paper, which was distributed prior to the discussion, along with two papers written in answer to it by Robert Culley and Robert Polzin.

The discussion itself centred largely on the argument presented by Professor Polzin for a structuralist analysis of the book of Job. He began by showing, in a reductio ad absurdum, that source criticism of this book left us with very few "authentic" verses -- not enough to merit a great deal of interest. He then presented an analysis based on the alternating polarity of the argument from experience and the argument from traditional doctrine. Martin Kessler participated enthusiastically in the attack on source criticism. Other participants seemed to support the trend, but expressed reservations about various aspects. The session provided a lively conclusion to the congress.

4. Robert Culley (Montreal, P.Q.): Report on Planning Sessions.

On Friday morning, planning sessions were held for the Old and New Testament sections. After meeting separately, the two groups joined for a brief discussion of matters of common interest.

From the O.T. section came these comments among others.

- try more often to have papers distributed in advance to insure better discussion.
- interdisciplinary sessions a good idea, but try to make sure that a genuine dialogue takes place in future attempts.
- experiment with a session on a review of recent books.
- give some time to a consideration of professional questions such as teaching methods or systems of evaluation.
- when planning meetings, it should be remembered that we are all generalists who need continuing education in many areas and most are doing some research and need the opportunity to try out new ideas.

From the N.T. section came these comments.

- develop a regular method (e.g., through Bulletin) of reporting research in progress.
- try a session on teaching of elementary N.T. Greek.
- a session on computers at Toronto.
- a session on the contents of an introductory Bible course.

The joint session discussed matters like the time of the meetings, overlap with other societies, and format of the meetings. In general, the suggestion was to follow the pattern of the Kingston meetings.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY

The 41st annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies/Société canadienne des études bibliques was held concurrently with the 34th annual meetings of the Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature, May 31st to June 2nd, at Queen's University, Kingston, as part of the 1973 Learned Societies Conference. Joint sessions were held of the Canadian Theological Society and the Canadian Society for the Study of Religion, which were meeting at the same time. The Canadian Society of Church History was meeting during this period also.

The business meeting was opened by the President, John C. Hurd, at 4 p.m., on Friday, June 1st.

The minutes of the annual meeting of 1972 were adopted.

The following members have sent their regrets at not being able to attend: J.D.F. Anido, Carl E. Amerding, T. Bailey, Edgar M. Baird, James R. Brown, J. Edgar Bruns, E. Combs, Michael Coogan, Guy Couturier, P.C. Craigie, Jean-Louis D'Aragon, Wesley Ellis, J.T. Forestell, S. David Garber, Malcolm J.A. Horsnell, Robert W. Huebsch, Johannes A. Huntjens, S. Jellicoe, George Johnston, W. Morrison Kelly, Charles Kiker, H. W. Lang, W.S. McCullough, Harold A. Merklinger, G. E. Moffatt, M. T. Newby, R. Gordon Nodwell, W. C. Paisley, G. H. Parke-Taylor, Norman A. Perry, Albert Pietersma, W. Harold Reid, Pater Richardson, Eduard R. Riegert, Wolfgang M. W. Roth, Eric Segelberg, W. Wayne Soble, R. F. G. Sweet, Norman J. Threinen, C. Van Dam, Don Warne, R. J. Williams, Stephen G. Wilson, Fred V. Winnett, Roland E. Wolfe, Blake G. M. Wood.

C. H. H. Scobie and T. Lutz were appointed as auditors.

A report of the Secretary had been distributed to the members attending but most of the items mentioned were to appear on the agenda. The Secretary reported that, as of the time of the meeting, 77 replies had been received regarding attendance at these meetings. Of those replying, 71 paid dues to CSBS/SCEB and that this then was the present membership figure (compare 105 members in September, 1972). Of those replying, 36 had said that they would be coming to the meetings. At last count, the membership of the Canadian Section stood at 131. About 41 persons are members of both CSBS/SCEB and the Canadian Section.

The Secretary also reported that CSBS/SCEB had been awarded a travel grant from the Canada Council through the Humanities Research Council of Canada for an amount of \$1274. This was handled by Peter Richardson who had kindly agreed to assist in this matter. About fifteen persons received grants and most of the money has been allocated. The Secretary reminded the meeting that Canada Council travel grants are calculated by using a number of factors, one of which is the number of paid-up members in CSBS/SCEB.

The auditors reported that the books of the society were in good order and the Secretary-Treasurer gave a brief summary of the financial year June 1972 to May 1973. The following contains the main items and the figures only.

<u>Income</u>		<u>Expenses</u>	
Balance	\$ 805.02	Canada Council (72)	\$ 501.00
Dues, 72	26.00	Exec. Travel	119.05
Dues, 73	523.51	Bulletin	135.54
From SBL	74.00	Mailings	50.59
Canada Council (Travel)	1274.00	Corporation dues	36.00
	\$ 2696.78		\$ 995.25
Balance: May 28, 1973	\$ 1701.53		
(Incoming from SBL	95.00		
Outstanding expense - portion of dues for SR subscriptions		\$ 280.00)	

With regard to the Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature, it was reported that for the first time the programme of these meetings was published in the April issue of the Bulletin of the Council on the Study of Religion. This meant preparing the programme earlier than usual and sending out the first notice with the Bulletin of CSBS/SCEB in November.

It was reported that the Bulletin of CSBS/SCEB had again been prepared and produced by Peter Craigie who has offered to undertake this task for another year.

Walter Principe of the Corporation for the Academic Studies in Religion forwarded to the Secretary a copy of a letter from John Gates of the Canada Council regarding the policy for the support of learned journals. The letter contained a summary of that policy and invited response from learned societies in the field of religion. Since it was not possible to have an adequate discussion in the business meeting, the executive was asked to make an appropriate response.

The members were reminded that we are members of the Corporation for the Publication of Academic Studies in Religion and nominate six of our members each year to be members of the Corporation. CSBS/SCEB pays six dollars each, or \$36.00 in membership fees. The Corporation publishes the journal Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses (SR) which now comes to every member of CSBS/SCEB. This is paid for at a reduced subscription rate in the \$8.00 annual dues. The Secretary of CSBS/SCEB is a director of the Corporation and a member of the Publications Committee. A reprint of articles from the Canadian Journal of Theology in the form of one or two volumes on biblical studies is under discussion.

It was also reported that CSBS/SCEB is in regular communication with the Humanities Research Council of Canada because they are involved in arranging for the annual meetings of the Learned Societies and for assigning and disbursing travel funds from the Canada Council. The Society has been considering our relationship to HRCC for the past few years and last year approved action to join if this should appear necessary. The situation appears to be that the HRCC cannot continue to expand by adding individual societies but may consider some sort of representation by fields. In order to be fully engaged in such a process, it was duly moved, seconded and carried that the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies/Société canadienne des études bibliques apply to the Humanities Research Council of Canada.

It was duly moved, seconded, and passed that CSBS/SCEB would heartily approve of Walter Principe as an appropriate representative in the field of religion on HRCC.

It was duly moved, seconded and passed that the present arrangement of meeting with the other societies within the Learned Societies remain the same.

It was duly moved, seconded, and passed that the executive appoint a committee on Research and Publication to investigate what, if anything, CSBS/SCEB should do in these areas and that the committee should report to the next annual meeting.

The nominating committee report was presented and the following were elected:

1. Executive 1973-74

President:

C. H. Parker,
Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.

Vice-President:

Andre Legault, Vice-Doyen de la Faculte de Theologie
Universite de Montreal, Montreal 101, Quebec.

Secretary-Treasurer:

Robert C. Culley, Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University, Montreal 101, Quebec.

Members-at-large:

James R. Brown, Warden and Vice-Chancellor
St. John's College, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Guy P. Couturier,
Universite de Montreal, Montreal 101, Quebec.

David Schroeder, Canadian Mennonite Bible College
600 Shaftesbury Blvd. Winnipeg, Manitoba.

2. Six members nominated by the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies/Société canadienne des études bibliques to the Corporation for the Publication of Academic Studies in Religion in Canada/La corporation pour la publication des études académiques en religion au Canada:

C. H. H. Scobie, Department of Religious Studies
Mount Allison University, Sackville, N.B.

Adrien M. Brunet, 2715 Cote Ste-Catherine,
Montreal 26, Quebec.

Joseph P. Cahill, Department of Religious Studies,
University of Alberta, Edmonton 7, Alberta.

John C. Hurd, Trinity College,
Toronto 5, Ontario.

Norman E. Wagner, Director of Graduate Studies and Research,
Waterloo Lutheran University, Waterloo, Ontario.

* Robert C. Culley, Faculty of Religious Studies,
McGill University, Montreal 110, Quebec.

*(Designated as a Director)

3. Nominating Committee: (To prepare nominations for 1974-75)

George Taylor, Dean, Faculty of Theology,
University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Vernon Fawcett,
Emmanuel College, Toronto, Ontario.

Francois Rousseau
Universite du Quebec, Montreal, Quebec.

The Secretary reported that it might be useful to elect a treasurer at the next annual meeting in order to divide the work among more persons. In preparation for this possibility the Secretary suggested that Peter Richardson should assist the Secretary in working out a suggested division of work between the offices of secretary and treasurer. It was agreed that the Secretary had power to act along these lines.

It was agreed that the local representative for CSBS/SCEB for the annual meetings in Toronto in 1974 should be Vernon Fawcett.

The following were received as members of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies/Société canadienne des études bibliques:

Elizabeth Bieman, London, Ontario
 Benjamin J. Hubbard, Waterloo, Ontario
 D. Leadlay, Hamilton, Ontario
 Alex R. G. Deasley, Winnipeg, Manitoba
 Wilhelmine de Philippe, Hamilton, Ontario
 S. David Garber, Hawkesville, Ontario
 A. Roxburgh, Scarborough, Ontario
 Philip Shuler, Hamilton, Ontario
 Robert Huebsch, St. Catharines, Ontario
 Kenneth J. Neumann, Toronto, Ontario
 Benno Przybylski, Hamilton, Ontario
 Robert Polzin, Ottawa, Ontario
 John Horman, Hamilton, Ontario
 Bilhah Wardy, Montreal, Quebec
 Eileen Schuller, Edmonton, Alberta
 Clive H. Cardinal, Calgary, Alberta.

The prize for \$25.00 for an essay by a graduate student was awarded to Benno Przybylski, McMaster University. The essay was read as a paper in the New Testament section of the programme.

It was reported that Peter Richardson had prepared a draft of a new constitution for the consideration of the membership. It was agreed that a French language version of this be prepared and both versions be sent out in a mailing before the next annual meeting at which time consideration could be given to these documents.

It was unanimously agreed that letters of thanks should be sent to the Humanities Research Council and Queen's University for all the work devoted to the present meetings.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert C. Culley,
 Secretary.