

BULLETIN

No. 13

November 1948

C O N T E N T S

1. Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Society, held in Trinity College, Toronto, on May 11th and 12th, 1948.
2. The Presidential Address delivered by Professor W. S. McCullough  
"Roman Policy towards the Jews from 63 B.C. to 135 A.D."
3. A Synopsis of a paper read before the Society by Professor R.B.Y. Scott.  
"Embryonic Prophetic Oracles"

This Bulletin is published annually by the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies. The address of the Secretary-Treasurer is 258 Donlea Dr., Toronto, Canada.

BULLETIN NO. 13

1. Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies.

The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies was held concurrently with the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in Trinity College, Toronto on the evening of May 11th and the morning and early afternoon of May 12th, 1948.

First Session, Tuesday evening, May 11th

The meeting was opened with prayer by Professor Andrews. Nineteen members were present and two visitors. Professor W. S. McCullough, president, occupied the chair. On the motion of the secretary, duly seconded and carried, the publication of the proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting on May 13 and 14, 1947, as found in the Twelfth Annual Bulletin of the Society were taken as the reading of the minutes of the last Annual Meeting.

Letters from Rev. G. H. Dowker and Canon Hiltz were read expressing regrets at inability to attend and letters of resignation from Principal Ferguson and Professor Cousland and Miss Rutherford.

The Secretary-Treasurer reported:

(a) that the membership of the Society numbers seventy, of whom forty-eight paid the fee for the current year.

(b) that eighty five copies of the Bulletin were published in October, 1947.

(c) that there was a credit balance of \$33.92 in the treasury with all accounts paid.

Other official business included:

(a) The appointing of Professor Park-Taylor to audit the Treasurer's accounts.

(b) The appointing of a nominating committee; Professors M.T. Newby, F. Beare, and R. B. Y. Scott.

(c) Announcements concerning:

(i) the Annual Fee

(ii) The Travel Pool into which each attending member is expected to contribute fifty cents.

(iii) The titles of papers to be read on Wednesday.

Professor W. S. McCullough of University College delivered the Annual Presidential Address on "Roman Policy towards the Jews from 63 B.C. to 135 A.D." A summary of this address is included in the bulletin.

The Secretary on behalf of Trinity College extended a welcome to the members of the Society. Refreshments were served and the meeting adjourned to re-assemble on Wednesday.

Second Session, Wednesday morning, May 12th

Professor Beare reported for the Nominating Committee, naming the following persons as its nominees:

President C.S.B.S. - The Very Rev. K. C. Evans

President Can. Section of S.B.L. - Rabbi H. A. Fischel

Vice President - The Rev. J. G. Berry

Secretary-Treasurer - The Rev. G. H. Johnson

Other members of the Executive - Professors D. K. Andrews,

B. W. Horan and The Rev. F. J. Jackson.

It was recommended, further, that no election be made this year to the office of Honorary President. There being no further nominations from the floor the Committee's report was adopted by the Society and those so nominated were duly elected.

Professor Park-Taylor reported that the Treasurer's accounts had been examined and found to be correct.

Mr. R. B. MacDonald of Trinity College was elected to membership in the Society.

Discussion arose concerning the time of year when the Annual Meeting of the Society should be held. Three possibilities were suggested, September, later in May, early in May as is now the case. An expression of opinion was asked and slight favour was shown for a date late in May. The incoming executive was asked to bear the matter in mind.

Professor Winnett moved and Professor Meek seconded that on behalf of the Canadian Section of S.B.L. the Secretary write the Secretary of the parent society to ask whether the Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis could be offered to students for the reduced rate of three dollars per year. Carried.

The following papers were read:

Professor R. B. Y. Scott - Embryonic Prophetic Oracles

Professor W. E. Staples - Isaiah 53: 8

Principal W. R. Taylor - The Purpose and Construction of Psalms  
9 and 10

Mr. R. B. MacDonald - The Berber Calendar and Agricultural Rites

Professor F. V. Winnett - The Site of Bethel

Professor F. Beare - The Origins of the Ministry in the New  
Testament.

Third Session, Wednesday afternoon, May 12th

The members of the Society assembled for luncheon in Hart House. After luncheon the meeting continued, the final paper being:

Rabbi Fischel - A Re-evaluation of the Maccabean sources

The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.

Roman Policy Towards The Jews From 63 B.C. to 135 A.D.

Professor W. S. McCullough

A. 63 B.C. to 70 A.D.

1. Rome's General Policy Towards The Jews, With Particular Reference To Those Living In Italy.

We do not know when the Romans first became acquainted with Jews. There is one reference to Jews in Rome as early as 139 B.C., and we conclude from one of Cicero's orations (Flaccus) that in 59 B.C. there were enough Jews in the capital to carry weight in public meetings. While we know nothing about the origin of these Roman Jews, it is probable that they came to the city either for commercial reasons or to get away from the civil strife that vexed Judaea in the first part of the first century B.C. Apparently these first Jewish arrivals in Italy were religiously-minded, and as their religious observances were harmless enough, they appear at an early date to have gained toleration for their traditional religion.

The Jewish population of Rome seems to have increased in the first century B.C., especially after Pompey's conquest of Judaea in 63 B.C. There is no evidence that Pompey himself brought large numbers of Jewish prisoners to Italy, but in the following years the various rebellions in Judaea that the Romans had to deal with must have resulted in some Jewish captives being sent off to Rome. The size of the Roman community of Jews at the opening of the Christian era can only be conjectured. On the basis of a statement made by Josephus, it is estimated that in 4 B.C. the total number of free Jews in the capital must have been about 20,000.

Both Julius Caesar and Augustus are said by Josephus to have protected the Jewish religion; they thus confirmed the earlier practice. Jews were

permitted to assemble, to collect money for religious purposes, to hold common meals, and to be freed from a juridical process on the sabbath day. One result of this toleration of the rites of Judaism was that the synagogues both in Italy and elsewhere were very successful at proselytism. Converts were won among the free as well as among the servile classes.

The sources record expulsions of Jews from Rome in 19 A.D. in the reign of Tiberius, and again in 49 A.D. in the reign of Claudius. For various reasons, too detailed to be recorded here, it seems unlikely that these expulsions involved all the Jews of either Rome or Italy. Probably only a limited number of foreign Jews (peregrini) were involved; in the case of the troubles of 49 A.D., the preaching of the Nazarene missionaries may have been the prime factor in the disturbances which led to the expulsion referred to in Acts 18: 2. The general toleration hitherto extended to the Jews and their religion was not diminished by these local and temporary developments.

II. Rome's Policy Towards The Jews Of Judaea.

The circumstances under which the Romans gained control of Judaea in 63 B.C. do not here concern us. The fact is that in this year Pompey added Judaea to the Roman province of Syria and brought Jewish political independence to an end. But Pompey was not unaware of the semi-religious character of the Jewish state, and he was apparently prepared to tolerate the continuance of a measure of the traditional Jewish theocracy. The head of the Jewish community was to be the high priest (in Pompey's time he was Hyrcanus II), and the Jewish high court, the Sanhedrin, over which the high priest presided, was to have charge of the internal affairs of Judaea. As time went on, the Romans tried various methods of administering Judaea, but none of them proved to be entirely successful. The chief obstacle with which Rome had to contend was a persistent Jewish nationalism. This

nationalism refused to accept any form of Roman rule, whether mediated by high priest, king, or procurator, and the eventual result of this was the rebellion of 66-70 A.D.

The Jewish war which broke out in 66 A.D. was brought about by Jewish extremists, though it must be admitted that the ineptitude of some of the procurators who held office between 44 and 66 A.D. was a contributory factor. The Romans, however, and particularly Vespasian and Titus, were evidently persuaded that the last vestiges of the Jewish theocratic state should now disappear. The temple, destroyed in the summer of 70 A.D., was not to be rebuilt, and a Jewish high priest was therefore no longer necessary. The Sanhedrin was to cease to function in Israel's life. Judaea now became a separate province in the Roman world with a legate of its own and with a legionary camp at Jerusalem. Otherwise, the Jews in Palestine were left to themselves, and the exercise of their religion (except that part of it connected with the temple) was not interfered with.

### III. Roman Policy Towards The Jews In Certain Provincial Areas.

The story of Rome's penetration of the eastern Mediterranean is well known. It must suffice here to note that it was in 167 B.C. that Macedonia came under Roman control, and that in 30 B.C., when Egypt was acquired, Rome completed her conquest of the Hellenistic East. One of the most characteristic features of this Hellenistic world was its urban development. The cities were the vital centres of the cultural life of the Near East.

It was in the cities of the Hellenistic world (we are not here considering Judaea) that the Romans found vigorous Jewish communities. These urban Jews had managed to gain from their Hellenistic overlords toleration for their religious customs. In some of the larger centres the Jews

formed a more or less self-contained community within the larger Gentile population, with an organization of their own, a kind of ghetto without the unpleasant modern associations of that term. This was true of the Jews in Alexandria and Antioch, and probably of other cities as well.

It was Rome's policy to accept the position of the Jews in the Hellenistic world as a fait accompli. The Romans do not appear to have extended Jewish rights, but they did concede such privileges as were already well established. Speaking generally, these rights were similar to those which Jews had in Italy. They could erect synagogues, collect and send to Jerusalem the annual temple money, and were to be free to observe their Sabbath regulations. In addition, in certain cities, notably in Alexandria and Antioch, the Jews had a limited measure of self-government especially in juridical affairs, and in Roman Asia, principally in Ephesus, such Jews as were Roman citizens (these can hardly have been very numerous) had exemption from military service. The origin of this latter exemption is difficult to explain; it may have been first gained in the Hellenistic period. In any case these special rights which certain Jewish communities enjoyed can hardly have commended the Jews to their Gentile neighbours; they throw considerable light on the anti-Jewish outbreaks which took place in Egypt and Syria in the first century A.D.

### B. 70 A.D. to 135 A.D.

It was in 70 A.D. that Vespasian made one change of the greatest importance in Rome's treatment of the Jews. After Titus took Jerusalem and razed it to the ground, Vespasian imposed upon all Jews, wherever resident and irrespective of their civic status, an annual tribute of two denarii, to be forwarded to Rome for the worship of Capitoline Jupiter. This tax, the fiscus Judaicus was to replace the temple tribute, hitherto

sent annually to Jerusalem by all faithful Jews. This tax, a biting parody upon its predecessor, probably reflected the emperor's impatience with Jewish nationalism; it was doubtless intended to be a constant reminder to those who paid it that the Roman state was supreme. As no other group within the Empire paid such a tax, the distinction was invidious. Israel became in a new sense a peculiar people, and so we note the beginning of a deterioration in the social status of Judaism. This imposition of a special toll on Jews was undoubtedly a factor, particularly in the second century A.D. in reducing the numbers of Gentile converts to Judaism, though it may be doubted whether Vespasian had this in mind when he instituted the tax.

It is significant that despite the trouble which the Romans had with the Jews in the Near East in this period, there was no further diminution in the religious rights of Judaism. The first of these suicidal conflicts took place in 115-116 A.D. and was confined to the Jews of Cyprus, Cyrenaica, and Egypt. The second was a rebellion of the Jews of Judaea in 132 A.D., and it was serious enough to last until 135 A.D. Both of these uprisings were sanguinary affairs, but neither resulted in any permanent alteration in the legal status of the Jewish religion within the Roman world. Their chief legacy was an increase in anti-Jewish feeling among the peoples of the Roman East.

#### Embryonic Prophetic Oracles

Professor R. B. Y. Scott

Most of the prophetic oracles as they have come down to us are careful literary compositions, often of high artistic quality and considerable length. These compositions belong to one of four types - The Reproach

the Threat, the Promise and the Exhortation - which have recognizable structure and content. Though they are prefaced by "Thus saith Yahweh" it is pretty clear that it is the content rather than the finished form for which Divine authority is claimed.

It is equally clear that most of the prophets received the impulse to speak in some form or other of religious ecstasy, in which a Word of Yahweh emerged in their consciousness and demanded utterance. This experience was not necessarily repeated as the condition of all subsequent oracles, for one ecstatic impulse, or a series of them, might and apparently did give rise to subsequent prophetic addresses, which at the time of their composition were the formulation of the prophet's reflection upon his experience and moral convictions. But Isaiah's report (8:11) of the occasion when Yahweh spoke to him as if laying a strong hand upon him, and Jeremiah's testimony (20:9) that the Word burned like a fire within him, and many other instances, point to a primary ecstatic impulse to speak. Eissfeldt (Einleitung, p. 83) says that even among those who had long outgrown the more violent forms of ecstasy, it is still quite clear that their utterances ultimately stemmed from the moment of Divine possession of which Amos says: "Yahweh has spoken; who can but prophesy?" (3:8). "That which we have as vision narratives" Eissfeldt goes on, "has been told and written down by the prophet after the vision, and the oracles which in content are an expansion of the communication received in the ecstatic moment, are formulated by the prophet after this moment". But Eissfeldt denies that we can trace the connection between the finished literary oracle and the idea content of the ecstatic moment.

I wonder if this is so. Consider some examples of brief enigmatic oracles which are also expanded into a form where their meaning is plain not only to the prophet but to his hearers. l<sup>a</sup>maḥēr shālāl hāsh baz of

Isa. 8:1 and 3 is one such. Dillmann says that this is a striking phrase or key-word, mysterious and ambiguous, which is only the quintessence of the oracle in v. 4. Buchanan Gray says that "Isaiah crystalized his teaching into the phrase". Ehrlich says "It seems that the prophets on extraordinary occasions published the theme of their discourse succinctly in advance", and that here Isaiah is announcing that his next address will be on the subject mahēr shāllāl hāsh baz (quite like a church noticeboard!)

I suggest that this rhythmic sentence, with its gutturals and sibilants, is not a summary of the oracle, condensed in an inscription on a child's name, but its primary form, retaining the imprint of the emotional ecstatic state in which it first burned itself into the prophet's mind. How else could he receive the idea-content which later is expanded into the literary oracle, except in some word or phrase articulating the idea, however enigmatic it might be? A word was always a mysterious and powerful thing to the Hebrews, partaking of the spirit-power of the person uttering it. And under strong religious emotion what comes into the mind is often a word or phrase articulating the conviction with which is associated the emotion. Sometimes it is suggested by a similar sounding word which by chance comes into consciousness, as the sight of the shāqēd suggested to Jeremiah that Yahweh was shōqēd.

Shāqēd - shōqēd is an embryonic oracle like mahēr shāllāl hāsh baz. In both cases the ambiguous words become the text of a developed oracle or narrative. And there are a number of others which may be pointed out. The famous shēār yāshūb of Isa. 7 is one, -brief, pregnant and remarkably ambiguous, so much so that in 10: 20,21 and 10: 22,23 are two oracles which expand it in opposite senses. The qayiq - qēç of Am. 2:8 is another example of what might be called a "primary oracle of assonance", and the çēdāqā - çēāqā of Isa. 5:7 is still another.

A second series of these brief, pregnant utterances is found in the names given in the first instance to children, the two of Isaiah already mentioned, and Hosea's Yizrēl, lō' ruḥāmā and lō' ammī. In each case the name is explained in an oracle, but it is an explanation and expansion of meaning clearly present already in the name as perceived by the prophet's mind. Perhaps Isaiah's own name, which like that of his children was to be a sign and a wonder in Israel, also came to him in the moment of prophetic ecstasy. So the name immanū'ēl in Isa. 7:14 is a "sign". Again, the name given by Jeremiah (20:3) to Pashūr who put him in the stocks, māgōr miṣṣābīb, is an enigmatic oracle which becomes the text of a denunciation following.

In all the examples given so far, except one, the primary or embryonic oracle now stands out as distinct from its expanded literary form. The one exception, the çēdāqā - çēāqā of Isa. 5:7, suggests that we may look for the primary oracle to be preserved sometimes as the text or conclusion of the literary oracle. The lō' ta'amīnū - lō' tē'amēnū of Isa. 7:9 is an oracular conclusion. bēshūbā tiwāshē'ūn in 30:15 has a kind of inverted assonance, emphatic gutturals and sibilants, and serves as a text for what follows. Other possible examples taken only from I Isaiah are raḥ'çū hizakkū of 1:16; sārayik çōr'rīm of 1:23; mēsīr mīrūshālayim mash'en of 3:1; ma'as mēsūs of 8:6; another example of inverted assonance in 9:17 - ba'arā kā'ēsh rish'ā; in 29:2 arī'el anīyyā; in 30:1 asōth 'ēçā...çephōth haṭṭā'th; in 31:1 yishshā'nū...w'lō' shā'ū; in 31:2 hū' hākām...w'qām.

All these examples have the same general characteristics; - they are striking but enigmatic phrases or word-pairs, marked by strong rhythm, verbal symmetry, paronomasia, assonance and a preponderance of sibilant and guttural sounds. All contain the quintessence of longer literary oracles. Is it not altogether probable that they are the prophets' first and immediate articulation in consciousness, of the Word which Yahweh was putting in their mouth?