

Contents

I. Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Society, held in Wycliffe College, Toronto, on May 10 and 11, 1943.

II. Texts of four of the papers read before the Society:

History in the Fourth Gospel.
S. MacLean Gilmour

A Glance Once More at Some Problems of the Epistle of the Hebrews.
Sir Robert Falconer

The Unjust Steward.
B. W. Horan

The Development of Hebrew Wisdom Literature.
R. F. Schnell

This Bulletin is published annually by the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies. The office of the secretary-treasurer is Room 42 H, University College, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada..

I. Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies

The eleventh annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies was held in the reading-room of Wycliffe College, Toronto, on May 10 and 11, 1943. The meeting was held concurrently with the fifth annual meeting of the Canadian Section of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

First Session, Monday evening, May 10

The president, Professor N.H.Parker, was in the chair. There were seventeen members and four visitors present. The session was opened with prayer by Professor B.W.Horan. It was then agreed that the summary of the proceedings of the tenth annual meeting of the Society, as published in the seventh annual Bulletin of the Society (January 1943) be accepted as the reading of the minutes of the last annual meeting.

The report of the secretary-treasurer:

(a) Regrets for absence were presented from Provost J.H.Cosgrave, Chancellor W.T.Brown, Principal W.A.Ferguson, Rev. George C.Pidgeon, Rev. Canon R.A.Hiltz, Professor F.D.Coggan, Professor W.E.Staples, Professor H.L.MacNeill, Professor R.S.McCracken, and Professor R.B.Y.Scott.

(b) Membership. On May 11, 1942, the membership of the Society was reported as being 73. With two new members (Principal W.A.Ferguson and Rev.J.W.W.Wilkinson), one removal through death (Rabbi A.Feldman), and six members removed from the roll for being three years in arrears with fees, the present membership stands at 68.

(c) Annual Bulletin. 94 copies of the seventh Annual Bulletin (mimeographed) were published in January 1943, at a total cost (exclusive of postage) of \$12.00.

(d) The treasury. The Society began the present year with a credit balance of \$49.81. The credit balance, as of May 10, 1943, is \$37.92, with all accounts paid. Professors Dillistone and Dow were appointed to audit the treasurer's statement.

(e) Accommodation for out-of-town members. Although bed and breakfast accommodation had been offered to out-of-town members this year, there was almost no demand for it. The one and only request was readily taken care of.

Nominations to membership. The following persons were nominated to membership in the Society, and subsequently elected:

Professor B.W.Horan
 Rev.Thomas B.McDormand (who sent regrets that he was unable to be present)
 Rev.R.F.Schnell
 Rev.R.J.Williams

Officers for the year 1943-1944. After some discussion, it was moved and carried that the same executive should hold office for another year (for names, see Seventh Annual Bulletin, page 2).

Programme for Tuesday, May 11. The titles of papers to be read were announced. The secretary informed the meeting that, owing to present conditions, it had been impossible to arrange a luncheon on the campus for Tuesday noon.

Welcome from Wycliffe College. Professor F.W.Dillistone extended to both Societies a warm welcome to Wycliffe College.

Presidential address. The president, Professor N.H.Parker, had indicated some months ago that owing to ill-health he would be unable to prepare the annual presidential address, and he had prevailed upon the vice-president, Professor S.MacLean Gilmour, to take his place. Professor Gilmour now proceeded to give his lecture, the subject of which was "History in the Fourth Gospel". After the discussion which followed, the societies retired to the refectory where, through the generosity of Wycliffe College, they enjoyed some light refreshments.

Second Session, Tuesday morning, May 11

Professor Gilmour was in the chair.

The Society proceeded to consider the following papers:
 By Professor K.C.Evans: The Fourth Gospel and the Messianic Secret
 By Sir Robert Falconer: A Glance once more at some Problems of the Epistle to the Hebrews
 By Professor W.R.Taylor: Mistranslations of the Old Testament in the New Testament

Business period.

Professor Dillistone reported for the auditors that he had found the treasurer's financial statement in good order.

Travel pool. While it was understood that the travel pool would operate as in previous years, the secretary asked for guidance in two particular points, and the meeting therefore instructed him (a) that a person must be a member of the Society of at least one year's standing before he can share in the travel pool, and (b) that any one participating in the travel pool is expected to be in attendance at all the sessions of the annual meeting.

Annual Bulletin. The executive was authorized, in view of the healthy state of the Society's finances, to increase the size of the Annual Bulletin.

Time of the next annual meeting. As many members did not seem to find a meeting in May convenient, after some discussion it was decided to experiment with another season of the year. The executive was therefore authorized to plan the next annual meeting for the week commencing December 26, 1943.

The secretary was instructed to write a letter of thanks to Principal R.Armitage of Wycliffe College for the use of the College for the annual meeting, and to Professor H.L.MacNeill, wishing him a speedy recovery from his recent accident.

The business of the session being concluded, the Society resumed the consideration of papers:
 By Professor B.W.Horan: The Parable of the Unjust Steward

The Society then adjourned for luncheon.

Third Session, Tuesday afternoon, May 11

Professor Gilmour was in the chair. This concluding session was given over to the following papers:
 By Rev.R.F.Schnell: The Development of the Hebrew Wisdom Literature
 By Professor W.S.McCullough: Prophecy and Apocalypse in the Old Testament
 By Rev.R.J.Williams: Zar'a Yâ' qôb, an Ethiopic Christian Rationalist of the Seventeenth Century
 By Professor F.V.Winnett: Priests and Levites.

The following members of the Society were present at one or more of the above sessions:

Beare	Harris	Orton
Davidson	Horan	Parker
Dillistone	McCullough	Rutherford
Dow	McLennan, D.A.	Schnell
Evans	McLeod	Shortt
Falconer	Meek	Taylor
Gilmour, S.M.	Newby	Williams
		Winnett

II. Texts of four of the papers read before the Society

S. MacLean Gilmour: HISTORY IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

In the Fourth Century Eusebius quoted Clement of Alexandria's opinion, from his lost *Hypotyposesis*, to the effect that "John, ... conscious that the outward facts had been set forth in the Gospels, was urged on by his disciples and, divinely moved by the Spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel." Since early in the Nineteenth Century this contrast between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, implied in the Clementine quotation, has made it commonplace to assume that the latter, in the main, is doctrinal rather than historical, an interpretation rather than a presentation of the historical Jesus. We go to the Synoptic records to reconstruct a picture of the Jesus of history. The Gospel of John is a portrait of the Christ of faith as he was presented to the Church towards the end of the First Century by a theologian for whom he was the divine *Logos* manifested in the flesh.

This popular assumption that the Synoptics give us history and John gives us interpretation has recently been challenged from two directions. On the one hand, Form-Criticism has been demonstrating that there is far more of the Christ of faith in the Synoptic representation than had formerly been acknowledged. On the other hand, there has been an increasing number of students of the Gospel of John who have been arguing for the likelihood that the narrative in John is much more historical than had popularly been assumed. In most instances this latter point-of-view has limited itself to the citation of specific passages where preference for John over the Synoptics can reasonably be maintained, but a few interpreters have boldly discarded the Synoptic framework in favour of the Johannine and have deliberately harmonized the former to the latter. A striking example of this method of procedure is A.T. Olmstead's "Jesus in the Light of History" (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942).

The basic assumption of Olmstead's study of the life of Jesus is that the narrative framework of the Gospel of John is really the memoirs of the younger son of Zebedee, which were written in Aramaic shortly after the crucifixion. Some unknown editor later translated them into Greek and added long theological discourses to form our present Gospel. The original Johannine narrative is our earliest and most historical account of Jesus' life, and Olmstead follows it almost throughout, fitting those incidents from the Synoptic tradition which he regards as authentic into the Johannine framework. The correlation of the Synoptic tradition with the Johannine is carried out, to use Olmstead's own words, "by the painstaking jig-saw puzzle method".

It is regrettable that Olmstead has not included in this book any ordered statement of the reasons for differentiating between the narrative and the discourse sections of John. Many attempts have been made in the past to distinguish between a Johannine *Grundskrift* and later enlargements, but with results so dissimilar and even contradictory that they led W.F. Howard in 1931 to remark that "every fresh attempt to show by what different hands the various parts of the Gospel were written adds to the inherent improbability that any solution will be found along those lines." My own survey of source theories in the writings of Spitta, Wendt, Wellhausen, Stanton and others inclines me to agree with Streeter's dictum: "If the sources have undergone anything like the amount of amplification, excision, rearrangement and adaptation which the theory postulates, then the critic's pretence that he can unravel the process is grotesque. As well hope to start with a string of sausages and reconstruct the pig." It is significant, too, that Dr R.H. Strachan, in the preface to his recent book (*The Fourth Gospel*, 1941), admits: "I have found it necessary to join the ranks of those who are convinced that the Gospel is essentially a literary unity, and have withdrawn my previous attempt to isolate certain portions as editorial revisions or insertions."

Lacking evidence that would convince us of the truth of Olmstead's fundamental postulate, we are driven to a more piecemeal weighing of alternatives. The issue is not the Fourth Gospel versus the Synoptic tradition, but the individual incidents wherein the Fourth Gospel may preserve a more historical base than the Synoptic variants.

Many of us have long been convinced that John's dating of the Crucifixion on the 14th of Nisan is inherently preferable to the Synoptic dating on the 15th. The Marcan account retains traces of a tradition inconsistent with the Passover date, e.g. the intention of the Chief Priests and the Scribes to put Jesus to death before the beginning of the feast (14:2), the incident of Simon of Cyrene returning from the country to Jerusalem (15:21), something that would not likely have happened on the holiest of Jewish holy days, and the burial of the body of Jesus by Joseph of Arimathea (15:46), also improbable on the Passover. Moreover, it seems inconceivable that such secular matters as the arrest of Jesus, the hearing before the Sanhedrin, the trial before Pilate, and the crucifixion could have been carried out by Jews on a religious holy day. St Paul's reference to Christ as the true paschal sacrifice (1 Cor. 5:7f) also appears to imply that our Lord died upon the Cross at the time that the Jewish paschal lambs were being slain.

If the Friday on which Jesus was put to death was the 14th rather than the 15th of Nisan, the dating of the Crucifixion in terms of the established Christian calendar must look for a year in which the Passover began on a Friday rather than on a Thursday evening. Olmstead's date of

April 7th of the year 30 seems to me to be convincing. It is based on Parker and Dubberstein's study which has now been published by the University of Chicago Press (1942) under the title: Babylonian Chronology, 625 B.C.-46 A.D. In the past it has been the year 28 or 29 that has usually appeared in the handbooks.

On other points of chronology Olmstead leaves the critical reader largely unconvinced. Because John's dating of the Crucifixion is correct, it does not follow that a reckoning based on the Fourth Gospel must be considered preferable on all points to one derived from the Synoptic tradition. Let us look at a few points in question.

There are at least four dates for the birth of Jesus which can be derived from the Gospel sources.

1) In Luke 3:1f. there is an elaborate dating of the beginning of John the Baptist's ministry. John began to preach "in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar", i.e. in the year 28-29 of our reckoning. If we allow a year or so for John's ministry before Jesus' baptism, this would place the latter event, on Luke's assumptions, about the year 30. In Luke 3:23 we are told that Jesus was "about" thirty years of age when he began to teach. This would mean that he was born about A.D.1. This calculation agrees with the one made by Dionysius Exiguus in the Sixth Century, and he may have followed this very line of reasoning.

2) Luke has still another dating. In Chap.2:1-7 he places the birth of our Lord at the time when a census of the Roman Empire was being taken and at a time when a certain Quirinius was governor of Syria. The only census under Quirinius of which we know anything took place in A.D.6, and there is no evidence that Quirinius was governor at any earlier date or that there was any other census. According to this point of departure, Jesus was born in 6 A.D.

3) A third date is assumed in the Gospel of Matthew. Jesus is said to have been born towards the close of the reign of Herod the Great. Since Herod died in 4 B.C. it would appear that Jesus, according to the Matthean tradition, could not have been born much later than 9-6 B.C. Luke suggests in 1:5 that John the Baptist was born during Herod's reign. Since he assumes that Jesus was born soon after John, it might be said that this third date also has some Lucan support.

4) A fourth date is deduced from John 8:57, where certain Jews refer to Jesus, in the course of his ministry, as "not yet fifty years old". If Jesus had been in his early thirties at the time it would seem that, even speaking in round numbers, they would have said "not yet forty". Since Jesus was almost certainly crucified in A.D.30, it may be that the author of the Gospel of John thought of him as between forty and fifty years of age at the time. If this were so, it may be that Jesus was born as early as 15 or 20 B.C.

The only conclusion to be drawn from such conflicting evidence is that the date of Jesus' birth cannot be located more exactly than within the limits of 20 B.C. - 6 A.D. Generally speaking the Church has preferred the tradition in the Gospel of Matthew, and it seems to me unnecessary to discard it in favour of the much earlier date, which is based, after all, only on a chance and fleeting reference in John.

John refers to three separate Passover seasons during the course of Jesus' ministry, and perhaps to four (Jo.2:13, [5:1], 6:4, and 11:55). Thus it appears that he assumed a ministry of from two and a half to four years' duration. There are very few indications of date in the Synoptic tradition. On a chance reference to the harvest season in the pericope in Mk. 2:23 ff., it has been assumed that Mark presupposes a ministry including at least two Passover seasons. But it is arbitrary to assert that Mark rules out the possibility of a ministry longer than eighteen months. The many events recorded by the Synoptists may have occupied a period at least as long as that suggested by John.

But if we accept A.D. 30 as the date of the Crucifixion, and also a ministry of two and a half to four years, we run into trouble with Luke's dating of the beginning of John's ministry as given in Chap. 3:1 ff., which locates John's call late in the year 28 or early in the year 29. If Luke's dating is correct, Jesus' ministry could not have lasted for much over a year. But Luke was apparently wrong in dating the birth of Jesus during the census of Quirinius; he was wrong in dating the Crucifixion on the Passover day; he may have been wrong in terming Lysanias Tetrarch of Abilene early in the First Christian Century; and it is not impossible that his whole dating of the call of John is antiquarian scenery.

Olmstead, however, takes Luke's dating in 3:1 ff. so seriously that he allows it to override his otherwise wholesale endorsement of John's narrative framework. So far as I can see, Olmstead leaves John's intimation of a ministry for Jesus that included three Passovers completely out of consideration. He dates the call of John on the Day of Atonement, Oct. 18th, 28 A.D., and then proceeds to date the Baptism of Jesus on or about the First of December of the same year. This gives a period of 475 days, or about sixteen months, for the ministry of our Lord. These are assertions that do not carry much conviction with them.

Closely related to problems of chronology that emerge from a comparison of John with the Synoptics is the question of the relationship of Jesus' ministry to that of John the Baptist. Mark gives us to understand that Jesus did not begin his work until "after John was delivered up" and the field was open for a new proclamation of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God (Mk. 1:14). John, on the other hand, asserts

that the two men carried on a parallel ministry for some time, and even makes the categorical statement on one occasion (3:24) that "John was not yet cast into prison", a remark that looks like a deliberate correction of the Synoptic record. The Synoptic account might have supported the suggestion that Jesus was only carrying on and completing the work of his predecessor, an idea that may have been current among followers of John the Baptist at the time our evangelist was writing. By postulating an overlapping ministry, John is allowed to bear repeated witness to the subordination of himself to Jesus and of his work to Jesus' ministry. It strikes me as arbitrary to say, as Olmstead does, that Mk. 1:14 and Matt. 4:12 "postpone" the beginning of Jesus' ministry until after the Baptist's imprisonment.

Following his almost consistent thesis, Olmstead accepts the Johannine placement of the cleansing of the Temple at the beginning rather than at the end of the ministry of Jesus. According to Olmstead, it is "strangely placed in the Passion Week" by Mark and the evangelists who employ him as a source. In rethinking my own ideas with respect to the incident I have tried to thrust aside prejudices in favor of the Synoptic rather than the Johannine framework and to consider the incident wholly in the light of its more probable setting. In the Synoptic record it follows naturally upon the Messianic entry and helps to account for the opposition to Jesus on the part of the Priestly hierarchy, which shortly manifested itself in a demand for his crucifixion. The incidents that precede and the results that follow the cleansing of the Temple form an intelligible sequence of event. I have been unable to understand Olmstead's choice of the adverb "strangely" to characterize the Synoptic setting. It could scarcely have happened at any other time than in the last days. Jesus was protected for the moment from the wrath of the "den of thieves" by the presence of friendly Galilean pilgrims, but shortly afterwards fell a victim to its retaliation.

In recent years there has been a growing conviction on the part of many students of the New Testament that Luke, in the Passion narrative, is employing a source independent of the Gospel of Mark. If this conviction is valid, the setting of the incident of the cleansing of the Temple in the last days is attested by both Mark and Luke's special source, two diverse strata of tradition. On the other hand, it must be admitted that Streeter excluded the Lucan account of the cleansing of the Temple from his reconstruction of Proto-Luke on the grounds that it is a Marcan insertion.

Apart from the hypothesis that John's narrative framework must be accepted *a priori* as preferable, there seems to be little that speaks in favor of the Johannine setting. In all probability John transposed the incident to make it a vivid frontispiece to the ministry of our Lord, an inaugural act by which Jesus offers himself to the assembled representatives of the nation as the Christ who is to

abrogate the old order and to establish a new one by his death and resurrection. As such it is a counterpart to the preceding miracle story of the changing of the water into wine. Jesus is made to declare, as did he that sat upon the throne in the vision of the seer of Patmos: "Behold, I make all things new."

According to the Synoptic tradition, Galilee was the sphere of the ministry of Jesus. He did not go to Judea and Jerusalem in the furtherance of his mission until the Passover season at which he was crucified. According to John, on the other hand, Jesus' ministry was centred in Judea and in Jerusalem. He left Judea for Galilee only on three occasions, and then only as temporary extensions of his normal Judean ministry. In John only chapters 1:43--2:12, 4:43-54, and 6:1--7:9 have their setting in Galilean territory.

Olmstead follows this Johannine scheme, although the fact that he fits so many incidents drawn from the Synoptic tradition into these Galilean interludes obscures the relative unimportance given to the Galilean ministry by the Fourth Evangelist. One would gather from Olmstead that Jesus' ministry was more or less equally divided between Galilee and Judea, an impression foreign to both Mark and John.

Again I can see no certain solution of the problem if one lacks Olmstead's confidences in the historical accuracy of the Johannine framework. The work of Menzies, Weiss, and K.L. Schmidt has shown us that the topographical as well as the chronological sequence of Mark's Gospel is largely artificial. Both have been superimposed upon pericopae which originally circulated without definite indications of time and place. It would be difficult today to argue that Mark's limitation of Jesus' ministry until the last days to Galilee and other districts outside Judea is historically trustworthy. Furthermore, the lament over Jerusalem, recorded by both Matthew and Luke (Matt. 23:37 ff. and Luke 13:34 f.), certainly suggests more than one unsuccessful mission in the capital city. But the frequent reference even in John to Jesus as "the Galilean" suggests that his ministry was well as his family had been largely associated with the northern province, and I see no reason to doubt the Synoptic representation of Galilee rather than Judea as the main centre of his earlier work.

There are some intriguing variants in the Johannine narrative of the Passion story to which I should like to turn in brief.

According to Mark it was the company of Jesus' fellow-pilgrims from Galilee which hailed him as Messiah at the time of his triumphal entry. In John it was "a great multitude" of Jesus' supporters already present in

Jerusalem that came forth out of the city to extend him a Messianic welcome. I see no reason to share the scepticism of such a critic as Bultmann, who regards the whole incident, even in Mark, as a construction of the early Church by which it sought to make Jesus fulfil the prediction of Zechariah 9:9. But the influence of that Old Testament passage on the Johannine version can scarcely be denied. Zechariah 9:9 is actually quoted by John, and the notice is added that the disciples did not understand its relation to Jesus until after the resurrection. The Old Testament passage, even in the free quotation that John gives it, would demand that the Messianic honours should be paid by representatives of "the daughter of Zion" rather than by pilgrims who had not yet entered the city. Yet, even in this incident, John's version retains traits that appear more historical than comparable elements in Mark. Jesus obtains an ass for the entry more or less accidentally, rather than by a miracle of omniscience or by calculated pre-arrangement.

The pericope about the washing of the Disciples' feet occupies the place in the Johannine narrative that the Institution of the Lord's Supper takes in Mark and Synoptic parallels. I am not aware of any really convincing explanation of John's omission of an account of the institution of the eucharist. It is certainly not due to any lack of appreciation of the importance of the rite, as is clear from Chapter 6. McGregor believes it was due to the evangelist's desire to "counteract superstitious sacramentalism." John wished "to connect the Sacrament less with Christ's death and more with his life-giving power. Hence in chapter 6 the institution is associated with the life-giving miracle of the feeding of the multitude." I myself have wondered whether the omission could have been a deliberate protest against the Synoptic tradition, which identified the Last Supper of Jesus and his disciples with their celebration of the Passover meal. At any rate, Paul and Mark together offer incontrovertible witness to the fact that the Christian rite of the eucharist was associated in the thought of the early Church with Jesus' last supper with his disciples on the night in which he was betrayed, and John's failure to allude to this does less than justice to historical fact.

Jesus' washing of his disciples' feet is represented by John as an acted parable. Jesus takes upon himself the duties of a slave, and by an act of lowly service illustrates the content of such *logia* as the following, familiar to us from the Synoptic record: "Whosoever would be great among you, shall be your servant; and whosoever would be first among you, shall be slave of all" (Mark 10:43 f.); "For which is greater, he that reclines at the table, or he that serves? Is it not he that reclines? But I am in the midst of you as he that serves" (Luke 22:23).

But John 13:6-11 indicates that the Fourth Evangelist also regarded the incident as symbolic of some deeper truth. As Tertullian recognized (*de bapt.* 12), the bath that cleanses "every whit" is a probable reference to the rite of baptism. The supplementary "washing of the feet", which alone is necessary to preserve the purity that has been attained, may have been intended to symbolize the rite of the eucharist. If this be so, it would appear that John is interpreting history rather than narrating it. We are being introduced to doctrine rather than to fact.

According to John, Jesus was taken after his arrest to Annas. Annas had been deposed as High Priest by the Roman Procurator in A.D. 15, but since the office, according to Jewish law, was tenable for life, it may well be that he still unofficially exercised many of its prerogatives, in spite of his official demission. It is not unlikely that the Sanhedrin would take no action before consultation with the influential ex-High-Priest. But John's account, as it stands, is certainly confusing. It does not make it clear whether the High Priest before whom Jesus was examined was Annas or Caiaphas. An early rearrangement of the text (vss. 12, 13, 24, 14, 15, 19-23, 16-18, 25-31), witnessed to be the Sinaitic Syriac, resolves the ambiguity by making Caiaphas the examining official, but this is probably no more than an early instance of text criticism. If the text be taken as we now have it, it would seem that Annas made a preliminary investigation of the charges and then sent Jesus on to Caiaphas. If this is so, John gives no account whatever of the proceedings before Caiaphas.

The representation in Mark and Matthew of the events immediately following the arrest is even more confused than John's. It likewise presupposes two meetings of the Jewish authorities. The first took place at night, which would have been unconditionally illegal if, as we are led to believe, it was convened to give Jesus a formal trial. It seems historically more probable that Jesus' appearances before the Sanhedrin were in the nature of grand jury proceedings, and what the Jewish authorities were seeking to do was to frame charges against Jesus that could be laid before Pilate with the expectation of conviction. If this is so, then John's account is closer to factual representation. John's association of Annas with at least the preliminary stage of these hearings looks also like good tradition.

In the Gospel of John the trial of Jesus before Pilate was conducted at the Praetorium, the official residence of the Procurator while in Jerusalem. Since Schürer's time this has usually been identified as the former palace of Herod the Great, in the western part of the upper city. Olmstead prefers the traditional view that it was the Tower of Antonia, which overlooked the Temple grounds.

John's narrative represents the trial of Jesus as partly public and partly private. Jesus' accusers remained in the courtyard before the Praetorium. After the preliminaries,

Pilate called Jesus into the residence itself, emerging once to suggest that Jesus be released, a second time to declare that he had found no crime in the man whom he had had scourged, a third time to make another unsuccessful plea for his release, and a fourth time, at the sixth hour, to seat Jesus on the tribunal and allow the Jews themselves to reject their king.

The Johannine narrative is vivid and circumstantial, but scarcely warrants Strachan's over-enthusiastic comment that it "everywhere shows traces of an independent and first-hand source of information." A private rather than a public hearing would be strange Roman justice, and one might reasonably ask how, if it did take place, could it ever have been reported? Pilate's question to Jesus; "Art thou the King of the Jews?" is not based on any charge made by the Sanhedrin in John's report, and seems to presuppose some such formulation as Luke gives us in 23:2. In Luke 23:16, 22 Pilate is said to have proposed scourging as a substitute for further action. John says that scourging was actually carried out before sentence was pronounced, another strange commentary on judicial procedure. Finally, the whole narrative in the Fourth Gospel, culminating in the dramatic enthronement of Jesus himself on the judgment seat, carries further even than in Matthew and in Luke the attempt of early Christian apologetic to absolve the Romans of responsibility for the crucifixion of Jesus and to fix it firmly on the willing shoulders of the Jews. According to Matthew, the Jews cried out: "His blood be upon us, and upon our children" (27:25). According to John, the official representatives of the Jewish people dramatically rejected their own king, whom Pilate, with possibly unwitting prescience, had placed upon the tribunal from which justice was administered.

Olmstead's discussion of the trial before Pilate is a bad example of harmonization, from which many of us had hoped that New Testament studies had been redeemed. The charges against Jesus by the Jews in Luke 23:2 and the Lucan account of the trial before Herod Antipas are woven into the framework of the Johannine narrative.

In contrast to the birth narratives of both Matthew and Luke, John regards Jesus as the son of Joseph and Nazareth as his birthplace (1:45 f., 6:42, 7:41 f.). Lack of reference to the doctrine of the Virgin birth does not necessarily mean ignorance of it on the part of John. He probably regarded it as inadequate to express his understanding of the significance of Jesus. Jesus was the Son of God, not because he was supernaturally begotten at a point in time, but because he was, even before he became flesh and dwelt among us, the preexistent agent of God's creative, providential and revelatory activities.

On one occasion, according to John's account, Jesus' teaching in Jerusalem gave rise to a dispute among various groups of his listeners as to who he was (7:40 ff.). Some

claimed he was a prophet. Other claimed he was the Christ. Others denied that he could be the Christ on the grounds that he was a native of Galilee and that Scripture had foretold that the Christ would be born at Bethlehem of the seed of David. Because the evangelist makes no comment on this last objection, Olmstead asserts that John's memoirs must have been written before the theory of Jesus' Davidic descent and Bethlehemite origin had been "discovered". Olmstead regards this as "incontrovertible evidence" of the early date of the narrative framework of the Fourth Gospel.

This is one of Olmstead's most interesting observations, and probably one of the strongest points he would raise in any extended discussion of his primary thesis. But I submit that the evangelist's failure to correct such objections on the part of the Jews may be explained as well by his personal rejection of the hypothesis of Jesus' Davidic descent and birth at Bethlehem as by his ignorance of it. Even in Matthew and Luke the theory of Davidic origin has been superseded by a more advanced Christology, and maintains its place only because of the respect of the evangelists for their sources. Paul's reference to Jesus' Davidic descent suggests that it must have been part of the very earliest preaching of Jesus as Messiah. Absence of reference to Jesus' Davidic descent in John is an argument for a late rather than an early date for his tradition.

There are many other points of comparison between the Gospel of John and the Synoptic record, and all might have a bearing on an exhaustive treatment of the subject that has served as the title of this paper. What of the significant omission by John of any reference to Jesus as a healer of demoniacs? Did he leave such stories out because he assumed that his readers were already sufficiently familiar with them? Did he suppress them because they were out of keeping with his conception of the work of Christ? Or can a case be made out for the extra-Palestinian origin of the Synoptic stories about demoniac cures, which would justify John as an historian in omitting them? What of the miracle stories John does narrate? They can scarcely all have been created out of nothing, and in spite of their symbolism some of them preserve an appearance of historicity. Can their historical fact, if any, be separated from their spiritual meaning? What of the individuals who emerge in John's Gospel only, Nathanael, Nicodemus, Lazarus, the "beloved disciple"? Do their portraits preserve any historical traits? What of the details about such people as Philip and Peter that have no counterpart in any other tradition? What of the resurrection appearances in John? Is his location of them in and around Jerusalem preferable to the Galilean locale in Mark and Matthew? What of the bearing of the twenty-first chapter of John on this issue?

These are questions that I ask rather than answer in this paper, partly because it is already inordinately long, and partly because I have found little in Olmstead's book that would cast any fresh light upon them. Furthermore, I

suspect that their treatment would add little to the main conclusions of this study, which I should now like to itemize.

There is still no convincing differentiation between levels of tradition in the Gospel of John. The book so far has defied analysis along lines that have proved trustworthy in the case of the Pentateuch, the Book of Isaiah, the Synoptic Gospels, the Book of Acts, the Second Epistle of Peter and the Pastorals. So far as we can see as yet, the Gospel of John is woven of cloth that betrays no seams.

No evidence has yet been advanced that would demand an early date for the Gospel of John or for any of the sources the evangelist may have employed.

The Johannine account of Jesus' life and work cannot be preferred *en bloc* to that of Mark, or vice versa. Individual pericopae must be weighed on their own merits.

The contrast between the Synoptic representation of Jesus' life and ministry and that in the Gospel of John has often been overdrawn. There is less history in the Synoptics than has been popularly assumed; less conflict between Mark and John than has often been postulated; and more fact in the Fourth Gospel than has often been recognized.

There is good reason to believe that John preserves the correct dating of the crucifixion; that his assumption of a ministry for Jesus that lasted for several years is in accordance with the facts; and that his placement of a large part of Jesus' earlier ministry in Jerusalem and in Judea has much to be said for it. On the other hand, John's location of the cleansing of the Temple at the beginning of the ministry, and his portrait of Jesus as a middle-aged rather than as a young man at the height of his work are less plausible than conflicting Synoptic tradition.

The Johannine record of the Passion shows evidence of access to tradition independent of that in Mark and Luke, and in some respects preferable to our other sources of information. In particular this is true of events immediately following upon Jesus' arrest. But, on the whole, John's Passion narrative appears to presuppose a knowledge of the Synoptic account and to have been built on it.

The Gospel of John may have more to tell us of the Jesus of history than we have often assumed, and more than has yet been recognized, but nothing has yet emerged to lead us to dispute the general truth of Clement's dictum with which this paper began, however much we may wish to hedge it with qualifications: that we go to the first three Gospels primarily for the outward facts of the story of Jesus, and to the Gospel of John primarily for their spiritual meaning.

Sir Robert Falconer: A GLANCE ONCE MORE AT SOME PROBLEMS OF THE EPISTLE OF THE HEBREWS

The Epistle was used by Clement of Rome before 96 A.D., but was not admitted into the collection of our present Pauline letters, which probably circulated at Rome at the end of the first century. Tertullian in North Africa, late in the second century, seems to have accepted a tradition which, as Zahn says, may have come from the Montanists in Asia Minor, that Barnabas wrote it. For several centuries the Western Church did not recognize it as Pauline, though it was quoted by Justin, Irenaeus, Hippolytus and others. In the Churches of Alexandria and Syria, however, it was regarded as Pauline, and it holds a place in the Chester Beatty Papyri (3rd century) next to Romans, a proof of its unquestioned acceptance. The chapter numeration of B places Hebrews after Galatians; the Sahidic version puts it after 2 Cor. and before Galatians. As to the earliest Syriac version, the evidence goes to show that Hebrews was included in the Pauline group. Clement of Alexandria suggests that it was translated by Luke from an Aramaic original; Origen, while aware of this and other conjectures, finally remarked that God alone knows the author.

The fact that Hebrews profoundly influenced Clement of Rome and was held of high value by other leaders of the West, shows that its author was an outstanding person. It must have come to Alexandria from some other Church; otherwise it would not have allowed Paul's name to be attached to it; and that too from some major community. There was the great Syrian Church with its historic capital of Antioch. If it came from there to Alexandria, the attribution here, after some generations, of Pauline authorship may have been carried back to Syria. The mention of Timothy (13:23) would be appropriate to Antioch, but not, so far as we know, to Alexandria.

The title ΠΡΟΣ ΗΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ, everywhere attached to the epistle, was evidently due to its contents. The term can only mean Greek-speaking Jewish-Christians. The Epistle, however, was meant for some locality in the western Dispersion (Heb. 2:3,4; 5:11--6:8; 12:4; 13:18,23,24). Antioch with its circuit of churches in a Hellenistic area would provide a suitable destination.

Turning to the Epistle, I am unable to follow the many scholars who object to the title and place the treatise after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The Epistle was addressed to those who were Jews by birth or descent. It contains no such suggestions, as there are in Ephesians and 1 Peter, that Gentiles have been brought in to form with the Jewish Christians a new people, a true Israel. His readers inherit without question the traditional values of the Old Covenant. But the author's discussion of these values has not the tone of moral instruction such as prevailed in the Synagogue. In method and procedure

suggestive of Philo, whose readers were educated Jewish Hellenists, he employs allegory and rabbinical exposition to interpret the deepest truths in Jewish worship. In Hebrews, which in this respect is on a par with Romans, there are more quotations relatively from the Old Testament than in any other New Testament book. The author has the most thorough-going view of inspiration: God speaks directly through the Holy Spirit (3:7ff; 10:15). The pre-existent Christ wrought through individuals and in events as recorded in the Old Testament, in which he includes, as in the LXX, Sap. Sol., Jes. Sir., and 1 & 2 Macc. In any word or passage he finds hidden indications of the doctrine which he is expounding. Like Philo, though with less indifference to historical fact, he deduces a secret spiritual sense. For example: The 'Rest' sought by the Israelites in Canaan becomes the heavenly Rest of fellowship with God (4:1-11); by fantastic allegory Melchizedek (7:1-10) is the type of the eternal priesthood of Christ, while it is ignored that, according to Ex. 29:9; Nu. 25:13, Aaron and his sons held the priesthood by perpetual statute; the meaning and motives of the lives of Abraham and Moses (11:8ff; 23ff) are interpreted without regard to the historic facts. Even the application of the New Covenant of Jer. 31:33f has a changed emphasis.

It may be that it was due to this indifference in historical detail, as well as in events at large, that the author has fallen into confusion or actual error in regard to the function of the high-priest in daily sacrifice, the position of the altar of incense, the contents of the Ark and other details of service. Philo indeed wrote of the high-priest *Euchas kai thusias telōn kath' hecāsten hemeran* (De Spec. Leg. III, 131); but this referred to the offering of Lev. 6:12-16, not to the offering of Heb. Josephus also wrote loosely in regard to the high-priest. Some have supposed that another tradition was afloat; but the probability is that the author was not versed in the Torah nor familiar with Temple practice, and that he was only concerned with the general fulfilment in Christian doctrine of the reality foreshadowed in Old Testament priestly worship.

The author uses only the LXX, with some readings from Cod. Alex. (1:7, 12; 10:37; 12:5, 15). He founds arguments on wrong readings and translations: e.g. 10:5, 7, 8, where *sōma* is not correct; 10:37f, where taking *erchomenos* instead of *erchomene* he finds a prophecy of the Messiah; in 12:15 he follows the LXX Cod. Alex. in reading *gnōphē* instead of *en chole*; finally in 12:26 he is misled by the LXX into an unjustified statement. In 13:5 he agrees with Philo in a quotation not so found in any Old Testament writer. While the atmosphere of Heb. is similar to Philo's, that age soon passed away after his death somewhere between 41 and 50 A.D. With the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70 the entire sacrificial system came to an end, and the learned found a surrogate for it in the study of ritual laws (G.F. Moore). The Synagogue took the direction of national affairs, depression settled on the people and apocalypses re-appeared. The grubbings into ritual prescriptions by a small circle would at that

time make little appeal to Jewish-Christians, who had then become part of a powerfully growing Church.

There is a great passage in Heb. 12:18-24 setting forth the contrast between the earthly Jerusalem past and present and the heavenly Jerusalem, the thronged city of the living God. It is peopled by myriads of ministering and attendant angels; by the congregation of ancient Israel in festal worship assembled, who as the first-begotten have been registered as citizens in heaven (cf. ch. 11); to it also have drawn near, without fear, to God the Judge of all, believers who are being made perfect as saints under the New Covenant, because at the right hand of the Divine Majesty is seated Jesus its Mediator by His own blood, more full of promise by far than that of Abel, who yet under the Old was deemed righteous. There may have been in the mind of the author the festal pilgrimage of the noblest Jews who, coming from every city of the Dispersion, thronged Jerusalem yearly at each great feast bringing the money contributions from their localities to the Temple. Paul's argument in Gal. 4:24-26, where he speaks of the two Jerusalems and the two covenants, is different; the first that of Sinci leads to slavery--old Judaism; the other is the heavenly Jerusalem, free from the Law, the new Jerusalem, our Mother. Our author seeks to show that the passing, visible institutions of the earthly Jerusalem find their true realization in Christianity. The Jewish order is antiquated and growing old and will soon disappear (8:13).

Ceremonial worship was performed in splendour at the high festivals by the high-priest, by multitudes of ministering priests and levites, and by musicians and acolytes. Philo says that the high-priest is not a man but *logos theios*, and that the ideal high-priest has no share in any transgressions willingly or unwillingly. The dignity of the high-priest had been immensely enhanced in the post-exilic community. The efficacy of his suppliant prayers is emphasised in several rabbinic treatises (C. Siegfried, as in *Philo's Contribution to Religion* by H.A.A. Kennedy). If all this cultus had disappeared from Jerusalem through the destruction of the Temple, the argument would have lost much of its reality. If the system did not still head up in the Temple his long and deeply earnest discussion would not have been relevant. He would not have recalled a day that was dead even in a Philonic allegory which made little of historicity. The earnestness and the sense of danger, in which he felt his readers to be, will not permit such an assumption. Among them there must have been a large number to whom the continuance of Jewish ordinances was a serious stumbling-block. Many of them, baptized long ago, had remained at a rudimentary stage of the faith, and had become listless, some perhaps apostate. The problem for them was not that of living with Gentiles and their relation to the Law; nor of the dominance of the Synagogue. It was a matter as between Jews, Christian and continuing. The worship of the Jewish people, maintained with all its prestige, was a

religious as well as a social fact of overwhelming importance. Though the readers had not yet suffered unto blood, social pressure was causing them great distress. If the chief centre of the readers was Antioch, they would be surrounded by a most impressive and influential Jewish population, prosperous and cultured, protected by the superior power of Rome. Their chief synagogue, Josephus reports, was particularly elegant. Many of these Jewish-Christians may have been very loath to cut themselves off from their people, especially as reasonably fair relations had existed between Jews and some Christians in Jerusalem. Perhaps the use of the name 'Christian', flung as a jibe by the populace long ago, may have been irritating them. It was hard to cut themselves off completely from racial associates, and many may have sat with former co-religionists at sacrificial meals (13:9,10). And there was no glory of their coming Lord to support their faith. It has been suggested that the argument in 3:7-13 indicates symbolically that, if forty years had nearly elapsed since Jesus had preached the Gospel, they might expect His return before long to establish the Kingdom which cannot be shaken (12:28).

As to the rudimentary Christians the author is almost hopeless. They should have known long ago that levitical washings and offerings of food cannot purify the individual's conscience. He makes bold, however, to interpret for those who can follow him the truth of the high-priesthood and sanctuary worship. As long as the earthly ministry stands it allows no real approach for its worshippers into the very presence of God. But it can only endure until the introduction of the new order. He urges them to live by faith in the reality of the heavenly world; to follow Jesus, the perfect Apostle of God and high-priest, out of the camp bearing His reproach. They have a true altar and enjoy the true food of the soul--possibly in allusion to the Eucharist. The Day foretold by the prophets is drawing nigh, when all earthly things will be shaken, and the Kingdom which cannot be shaken will be manifested.

By the time that the Fourth Gospel was written such an argument as that of Hebrews was needless in Asia Minor, as the Jews had become an alienated people. Long ago Jesus had told the Woman of Samaria: The hour cometh and now is when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem will ye worship the Father. Also the high-priestly service of Jesus is based differently in John 17 from that in Hebrews. It is generally accepted by scholars that the Gospel of Matthew was a Jewish-Christian gospel, and that it originated in the Church of Antioch about 80 A.D. It interprets the Gospel as the fulfilment of the Law and emphasizes the ethic of the Sermon on the Mount. The main themes of Hebrews do not occur in it, at any rate not with emphasis. By that time deep depression among the Jews finds expression in such Apocalypses as IV Esdras and Baruch; and in these the Christians too were interested.

The Epistle is a Logos tēs parakleseōs, a prophetic exhortation based on instruction in the deep things of the Gospel, in terms of LXX tradition. The author evinces more Hellenistic culture than any other writer of the New Testament, and is thoroughly familiar with the intellectual world, if not with the actual writings, of Philo. His readers must have been well educated people of a type similar to those for whom Philo wrote. But, as we have said, that world passed away soon after Philo's death.

Greetings are sent to all the leaders and to all the saints (13:24), which may be meant to include Gentiles as well as Jewish-Christians in different localities within a certain area. There are no personal greetings. Leaders (hēgoumenoi, 13:7,17,24, in this sense only here in the New Testament) are commended to the obedience of the readers. It was some of them, now dead, who had preached to them the Word of God. The present leaders, of whom the author may possibly be one (13:18), preach the same Jesus Christ as did the first and as those to come will do (13:8). They are teachers and watchers of souls who have a divine responsibility for them; but they are not being given the obedience and submission which are necessary if all are to profit. No mention is made of bishop or presbyter as in 1 Clem.1:3; 21:6. There is no reference to Peter, Paul or Barnabas, nor to any apostolic order. Jesus is the great Apostle. The author has been on some mission (13:18), perhaps accompanied by another person, which seems to be difficult and not to have been of his own choosing, but in which he believes that he is successfully carrying out his duty. He earnestly asks for their prayers that he may be speedily restored to them; as a prophet would have done whose movements were directed not by himself but by the Holy Spirit (Ac.13:2,3). The place of his mission is probably indicated by the people from whom he sends greetings: 'those from Italy' (hoi apo tēs Italias). This may mean equally well Italians outside or in Italy. The latter seems to me more probable: brethren in the Italian churches. If outside Italy, why should a Christian writer single out a group of nationals instead of sending greetings from the whole church? This view is supported by the great use made of the epistle by Clement of Rome. Further, according to 13:23, it is common knowledge that Timothy has just been freed from prison, and the author hopes that he will soon join him on a journey that will bring them both to the readers. In Philippians, Paul wrote that he hoped to send Timothy from Rome to that church. At that time the condition of the Church in Rome had become serious because of factions. In 2 Tim.4:11 the writer asks Timothy to come to him and to bring Mark with him. This is in all probability an historical fragment. Timothy may have been imprisoned at that time.

Among the very interesting features of Hebrews is its similarities with 1 Peter. They have some remarkable words in common which are exclusive to them: antitupos, parepidēmoi, gēsῥhai, oikos (of the Christian people), logos zōn,

klēronomein tēn eulogian, poimēn (of Christ as also in Jn.10), anapherein thusian tō theō dia I.X. Especially similar is the terminology for the work of redemption: sōma Christou, haima amōmou, Christ as amiantos, hapax, anapherein hamartian, rhantismos, lutrōsis. There are also echoes in diction, as in the doxology and final greetings in 1 Pet.4:11; 5:10 and Heb.13:21; eirōnēn diōkein (1 P.3:11, H.12:14); oneidizesthai (1 P.4:14, H.10:33; 13:13); phanerousthai of the first appearance of Jesus (1 P.1:20, H.9:26); ep eschatou tōn chronōn, or hēmerōn (1 P.1:20, H.1:1). Faith also is close to hope, the unseen world for which they hope being an object of faith (1 P.1:8; H.11:1). In both Jesus is an example in suffering, and the pre-existent Christ speaks in the Old Testament. For both, sufferings are an indication of the approach of the final catastrophe (1 P.4:7, 17-19; H.10:37). Both use a LXX text in affinity with Cod.Alex (see v.Soden, HC III,2; 2f, 113). Both epistles are written in excellent Greek. These remarkable affinities have led scholars to assume that one work was known to the author of the other, or that they lived in similar religious atmospheres.

There is however in 1 Pet.5:12 this statement: 'By Silvanus, the faithful brother as I esteem him, I have written to you briefly'. The preposition may mean either the actual scribe or the messenger who carried the letter, or both. Mark, who, according to Papias, was an interpreter of the reminiscences of Peter in regard to Jesus, is also mentioned (5:13). Silvanus is associated by Paul with himself and Timothy in the letters to the Thessalonians. How far he was responsible for 1 Peter it is of course impossible to determine. This is one of the richest and most personal letters in the New Testament. The author has vivid sense of the nobility and sufferings of Jesus Christ, who to him was very real and for whom he had deep love. In His life he sees prophecy fulfilled, and His marvellous response under suffering is an example for Christians, while also He took away their sin when He died on the Cross. He still shepherds His people, and has created from Jews and Gentiles a new House of God, the new Israel, which though suffering now will soon be delivered by Him in Person. A warm-hearted Gospel-filled soul, he sends his readers a throbbing message of the grace of God and of hope. He is a prophet in whom the profoundest spirit of Isaiah lives again, especially as in ch.53; also other messianic prophecies as well as the Psalms are deep in his heart. Christ is to him the same Person whom we meet in the Synoptic Gospels. The author of Hebrews is a more contemplative spirit, devotional, interested in recorded prophecy, more distant from the historic Jesus. But there is no reason in the nature of either writing why the author of Hebrews, if he helped the author of 1 Peter to compose it, should not have shown his hand in the many similarities which exist between them.

Is it then possible that Silvanus was the author of Hebrews? Silas was his Semitic name. In the primitive days in Jerusalem he was sent by that church to Antioch as an

interpreter and for conciliation. He was later an associate with Paul for perhaps a year on his second missionary journey at the same time as Timothy. He would have been an excellent representative of the new Body of Christ consisting of both Jews and Gentiles, if he came to Rome to mediate in the controversies which had broken out between the Judaizers and Paul's followers, as referred to in Philippians. The hopes of the author (13:18,19) may not have been fulfilled. The situation may have become so serious as to have brought Peter also to Rome. There, Silvanus would have again met Luke in whose writings there are many likenesses to Hebrews. After the word in 1 Peter 5:12 the curtain falls on Silvanus. Timothy probably returned to Ephesus: otherwise how account for the Pastoral Epistles, whoever their final author was?

B. W. Horan: THE UNJUST STEWARD: AN INTERPRETATION

The parable of the Unjust Steward is a notorious crux for New Testament exegesis. There have been an extraordinary number of interpretations, none of which has received anything like general approval. The causes of this impasse are two: first, and on the negative side, the loss of the original interpretation even before the time of St.Luke. "It is clear", writes C. H. Dodd, "that there was no certain clue to the application of the parable even when it reached the evangelist Luke". Dodd bases this judgment mainly on the fact that the application given by St.Luke is not one but several: (i) the sons of this age are more prudent in relation to their own time than the sons of light, (ii) I say unto you, make friends of unrighteous wealth..., (iii) If you have not been honest with unrighteous wealth, who will entrust you with the true riches? These applications reveal themselves to be substitutes, invented probably by preachers and missionaries in the oral period of the Gospel's transmission, on the grounds of (a) their disagreement, (b) their partial relevancy to the parable, and (c) their ordinary, common-place teaching. Second, and on the positive side, the difficulty of interpreting the parable has been due to the assumption that the Unjust Steward was held up, as in some way, a model of Christian discipleship. Nearly all interpretations have been based on this assumption. Even Dodd writes: "the most probable application of the parable is that which commends the Unjust Steward for his thinking strenuously and acting boldly as an example to the disciples in view of their impending crisis".

The purpose of this paper is to suggest (i) that the original interpretation has, as a matter of fact, not been lost, but has been preserved unwittingly by St.Luke at the close of the several applications he appends to the parable; (ii) that it is a mistaken assumption to think that the Unjust Steward was, for any reason, commended by Our Lord.

Let us forget for a moment St. Luke's applications of the parable. They have been the cause of the mistaken assumption that the Unjust Steward is commended for out-imitation. (To a lesser extent so also have the words, "and the lord commended the unjust steward because he had done wisely", the 'lord' being taken, in some cases, as referring to Our Lord, but in most cases as referring to the master of the story who has unconsciously been thought of as representing God). Looking at the story itself, it is a plain but vivid transcript from life. Everything in it, even the statement with which it closes that "the lord commended the unjust steward because he had done wisely", fittingly belongs to an order of society whose leading principle is that any means are lawful which lead to success and worldly gain. In a few bold strokes it depicts the world of Mammon.

The stage is set by the opening words--"there was a certain rich man which had a steward". (Would Our Lord have spoken of God under the figure of a rich man? Rich men in His parables are a suspect class). At once we are introduced into Sadducean society with its wealth and materialism. The story hardly gets on its way before we meet with that other aspect of such a society--its passion for gain, its unscrupulousness, and its heartlessness. The steward has an eye to gain, he plays the market with his master's money, but he gets into difficulties. Some associate or subordinate, also with an eye to his own interests, informs against him in the hope of getting his job. (The word, *dieblēthē*, implies hostility). Finding himself without a job, the steward falls back upon his wits. "I have it at last" (*egnōn*, a dramatic aorist). Before reaching his decision, it occurred to him that he might dig or beg. But he soon dismissed the thought--the way of honest toil and the valley of humiliation were not for him. So untroubled by thoughts of remorse or penitence or restitution, he resolves, while there is yet time and he has his hand on his master's property, to turn it to his own account. He strikes an attractive bargain with his master's debtors; and he does it in an imperious, off-hand manner. "Take thy bond and sit down quickly and write fifty". The shrewd fellow knows that "the grand manner" impresses people and wins their gratitude. The grasping debtors close with the bargain and ask no questions. The clever but dishonest scheme works and everyone is pleased. The defrauded master feels no resentment against his unjust steward. On the contrary, he compliments him on his cleverness (*phronimōs*). He is a rich man and can afford the loss, but more than this, he has a genuine admiration for a man who can manoeuvre himself out of a tight spot. For in the social circle to which he belonged, astuteness and success are the criteria by which a man is evaluated; conscientiousness and goodness and honesty are reckoned trivial virtues and only of conventional value.

Here is a realistic picture of a society where men use money to gain nothing more enduring or worth while than popular acclaim and temporary respite from anxieties. On the lips of a Preacher of Righteousness it could have had but one meaning--a warning against the spirit of mammon. This, in effect, is the force of the words: "and I say unto you, make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when it fails, they may receive you into eternal tents", if, as seems obvious, they were spoken in irony. Their relevancy to the parable is strong proof that they are part of the original application. Their very strangeness makes it highly improbable--on the principle that the harder reading is to be preferred--that they are a later invention.

We get support for this view of the parable from the hint St. Luke gives us as to its occasion. At the close of the parable (v. 14) he has these words: "and the Pharisees (Sadducees?) who were lovers of money heard all these things; and they turned up their noses at him". This reference to "lovers of money" is pointless unless the parable was spoken in reference to them. And the fact that "they turned up their noses at him" implies that they took the parable to be a scathing denunciation of them.

Again, we notice that the parable was addressed to the disciples. Why, we may ask, should Our Lord have warned a group of peasants and fisherfolk against the spirit of mammon? That was not their special temptation. Our suggestion is that the presence of prosperous, unprincipled men like these "lovers of money" had prompted them to put to Him some such question as: "Why do such men prosper while good and godly folk fare badly?" It was the old problem which had agitated the saints and thinkers of the Old Testament. It was a problem which was probably never very far from the thoughts of these simple, good men, least of all when it was forced upon their attention by the socialite Sadducees. The Lord's answer is striking and amounts to this: "Prosperity does come the way of men bent on gain; if you crave for it, this is a ready way to get it. But is prosperity worth craving for? Is there not something less likely to fail, more likely to endure? To obtain it, there is only one way--the service of God". This is the purport of the parable together with its initial application and is succinctly expressed in the words which St. Luke appends to his several applications: "No man can serve two masters... ye cannot serve God and mammon". These words, we suggest, are the true and original application of the parable.

None of those who heard the parable could have missed its point. But when the tale passed into a wider circulation and the circumstances of its telling (*Gitz im Leben*) were forgotten, the point was lost. Other and easier but less relevant interpretations were given to it--some of which St. Luke has preserved--with the result that the parable has suffered a fate similar to that of an earlier satire, the Book of Jonah. It seems evident that even St. Luke was not

clear as to its original interpretation--this can be the only explanation of the several different applications he appends to the parable. But it also seems evident that somewhere in his sources there was preserved the original application of the parable--else why should he have assigned it to this "apparently unlikely" context?

R. F. Schnell: THE DEVELOPMENT OF HEBREW WISDOM LITERATURE

A considerable amount of Wisdom Literature is found in the books of the Old Testament which do not particularly belong to the 'Wisdom' category. By studying these Wisdom passages, i.e. passages which by their nature place them in the Wisdom field, we can trace the development of the form of Wisdom teaching, and thus lay the foundation for a Form Criticism of the Wisdom Books themselves. As briefly as possible, I should like to outline this form history.

Very early is the folk lore of which we have several examples in Hebrew fables. The fable, by ascribing the power of speech to the order of nature which lack that faculty, is a means of presenting a moral in a veiled manner. Though no traces remain, Solomon was probably renowned as a composer, or at least as a patron, of fable literature, for "he spoke concerning trees, from the cedar which is in Lebanon to the hyssop which springs out of the wall, and he spoke concerning beasts and birds and reptiles and fish." (I Kings 5:13)

Several fables are retained for us in the Biblical Literature. There is the well-known fable of Jotham (Judges 9:7ff) in which the trees are represented as choosing a king. Again we have the fable of Joash concerning the bramble which desired to contract a marriage union with the cedar of Lebanon, when by chance a wild beast passed by and trampled down the bramble.¹ It is a warning to Amaziah to keep his place. We may also mention Isaiah's tool fable about the axe boasting over the one who swings it (Isa.10:15) and his other fable of the pot desiring to lord it over the potter (Isa.29:16).

Now while these two fables of Isaiah are very probably his own creation, for they exactly fit their context, the fables of Jotham and of Joash, although they roughly fit the situation, are found to be adaptations, i.e. they are older than the situation in which they are employed. This serves to illustrate the fact that fable literature was early in Israel, that it was possibly quite extensive although there remain to us but a few samples.

¹ II K. 14:8-10.

As early as the fable, if not earlier, is the mashal literature. The term mashal is applied to many types--the proverb, the curse, the lament, the oracle, etc. Our particular concern is with the first of these, the proverbial saying which in its early stages is a concise, pointed, spontaneous reflection upon life, and then develops into more and more elaborate forms which are often quite artificial, which gradually lose their spontaneity, and become more and more the deliberate medium of instruction.

The earliest form of the mashal is very short. Two proverbs are associated with Saul. The unexpected appearance of him among the ecstatic prophets drew from the bystanders the phrase: "Is Saul also among the prophets?" While another said: "And who is their father?" (I Sam.10:12) Ezekiel 16:44 records the two-word proverb "as the mother, so her daughter". Jeremiah 23:28--"What has straw to do with wheat?" In I Sam. 24:14 David quotes the ancient proverb: "From the wicked proceeds wickedness". A number of other examples might be quoted. But these suffice to indicate the very brief form which these proverbs take. In the Hebrew they consist of two or three words, or occasionally of four. In the Hebrew another fact becomes apparent, namely that even this short form of the mashal goes through a development, the earliest being in prose style and syntax, the later ones presenting poetic features.

Whereas the proverbs thus far have consisted of one stich or line, the form which we are now to consider consists of two stichoi. One such is found in I Samuel 16:7.

"Man looks on the outward appearance,
But Jahweh looks on the heart."

Another occurs in I Samuel 18:7.

"Saul has slain his thousands,
But David his tens of thousands."

These are in poetic style, with antithetic parallelism.

Hezekiah, when faced with the might of Assyria gave expression to his despair by quoting an old proverb:

"For children have come to the birth
But there is no strength to bear them."
(II K.19:3, Isa.37:3)

Quite appropriately the meter is the Qinah. Again, Isaiah comments upon the irresponsible conduct of the people of Judah by quoting a proverb which is still common: "Eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." (Isa.22:13). And turning to Amos, we find the following proverb in the form of a rhetorical question:

"Can horses run up a cliff?
Or can the sea be plowed with oxen?" (Amos 6:12)

Jeremiah asks a similar question:

"Can the negro change his skin?
Or the leopard its spots?" (Jer.13:23)

One other example must be mentioned, namely, Samson's riddle,¹ which is merely the maschal in the form of a question. It is almost impossible to represent the paronomasia, the alliteration and the subtlety of Samson's riddle and reply in a translation.

Now more examples might be given. But the nature of this form of the maschal has been indicated. In most cases we have still the spontaneous production of the proverb.

But in the next stage we reach the deliberate literary form. Amos 5:3 for example:

"The city which sent out a thousand shall have but
a hundred left,
And the one that sent forth a hundred shall have
but ten left."

Or Isaiah 1:3

"The ox knows its owner, and the ass its master's crib,
But Israel does not know, my people does not
consider."

Such proverbs consisting of several lines, of which there are other examples, may have their nucleus in a popular phrase, but the finished product is the conscious work of one individual.

Let us look now at the parable, which is merely an amplified simile. Nathan's parable² in brief form would be something like this: "Like the rich man who stole the poor man's only lamb." The added details merely intensify the appeal to the emotions of the hearer until self-judgment is passed. With Nathan's parable we may mention Isaiah's parable of the vineyard.³ These are both amplified similes.

The allegory, on the other hand, is an extended metaphor-- each subject is represented under the guise of some aptly suggestive likeness and each term has symbolic meaning. In this regard we may refer to passages in Ezekiel; for example, the allegory of the two eagles, the cedar and the vine recorded in Ezekiel 17:1-10.

¹ Judges 14:12-18

² II Sam.12:1-4

³ Isa.5:1-7

The next stage is the "Lehrgedicht" or didactic poem, in which one theme is discussed throughout, the thought being divisible into strophes. And there is a further development here, for the thought is moving out of the sphere of merely practical morality into the realm of religion and philosophy. The transition is seen in such poems as Psalms 127, 128, 133, Psalms of the Pilgrim Collection. These three Psalms emphasize the homey virtues, and have just a tinge of religion.

Orthodox religion finds expression in Psalm 1 and the second part of Psalm 19, which in more or less detail describe the ideal pious man of the Ezra type and sing the praises of the Law. The devotees of legalism then produce such artificial and monotonous poems as Psalms 34, 111, 112 and 119 which are in the form of alphabetic acrostics. The more creative and acute religious spirit, on the other hand, deals with the problem of theodicy in Psalms 49 and 73, both poems of some length containing a number of strophes. Finally we have the book of Job where this theme is discussed passionately throughout the length of a number of chapters.

Now what conclusions can be drawn from this rapid survey? Three at least become apparent:

1. We see that there is a development in the form of the Wisdom literature, from the very simple to the more and more elaborate and complex.
2. This further fact is to be noted, that the Wisdom literature is very early in Israel. In this respect W.F. Albright's article in the current B.A.S.O.R. is interesting. He presents in translation 'An Archaic Hebrew Proverb in An Amarna Letter from Central Palestine' which is as follows: "If ants are smitten, they do not receive (the smiting passively) but they bite the hand of the man who smites them."
3. It also becomes apparent that the Wisdom type of literature was very extensively employed, and that by various classes of people. And it leads us to surmise that the literature which is still preserved for us in the Old Testament is but a sample of all that was produced.