

BULLETIN
OF THE
CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

BULLETIN
DE LA
SOCIETE CANADIENNE DES ETUDES BIBLIQUES

No. 42

1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS (1982)	1
II.	PAPERS: ANNUAL MEETING (1982)	32
III.	PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY: ANNUAL MEETING (1982)	35
IV.	C.S.B.S. EXECUTIVE (1982-83)	40
V.	NEWS OF C.S.B.S. MEMBERSHIP: PUBLICATIONS, RESEARCH, NEW APPOINTMENTS	41
VI.	MEMBERSHIPS (1982-83)	50
VII.	NOTICES	52

[CN ISSN 0068-970X]

EDITOR: C.M. FOLEY
ST. THOMAS MORE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
1437 COLLEGE DRIVE
SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN
S7N 0W6
CANADA

"Nothing New Under the Sun" Is Bad for
Business: Biblical Studies Today.

1982 Presidential Address

The Canadian Society of Biblical Studies
Société canadienne des études bibliques

Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration
Ottawa, June 2-4th, 1982

Robert C. Culley
Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University

"NOTHING NEW UNDER THE SUN" IS BAD FOR BUSINESS: BIBLICAL STUDIES TODAY

The year 1932 is important in biblical studies for three things: the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies was begun, Herman Gunkel died, and I was born.

Now, it is true that the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies did not meet until 1933, but if the gestation period for learned societies is closer to that of humans than of elephants, we may assume it really began somewhere in 1932.

These three events are, I suppose, not of equal importance. For international biblical studies, the death of Herman Gunkel in 1932 might be the best known, even though Brevard Childs in his recent Introduction pronounced him dead in 1921. Probably only Canadian biblical scholars will show much interest in the 50th anniversary of CSBS. Only my closest family and the McGill Pension plan care about the date of my birth. As far as Gunkel and myself are concerned, I must admit that I did for a time wonder if there might be something to the notion of metempsychosis. However, all speculation along these lines ceased when I was told that a woman who once

met Gunkel reported that he had "ein Gesicht wie ein Topf voll Mauser"--a face like a pot full of mice.

As for CSBS, Gunkel, and me, these three things have a tenuous connection beyond the year 1932. At the age of 50, a scholar like myself may well look back and wonder whether what he or she has been doing over the past couple of decades makes any sense. I would like to do some of this. A learned society at 50 years, which in Canada is quite an age, might well reflect on what is happening in the discipline it represents. I would like to do something of this as well. Gunkel fits in because one of his great interests was in the forms of language which had emerged in Ancient Israel. I would like to pick up this interest in the question of language, although in a different way than Gunkel and his successors did. Therefore, this address will be a modest reflection on the field of biblical studies. It will be accomplished by examining what may be called a new direction in biblical studies, one which has to do with seeing the Bible as a work of language. This will be done largely in terms of my own work in this area but an attempt will be made to set the new direction in the context of biblical studies as a whole.

The title, "'Nothing New Under the Sun' Is Bad for Business," expresses the mixed feelings I have about new

directions. On the whole, I share the view expressed by the quote from Qoheleth. It is an illusion to get too excited over the new. The new is often the old. It's been done before. Furthermore, the new soon becomes old as in each new generation, biblical scholars driven by dark Oedipal urges arise to kill their fathers. But this blood-thirsty rite gives weight to the other side of the question. Our business turns on the new, going beyond what has already been said, gaining new ways of looking at things. And of course, this is the fun and the challenge of it all. Thus, I have always enjoyed poking around on the fringes trying to sort out the brilliant new insights from what is just plain weird.

But what is this direction that I have described as having to do with language? This needs to be identified more clearly. Broadly speaking, this approach expresses an interest and concern with the fact that the Bible is language. Now, this is not news. There have always been scholars interested in this. I have already mentioned Gunkel. Nevertheless, what has become noticeable in recent years is a more concerted and thorough-going effort to place this question of language in a central position and to follow out the implications of the fact that the Bible is language in a more systematic way than has been done before.

This approach can be called a new direction because it is not simply an extension of the main lines of criticism dominant for the past hundred years or so, usually called historical criticism. Historical criticism began with an analytic thrust. Through source criticism and then form criticism, the original oral and written units were sought and an attempt was made to link these units with their original historical setting. Some have also assumed or implied that what the text meant in its original setting is in effect what the text means. Even form criticism which is by definition an approach to literature ended up by-and-large as a tool for historical reconstruction of the history of Israel not only in its literary but also in its political, social, religious, and cultural dimensions. With the coming of tradition history and redaction criticism, a synthetic thrust emerged in historical criticism. The coming together of units into larger and larger collections gained the centre of attention. But the aim remained largely historical, namely, to trace the history of this growth. The problem of meaning became more complex because units were now seen as having been read in a number of different historical settings beyond the original. Meaning can be sought in the shape of final stages of collection and the intention of redactors.

In the new direction that I am seeking to delineate, the historical question is edged out of the centre of attention to make room for questions of language. The nature of a work of language becomes a significant issue. What linguistic and literary structures govern the shape of biblical texts? This shift in approach from history to language is sufficiently great that one may speak of a new perspective, or at least a different perspective. In what follows, I will make some general comments on the perspective of language, more to the study of narrative as a specific illustration (that means my own work on narrative), then illustrate further by means of a specific text, Exodus chapter 13:17 to the end of chapter 14, and finish with a brief evaluation.

Let me begin, then, with some general observations which derive from the notion that two perspectives can be adopted toward the Bible, an historical and a language perspective. There are actually more perspectives than this and this is so because of the nature of the Bible. When I say the Bible I usually mean the Hebrew Scriptures or Old Testament, although much of what is said can be extended to the Christian Bible.

Well, what is the Bible? For purposes of discussion, let me say that the Bible is a collection of ancient

sacred writings which has continued to be canonical scripture for two major religious traditions. This does not say everything but it may explain my point. There are a number of elements in this rough definition which can represent ways of looking at the Bible, or perspectives one may adopt toward the Bible. For example, to say that the Bible is ancient invites historical study. This may lead to attempts to the reconstruction of the text in its setting of Ancient Israel, or an exploration of the gap between ancient cultures and our own. Then too, the word collection suggests the process of growth from small units to ever larger entities which historical criticism has sought with great industry over so many decades to trace and chronicle.

The fact that the Bible functioned as a collection of sacred writings for the religious community of Ancient Israel, has significant implications which Brevard Childs, for one, has been so anxious to pursue. To be sure, some of the material in the Hebrew Bible may have arisen in what was in effect a secular context. But probably most of it did not. In any case, from very early on most, and very soon all, of the writings were functioning as special writings for segments of the religious community so that religious and theological concerns played a role in the process of collecting and editing. And so, what

Childs is trying to do in what he calls a canonical approach may indeed represent a distinct perspective. Two ideas are stressed. The development of canon involves the notion of sacred writings but also the notion that the process of collection in the case of the Hebrew Bible was neither haphazard nor random. The religious community exercised choice, made selections. New material was added to old, often with indirect or implied comment being made on the old.

Nor is it irrelevant to biblical studies that the Hebrew Bible is still scripture for Judaism and, along with the New Testament, for Christianity. For scholars within these traditions, the perspective of the Bible as scripture may likely be the most important perspective, although this usually entails the problem of how to place a notion of scripture in an appropriate relationship with and not in isolation from other important perspectives like historical criticism. One might note that the interest in Marxist interpretation of biblical texts comes largely, although not exclusively, from persons active within Christian communities.

Finally, the Bible is a collection of writings, an artifact of language. This leads to the language perspective that I spoke of earlier. I have used the term

language here rather than simply literary because I have in mind a wider range of approaches than the term literary usually covers. For example, I would want to include in a perspective of language that branch of linguistics called discourse analysis which aims at determining the factors which produce coherence in texts such as, with regard to narrative, the structure of paragraphs, episodes, and stories. This kind of study ends up looking at things like plot and viewpoint that have usually been features examined by literary critics. I would also include the kind of study of poetry and story done by folklorists. Structuralist analysis has grown in no small degree from the work of both linguists and folklorists. Structuralist analysis of biblical texts has largely been done on New Testament texts by scholars at CADIR in Lyon and by Daniel Patte but there are some experiments with this approach on Old Testament texts, the work of David Jobling, for example.

Then, of course, there are an increasing number of studies using literary criticism, as the term is normally applied, say, in the study of English literature. David Robertson has discussed this in his little book, The Old Testament and the Literary Critic. More recently, Robert Polzin has drawn on an important strand of Russian literary criticism to develop a compositional analysis

which he applied to the Deuteronomist. The work of Robert Alter, a scholar in comparative literature, may be mentioned as well. Most of these linguistic and literary studies which I have included in a language approach have been done on narrative texts. But there are signs of this kind of approach in poetry as well, witness the recent books of O'Connor and Kugel. I have not even mentioned the recent widely publicized book by Northrop Frye.

While the approaches which I have just mentioned represent a wide variety involving different disciplines like linguistics, folklore, and literary studies one thing is held in common: a major interest in the biblical text, its nature, its structure, its composition as a work of language. More often than not, these approaches do not simply focus on individual units in the text like poems or stories but show a similar interest in the many larger collections of texts which make up the Bible, or the whole Bible. But the interest is not so much in the process or stages of collection as it might be in historical criticism but in the ways in which the collection displays coherence, the way it sticks together because it is language and literature.

So far, then, we have suggested that a language perspective is one of a number of perspectives which can be adopted toward the Bible. We have seen that an interest

in text is central to this perspective. Now, we need to examine this notion more closely and we can do this I think by considering a fundamental decision that any scholar has to make at the very start of any study which seeks to produce a serious analysis of or systematic reflection on a text. The whole Bible is too big to swallow at one gulp and so for examination and discussion the text must be broken up into smaller bits. But this breaking up of the text is a subtle business. An analyst wants to break up the text along natural lines or seams so that the smaller elements which are obtained are not just fragments or chunks torn away at random but are genuine elements or constituents. One must also ask what is most important: the entities gained through analysis or the larger whole from which they are taken. Are these elements to be seen as constituent elements of a larger whole which is more important than the parts? This is another way of asking what kind of collection the Bible is.

The tradition has presented us with obvious divisions: large groupings like law, prophets, and writings, then books, chapters and verses. Certainly, in religious tradition this collection of books was seen to have a very special unity, although in some exegetical traditions the unit of the verse seems to have gained remarkable importance, functioning almost independently from larger

contexts.

It has been the great contribution of historical criticism to demonstrate that the Bible was a collection in a much more complex sense than the traditional divisions have indicated. We have noted how the basic units in historical analysis were things like a portion of text which could be attributed to a single author or literary units like stories and poems, which may have circulated independently in oral tradition. Larger collections like Noth's Deuteronomistic historical work were also identified. Marking historical stages has been an important principle in this kind of criticism. For many, it was deemed important and revealing to identify the various literary units and collections and set them out along a chronological line, that is, to see the Bible as the sum of its units and collections. There is a genuine payoff for this kind of analysis. This is well known, and little more need be said.

On the other hand, the traditional shape of the Bible continued to have a great appeal. This is remarkable, given the historical complexity we now know it to have. This success of the traditional form suggests that the various parts of the Bible stick together rather well. The Bible gives the impression of being a major

literary work. In fact, persons who are trained in the study of literature see such a measure of coherence that they often argue that it is more useful to read the Bible as it stands than re-arranged in chronological order (Northrop Frye, for example). Now, the point is really not the size of the unit. There is no reason why one may not study from the perspective of language a single story, or a historical layer like the Priestly tradition. What needs to be seen is that, in terms of the structures of language, meaningful units can be put together from heterogeneous elements from different times and authors. For example, the narrative of the Pentateuch seems to flow fairly well, even though a careful reader can distinguish a number of sources from different historical periods with different points of view. Narratives, at least of this traditional sort, can be stuck together to form larger and thicker stories. To follow these lines is, I think, to get close to the heart of the matter. It is to ask about the nature of language, about the structures of language, of texts, of literary works.

These are large questions. Scholars who have adopted a language perspective, for some or all of their work, are trying in many and various way to come to grips with them at least as far as biblical texts

are concerned. There has been much experimenting with linguistic, folklorist, structuralist, and literary approaches. As in other fields, many experiments do not work very well.

The best I can do to illustrate what I take to be a perspective of language is to say something about my own experiments, my work on narrative.

When I began working on narrative, it struck me that I would not go too far wrong if I focused on what appears to be a very basic characteristic of narrative, at least for the kinds of traditional narration found in the Bible, that is, narrative action, which is often described in terms of movement from complication to resolution. Stories begin and stories end. We usually know when a story begins and we usually know when it ends. We sense when a tension arises that needs a resolution and we sense when it has been resolved. A narrator may well choose to focus attention on other features found in narrative, something about a character or something unusual about an event, nevertheless all this will be done within this basic framework of narrative action, a movement from complication to resolution.

My own work began with an examination of the shortest stories I could find in the Hebrew Bible in the hope that

these, being reduced to the barest essentials, would yield a clear and uncomplicated view of narrative action. The Russian folklorist Vladimir Propp drew attention in his work on fairy tales to the fact that stories which were very different on the surface actually had very similar underlying patterns of narrative action. My analysis of biblical texts at a modest level of abstraction indicates that a small number of story patterns are being repeated over and over again in many different forms. One such pattern has to do with punishment: a wrong is done and a wrong is punished.

Another pattern which is very common moves from a difficulty to a removal of the difficulty. This often accomplished by an intervention of the deity who rescues persons from various situations through his power. The healing of Naaman has such a pattern. Less often there is no miracle because the hero rescues himself or others by his wits or his strength.

I have called patterns like the punishment and rescue patterns "action sequences" and have suggested that these sequences are a basic building block of narrative. One action sequence like a punishment sequence can itself be a story but more sequences can be added, embedded, or intertwined to form longer and more complex stories. The fuller story of Naaman, Elisha, and Gehazi

joins a punishment story to a rescue story. In my view, the coherence of the larger narrative complexes of the Bible like the Pentateuch even though composed of different layers and sources can be traced by examining how action sequence are related to each other. There is another way in which action sequences induce coherence in the biblical text. Reading one punishment story can evoke all other punishment stories. To read one rescue story can evoke all other rescue stories. Since punishment and rescue are important features of the prophetic tradition and the psalms, then there are also powerful links between narrative and other traditions.

This leads to one final matter which may be taken up before examining Exodus 13 and 14. In speaking of the Bible as a collection and in considering how one breaks up a text for analysis, we have been dealing with conflicting signals. On the one hand, the familiar contribution of historical criticism was noted, according to which the Bible can be seen as a complex layering of traditions consisting of individual stories, poems, and other genres up through even larger collections. It is very easy to stress differences and be very sensitive to distinctions from this perspective.

On the other hand, scholars looking at the problem of language and text, especially those using a literary approach, are more inclined to talk about coherence and what

holds texts together. I can refer again to the views of David Robertson. He suggests that a literary critic normally works with the assumption, once a specific text has been selected for study, that the selected portion is a meaningful whole. If one, then, chooses to study the book of Genesis, the important subdivisions would be the Abraham stories, the Isaac stories, the Jacob stories, and the Joseph story, all of which a critic would seek to relate to each other. "The critic assumes," says Robertson, "that the text he is interpreting is a whole, and that, while not every part of the text is of equal importance, every part is integral to the whole and each part modifies the meaning of the whole" (6). Robertson does not deny the existence of J, E, and P. In fact, he sees no reason why one could not select any one of these as the object of literary analysis. But for him, doing the whole of Genesis is more fun.

Robert Polzin has made a similar statement in his recent book Moses and the Deuteronomist, a literary study of the Deuteronomic history. "I will assume from the start" he says, "that the Deuteronomic History is a unified literary work" (18). Polzin does not any more than Robertson reject the existence of sources or editorial activity over a long period of time. He claims that "we are still responsible for making sense of the present text by assuming that the present text, in more cases than previously realized, does

make sense" (17) which sounds a little less absolute than Robertson. Indeed, his position is not exactly that of Robertson's in that he has adapted his approach to the composition of biblical texts from the theories of Mikhail Bakhtin, a Russian literary critic. As far as I understand it, Bakhtin sees discourse in society as multiple and, in addition, holds that one kind of novel (Dostoevsky is taken as an example) reflects these multiple languages of society within the structure of the novel itself so that it can be described a polyphonic having a number of voices participating in an internal dialogue. However, this system of languages is organized in a literary way. One still thinks of an author but the intention of the author is refracted through the many social languages brought together in the novel. The idea of many voices is intriguing and it will be interesting to see where Polzin's adaptation of Bakhtin leads and how he finally relates the notion of a unified literary work with an implied author and the idea of many voices in the work.

This point, the concept of an integral whole or unified literary work, has always troubled me when applied to biblical texts because so many of these are clearly composite. I am certainly not arguing against looking for coherence in such texts since my own work has led in this direction. I am simply asking if the assumption of a single integrating intention as a heuristic construct will encourage

a tilt toward seeing unity or coherence where ever possible in a similar way that the notion of sources has encouraged a tilt toward finding diversity wherever possible in historical criticism. Is there not something in between these two choices? Is the supposition of a composite text which shows real signs of being put together from different sources or traditions and yet at the same time displays a significant measure of coherence possible? This would not mean rejecting the idea of a literary whole but it might require us to consider a different way of talking about such a composite whole whether this be individual stories, larger collections in the Bible, or the whole Bible. Indeed, it intrigued me to see that Robert Alter, in his recent book, The Art of Biblical Narrative, does take up the idea of composite narrative to explore what this might mean in connection with some biblical examples. We will return to this issue later.

The last major step to be taken is to examine briefly a biblical text in order to see some of the things which emerge when a language perspective is adopted. It is not possible to consider all the new and interesting approaches which are being tried currently. I will stick to my knitting and consider especially two issues mentioned already: action sequences as important constituents of narrative and the problem of how to deal critically with a composite text.

That section of Exodus which runs from v.17 of chapter thirteen on to the end of chapter 14 is well-known to all. In the present form of the Bible, this text is part of a much larger narrative which includes the plagues and culminates in the slaughter of the first-born leading directly to the departure of the Israelites from Egypt. Nevertheless, the chosen selection is sufficiently self-contained to provide a useful basis for discussion. In a broad sense, the account of the events found in Exodus 13:17 and 14 gives the impression of being a single account of a single event. After leaving Egypt, the people find themselves in the wilderness. Pharaoh sets out after them. The remarkable happening at the sea leaves the Egyptian army dead and the Israelites free to go their way.

Nevertheless, as everyone knows, this passage has long been viewed as a combination of different sources, mainly J and P with a little dash of E. From S.R. Driver to the recent commentaries of Martin Noth and Brevard Childs, few significant differences are evident in identification of sources. This division into sources is based on some serious tensions evident at key points in the narrative. From the point of view of the question of composite narrative, it will be important to measure the force of these tensions and so two focal points will be considered briefly.

The first focal point is verse 21 of chapter 14. This

verse comes at the point in the story where the waters are moved. The text runs this way: "Moses stretched out his hand over the sea. Yahweh caused the waters to move all night by means of a strong east wind. He made the sea dry ground. The waters were split." Since Yahweh had instructed Moses earlier to stretch out his hand and split the waters, one assumes that here Moses is doing what he was told. But what has troubled scholars about this verse is that in between these two actions we are told that Yahweh caused a wind to blow all night so that the sea became dry ground. I find it difficult not to agree with those who say that we have two conflicting pictures here: one, where the waters are split dramatically forming, as the next verse indicates, two walls on either side and another where the waters are moved off by the action of a wind blowing all night. The remarkable thing from our point of view is why anyone would want to intertwine these in the same verse implying that we were dealing with one event. This is the most striking tension in the story.

The same conflicting view is continued in the verses which follow when we learn of the fate of the Egyptian army. The conflicts are less sharp. The apparent clogging of the chariot wheels in verse 25 may fit the picture of waters blown away by the wind. In verses 27 and 28, Moses again raises his hand and the waters, apparently collapsing from

the walls they had formed on either side, cover the Egyptians. But in between these two actions, it is said that the waters returned to their normal course in the morning, as though the waters blown away by the wind during the night were not allowed to return. Verse 24 adds another feature. Yahweh, looking down from the pillar of fire and cloud, panics the Egyptian camp. This could be a third picture of what happened.

The second focal point is in the first few verses of chapter 14. The question here is: why did Pharaoh pursue the Israelites? The first four verses of chapter 14 seem to give a clear answer. In a speech to Moses, Yahweh tells him to have the people turn back and camp near the sea. Pharaoh will think they are confused. Yahweh will harden his heart to pursue so that Yahweh will be able to gain a glorious victory. But this speech is followed directly in v.5 by a puzzling statement to the effect that the King of Egypt received a report that the people had fled. Then right after this in the same verse it is reported that Pharaoh and his officials have a change of heart and regret letting Israel leave their service. The statement telling of the pursuit is repeated two or three times. There seem to be two pictures about the pursuit. In one, Yahweh sets a trap. In the other, Pharaoh regrets his earlier action and sets out to do something about it. Whether the report

about a flight of the people is a fragment of yet another version is difficult to say.

In mentioning these two focal points of tension in the narrative, I am saying nothing new. It is all old stuff. I am simply affirming that I too see significant tension and think that any close reader of the text would as well. But there is another way in which tension can be seen in the story and this is related to the narrative action, that is, these movements in the story from complication to resolution which have been called above narrative sequences. Two parallel sequences can be identified.

One of these can be called a rescue sequence in that there is a difficulty or danger which is removed. One picks this up with decision of Pharaoh to pursue the Israelites. When the Egyptian army arrives on the scene, the Israelites are terrified and cry out to Moses. It is only at this point that Moses tells the people not to fear for Yahweh will perform a rescue, a deliverance. This happens in the event at the sea, where v. 30 emphasizes that Yahweh delivered Israel. In this sequence, there appears to be a real danger and a dramatic rescue.

Intertwined with this action sequence, there seems to be another kind of movement. Yahweh has decided well beforehand to humiliate Pharaoh in order to assert his own power. He plans to get Pharaoh out in the wilderness near

the sea and gain a glorious victory, and this happens. The movement of the action starts with an announcement in which Yahweh tells Moses what he plans to do. This sort of thing can be the beginning of an action sequence and provide the kind of tension which is needed to start a story. Once the announcement is made, we are waiting to hear how it works out. Once it happens, we are satisfied and the action sequence is at an end. Childs notices this element and calls it an announcement-fulfillment pattern, although I do not believe he is very successful in describing the narrative in this section because he has not developed appropriate ways of discussing narrative. Now in this sequence (announcement-happens), there is no danger to the people of Israel and therefore no rescue. Pharaoh is being set up. Yahweh will see to it that he comes out after Israel so that his army will be destroyed.

In my view, these two action sequences, the rescue and the announcement, run side by side in the story and thus provide a more fundamental tension than the contradictory details mentioned earlier. The rescue in parts of the story usually attributed to it would seem to make real sense only if there was a real danger from Pharaoh's pursuit. The announcement in parts of the story usually attributed to it implies that Pharaoh was at no time really in control of events.

This, then, is what one might call a composite narrative. How does one read such a text? We have seen that source analysis has found definite signs of a J account, a P account, and traces of E. Certainly there are indications in the tensions both with regard to details and to action sequences that there are at least two different pictures of what happened as well as some puzzling details which may point to at least one other picture and possibly more. Why not do what is often done: separate the text into two or three sources and deal with each one independently as chronologically distinct stages giving different versions of the Exodus story? This is certainly possible but one must reconstruct what each version must have been since the process of joining the accounts involved the leaving out parts of at least some of the versions. In his commentary, Childs gives a tentative reconstruction of the sources. Even so, Childs, as you might expect, is not happy to leave it there. Some persons or persons merged these accounts and so must have thought it important to do so. He speaks of the final author or witness. He argues that the redactor has formed a story which was different from its parts. This final literary production is according to him a meaningful composition and has an integrity of its own. In other words, he seems to be taking a position similar to that of a literary critic like Robertson quoted above,

without, however, adopting a literary perspective or adopting any modes of analysis which would normally be associated with literary criticism. As far as I can tell, Childs simply gives an example of how one might read the story as a single story if one were determined to do so. And this seems to mean ignoring or playing down the tensions in the story which I have outlined above. I agree with Childs, and with literary critics, who believe that there is sufficient justification for reading this story as it is (as well as in its sources). Someone tried hard to weave sources together as though this were one story about one event. Yet, the tensions are unresolvable and irreducible. Nevertheless, we are invited to see what we can make of this composition. It is certainly worth a try before we conclude that someone tried to put two versions together which do not match but did not succeed.

Our problems may have something to do with perception. On the wall of the classroom in which I often teach is a copy of a painting which one critic has called the most significant of our century. It is Picasso's Guernica. It is his response to the destruction of a little Spanish town by German bombers in the Civil War. In this picture, a cluster of images: a bull, a horse, a woman with a dead child, a lamp in a woman's arm, a lightbulb, an arm clutching

a broken sword, all fragments of external reality, each one distorted by shifts in perspective, merge into one another blurring and confusing the shapes. This is a deliberate and shocking composite. It is not directly comparable to composite biblical materials. One might think also of the Dutch artist M.C. Escher some of whose paintings appear at first glance to be quite natural but on closer examination contain fundamental contradictions, such as the Waterfall where the water from a waterfall flows into a channel which ends up feeding the same waterfall.

At any rate, all that needs to be said on this point is that modern art is one of the things, and it is only one of many, which suggests that a meaningful whole in art or literature need not present a unified picture but may embrace tensions and contradictions. The stark example of modern art may at least encourage us to struggle with composite texts containing strong tensions and contradictions and to be open to exploring different kinds of perception, different way of perceiving. When Robert Alter discusses composite biblical texts, he proposes that biblical writers and redactors had "certain notions of unity rather different from our own" so that they were led "to violate what a later age and culture would be disposed to think of as canons of unity and logical coherence" (133). He mentions postcubist painting with its contradictory mixtures of profile

and frontal perspective as an example of a style involving a different notion of unity.

If we may return to the Exodus text just briefly, many of the tensions in details and narrative action seem to cluster around the one issue, the description of the divine as present and active. This is where the blur is. As we have seen, some details indicate direct divine action and presence. Yahweh is there in a cloud. From the cloud he panics the Egyptian camp and shakes them into the sea. On the other hand, indirect action is seen where Moses acts as agent and intermediary, even though the miracle of splitting the waters is a very dramatic, direct intervention of supernatural powers. The movement of the water by the east wind, while still striking, is more indirectly brought about by natural agencies working more slowly. From the point of view of action sequences, the announcement sequence views Yahweh as supremely in control, stage-managing everything without any opposition. The rescue sequence sees Yahweh entering into a situation of genuine conflict with a real enemy threatening.

In a way, it should not be surprising to discover blurring and tensions in connection with deity. Many religious traditions would reflect this in their attempts to discuss, tell stories about or depict in poems the supernatural or the transcendent. In the New Testament

traditions in the Gospels illustrate this, especially the resurrection accounts. I think that one can take composite texts like the Exodus seriously with all the tensions they present because they reflect in a smaller way some of the fundamental ambiguities of the larger tradition which is not limited to the relatively small number of composite narratives like the Exodus story. The whole Bible is a composite and, if one wishes to grasp as a whole the richness and complexity of this whole, we will need to reflect further on things like the nature of perception, the significance of ambiguity, and how one develops a critical approach capable of dealing adequately with such issues. Isaiah 40-55 was, most would say, all from one author. Yet, it still represents a strange and puzzling composite of oracles combining some remarkable tensions, such as the pictures of the presence and action of Yahweh seen in Chapter 40 compared with that in Chapter 53. Job is a composite and continues to puzzle, intrigue, and challenge interpreters.

As Picasso struggled to grasp the complex and confusing nature of twentieth century humanity, perhaps in an analogous way Ancient Israel was struggling at the borders of language to state their compelling yet illusive vision of the Divine, which no single image captured for them satisfactorily, such that only in the clash of images shimmered the reality they believed so deeply encountered them.

The perspective I have discussed under the heading of a new perspective is just one among the many possible ones that make up biblical studies. The problem of the one and the many has been with us since the pre-Socratics at least. Can all the multiple perspectives be gathered into one great perspective or model? This is appealing but I see no encouraging signs of this at the moment. Must one be chosen over the other? Perhaps we simply do what we feel compelled to do, or want to do, or just plain enjoy doing. I would like to think that as a community of scholars we could maintain a sense of humility sufficiently to work for healthy cooperation and debate, of course setting high standards and making stern demands on ourselves, in the hope that in the clash of our proposals and views, our theories and hypotheses, some glimmers of the truth we seek may be afforded to us.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Alter, Robert.
1981
The Art of Biblical Narrative.
New York: Basic Books.
- Childs, Brevard S.
1979
Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- 1974
The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Frye, Northrop.
1982
The Great Code: The Bible and Literature. Toronto: Academic Press.
- Groupe d'Entrevernes.
1979
Analyse Sémiotique des Textes. Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon.
- Jobling, David.
1978
The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Three Structural Analyses in the Old Testament (I Samuel 13-31, Numbers 11-12, I Kings 17-18). Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series, 7. Sheffield: Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield.
- Patte, Daniel.
1976
What is Structural Exegesis? Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Polzin, Robert.
1980
Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History. New York: Seabury.
- Robertson, David.
1977
The Old Testament and the Literary Critic. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

ANNUAL MEETING (1982)

P A P E R S

Presidential Address

R.C. Culley (McGill) "'Nothing New Under the Sun' Is Bad for Business: Biblical Studies Today".

Guest Lecturers

C. Davis (Concordia) "The Impact of Biblical Criticism on the Concept of Theology".

J. Gold (Waterloo) "The Bible as a Literary Phenomenon".

H. Orlinsky (New York) "Translating the Bible for Protestants, Catholics and Jews". Professor Orlinsky also spoke at the CSBS 50th anniversary banquet.

J.Z. Smith (Chicago) "Empty Thrones: Apocalyptic and Magic in Late Antiquity" (The Carleton University McMartin Memorial Lecture).

Hebrew Bible

D. Burke (Toronto) "2 Kings 21:1-18: Will the real Manasseh please stand up?" (CSBS student prize essay).

E.W. Conrad (Brisbane) "'Fear Not' Oracles in Second Isaiah".

C. Cox (Brandon) "Theodotian's Translation of Job".

M. DeRoche (McMaster) "Covenant Lawsuit in the pre-Exilic Prophets".

L. Eslinger (McMaster) "A Literary Analysis of I. Sam. 8-12".

W.O. McCready (Calgary) "Law in IV Ezra".

S. McEvenue (Concordia) "The Elohist and the Ancestress".

L. Toombs (Wilfrid Laurier) "The Northern Negeb under the Divided Monarchy".

G. Yee (Toronto) "Two Presuppositions in Hosean Scholarship: A Methodological Debate".

New Testament

S. Brown (Toronto) "The Jesus of History and Contemporary Historiography".

J.H. Corbett (Toronto) "Reflections on Normative Self-Definition in Early Christianity".

D. Fraikin (Queens) "Jesus the Persuader".

A. Leske (Concordia) "Covenant Implications for Paul's Concept of Justification by Faith".

S.N. Mason (Toronto) "Pontius Pilate in History: A Critique of P. Winter" (CSBS student prize essay).

B. Meyer (McMaster) "Did Paul's View of Resurrection undergo Development?"

A. Reinhartz (Toronto) "Doubting Thomas and the Johannine View of Signs-Faith".

G.P. Richardson (Toronto) "Proto-Luke and the Pauline Mission".

Biblical Studies (general)

S.B. Frost (McGill) "Science and Creation: A Nineteenth Century Comment".

J. Sandys-Wunsch (Memorial) "'Biblical Theology' in the Eighteenth Century".

Seminar: Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity

L. Gaston (Vancouver) "Retrospect".

H. Remus (Wilfrid Laurier) "Justin's Dialogue".

H. Rollmann (Memorial) "Didache 6:2".

A. Segal (Barnard) "Judaism and Gnosticism".

Seminar: The Book of Job

P. Dion with Messrs. S. Dempster, P. Gentry and W. Morrow (Toronto) "O'Connor's 'Hebrew Verse Structure' and the Book of Job".

I.J. Kagedan (Winnipeg) "Akkadian-based contributions to the Book of Job".

Research Reports

E.G. Clark (Toronto) "Targums".

P.C. Craigie (Calgary) "Ugaritic".

B. Pryzbylski (Edmonton) "The McMaster Project" and the CSBS seminar "Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity".

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

SOCIÉTÉ CANADIENNE DES ÉTUDES BIBLIQUES

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY

50th Annual Meeting

Universite d'Ottawa, 1982

The 50th Annual Business Meeting of the Society was held on Wednesday, June 2, 1982 at the Universite d'Ottawa.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Professor R.C. Culley.

1. Agenda. The agenda was adopted as distributed.
2. Memorial Resolutions. Brief resolutions were moved by the Secretary in remembrance of William Stewart McCullough (ob. May 4, 1982) and Nathaniel Herrington Parker (ob. April 24, 1982), both past Presidents of the Society. Fuller resolutions will be deposited in the Society's archives.
3. Minutes of the 49th Annual Meeting were adopted as printed in the Bulletin, with the addition of Mr. Quammie's name to the list of those attending (Richardson/Brunet).

Business Arising - none.

4. Report of the Treasurer. The Treasurer's Report and financial statement was adopted as circulated (Fox/Brunet) (see pp. 38,39). The Treasurer moved: "that the membership fee be \$22 for regular members, \$14 for students, and \$12 for dual members." Carried (Fox/Runnalls).
5. (a) Election of New Members. The following were elected to membership in the Society (Fox/Williams): Warren Trenchard, Ian B. Maclellan, George Skillington, David Schroeder, Gerald Gerbrandt, Waldemar Janzen, John Kampen, Willi Joubert, Isadore Gorski, Ray Shankman, Solomon Aina, M. Alma Losier, Harvey G. Henderson, Steven N. Mason, Sydney H.T. Page, Michael DeRoche, Daniel J. Block, Marion Finlayson, Barbara E. Organ, Sheila A. Weissenberger.
 - (b) Election of Life Members. It was unanimously agreed to elect the following as life members (Fox/Dion): S.B. Frost, G. Johnston, R.J. Williams.

6. Nominating Committee. The Vice-President put the following names in nomination for 1982-1983 (Klassen/Hurd).

Vice-President (1982-1983) and President (1983-1984): Donna Runnalls
Member-at-large (1982-1984 to fill out Professor Runnalls' term):

C. Foley (to continue as Publications Chairman)

Member-at-large (1982-1985) W. McCready (to serve as Programme
Chairman)

CCSR Delegate (1982-1984 to complete P. Craigie's term): C. Foley

Members were reminded that the following continue to serve:

President (1982-1983) W. Klassen

Treasurer (1980-1983) D.J. Fox

Member-at-large (1980-1983) L. Gaston

Secretary (1982-1985) S.G. Wilson

CFH Delegate (1981-1984) G.P. Richardson

No further nominations were made and the above were declared elected.
A vote of thanks was extended to G.P. Richardson for his term as
Secretary.

7. Programme Committee. No report was necessary. Thanks were extended to Professors Wilson and Pummer.
8. Publications Committee. Professor Foley reported that the SR issue was out, and thanked Professors Dion, Halpern, Klassen, Cahill and Anderson for editorial help. He reported that no action was recommended on last year's suggestion to start a new journal. The state of the MSS before the CCSR was noted, as was the delay of Professor Moir's A Sense of Proportion from Scholar's Press.
9. Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion. Professor Craigie reported.
10. Canadian Federation for the Humanities. Professor Richardson reported on the revived Newsletter, C.F.H.'s lobbying activities, SSHRCC's five-year plan, plans to alter the Constitution of C.F.H., and the Mediterranean Institute.
11. Report of the Executive Secretary

(a) The deliberations of this and other Executives was outlined on the matter of cooperation. It was hoped that (i) Presidential address slots would be kept clear; (ii) programmes would be circulated at the annual meetings; (iii) the joint session would continue, as decided by the three programme chairmen, with a speaker preferably from outside the societies, and with no responses; (iv) seminars might begin beyond the scope of a single society.

(b) Seminars. It was expected to start a seminar in 1983 on "Torah and Nomos." The choice between "The Bible and English Literature" and "Literary Theory and Biblical Narrative" was put to the meeting. "Literary Theory" won hands down.

There being no other business the meeting adjourned at 4.30 to hear Professor Culley's Presidential Address.

Report of the Treasurer (Dr. D.J. Fox)
to the 1982 Annual meeting of C.S.B.S.

Accompanying this report is the financial statement of the Society from May 1st, 1981, to April 30th, 1982, this being the financial year established by the membership at its last annual meeting.

Through the generosity of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada the executive received a travel grant of \$2,200 for its meeting in May, 1981, and an additional \$1,000 for its meeting in Ottawa in January, 1982. The Canadian Federation for the Humanities provided the executive with a special grant of \$1,000 to cover some of the extra expenses related to executive, secretarial and printing expenses. We are grateful to S.S.H.R.C.C. and C.F.H. for these grants which have enabled the members of the executive to meet and plan for this special anniversary meeting of C.S.B.S.

We are also grateful to S.S.H.R.C.C. through C.F.H. for a travel grant of \$3,016 which assisted twenty-one of our members (excluding the executive) to attend the 1981 meeting in Halifax.

I wish to emphasize that one important factor in the calculation of our annual travel grant is the number of members who officially registered (i.e., paid the registration fee) at the previous annual meeting.

Apart from receiving the above travel grants, C.S.B.S. is self-supporting. In the past year we continued to pay \$6.00 per member for Studies in Religion (excluding those who hold "dual" membership, i.e. those who are members of C.S.S.R. or C.T.S.), and \$3.00 per full-time faculty member as our Society's membership fee in the Canadian Federation for the Humanities.

We now have one hundred and fifty-one members (excluding those to be received at this annual meeting). All our members have full voting privileges, but in terms of the present schedule of dues they are as follows (the figures for 1981 are in brackets):

Life members	5	(5)
Full members	112	(117)
Dual members	18	(15)
Student members	16	(21)
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	151	(158)

While our financial year ends on April 30th, our membership dues cover the calendar year and are collected in the autumn of each preceding year. The first notice for the renewal of memberships for 1983 will be sent out in the latter part of September. I would appeal to all members to respond promptly to that notice.

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

May 1st, 1981 - April 30th, 1982

CURRENT ACCOUNT

Receipts

Balance, May 1st, 1981	\$1,263.36	
Executive Travel Grant from SSHRCC (May/81)	2,200.00	
Annual Meeting Travel Grant from CFH (May/81)	3,016.00	
Executive Grant from SSHRCC (Jan./82)	1,000.00	
Executive Grant from CFH (Jan./82)	1,000.00	
Members dues	1,959.50	
U.S. exchange	7.19	\$10,446.05

Expenditures

Subscriptions to <u>Studies in Religion</u>	828.00	
Canadian Federation of the Humanities	333.00	
Executive Travel (May/81)	2,219.00	
Annual Meeting Travel (May/81)	3,016.00	
Annual Meeting Expenses (May/81)	139.33	
Executive Travel (Jan./82)	1,519.35	
Executive Meeting Expenses (Jan./82)	227.06	
Secretarial help for Bulletin	47.25	
Printing of Bulletin	275.98	
Printing and mailing (from University of Toronto)	141.87	
Postage	149.12	
Telephone	45.76	
Bank charges	7.00	8,948.72
Balance		1,497.33
Uncashed cheque		145.00
BANK BALANCE (as of April 30th, 1982)		\$ 1,642.33

SPECIAL SAVINGS ACCOUNT

(for Tax Deductible Donations)

Receipts

Balance, May 1st, 1981	\$107.08
Bank Interest	62.92
<u>BALANCE (as of April 30th, 1982)</u>	<u>\$170.00</u>

Expenditures - None

Note: The reason for this high amount is that during the year \$2,000 from the current account was held in this savings account for several months.

Submitted by

Douglas J. Fox,
 Treasurer, C.S.B.S.

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL STUDIESSOCIÉTÉ CANADIENNE DES ÉTUDES BIBLIQUESOFFICERS / OFFICIERS: 1982-1983

President: William Klassen, Director of Resources, Simon Fraser University,
(1982-83) Burnaby, British Columbia. V5A 1S6

Vice-President: Donna Runnalls, Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill
University, Montreal, P.Q. H3A 2T5 (President: 1983-84)

Executive Secretary: Stephen G. Wilson, Department of Religion, Carleton
(1982-85) University, Ottawa, Ontario. K1S 5B6

Treasurer: Douglas Fox, Huron College, University of Western Ontario,
(1980-83) London, Ontario. N6G 1H3

Publications Chairman: Christopher Foley, St. Thomas More College,
(1972-84) University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. S7N 0W6

Programme Chairman: Wayne McCreedy, University of Calgary, Calgary,
Alberta. T2N 1N4

Member-at-large: Lloyd Gaston, Vancouver School of Theology, 6000 Iona
Drive, Vancouver, British Columbia. V6T 1L4

Past President: Robert Culley, Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill
(1981-82) University, Montreal, P.Q. H3A 2T5

C.F.H. Representative: Peter Richardson, University College, 15 King's
(1981-84) College Circle, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.
M5S 1A1

C.C.S.R. Representative: Christopher Foley (see above).

Local Representative, 1983 Learned: Lloyd Gaston (see above).

1. PUBLICATIONS BY MEMBERS: BOOKS

Brown, S.

With D.E. Saliers. Proclamation 2: Aids for Interpreting the Lessons
of the Church Year. Series B: Pentacost 3. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Carson, D.A.

Ed. From Sabbath to Lords Day: A Biblical, Historical and
Theological Investigation. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Press, 1982.

Craigie, P.

Ugarit and the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1983.

Culley, R.

Ed. with T.J. Overholt. Anthropological Perspectives on Old
Testament Prophecy. Semeia, 21 (1981).

Hurtado, L.H.

A Commentary on the Gospel of Mark. Good News Bible Commentary
Series. Ed. W.W. Gasque and C.E. Armerding. San Francisco: Harper
and Row, 1983.

Luedemann, G.

Paulus, der Heidenapostel, Vol. II Antipaulinismus im fruhen
Christentum. Gottingen, 1983.

Paulus und das Judentum. Munchen, 1983.

Olson, T.

Millennialism, Utopianism and Progress. Toronto: University of
Toronto Press, 1982.

Remus, H.

Pagan-Christian Conflict Over Miracle in the Second Century.
Patristic Monograph Series, No. 10. Cambridge, Mass., 1983.

Trenchard, W.C.

Ben Sira's View of Women: A Literary Analysis. Brown Judaic
Studies. Chico: Scholar's Press, 1982.

Trites, A.A.

New Testament Witness in Today's World. Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson
Press, 1983.

2. PUBLICATIONS BY MEMBERS: ARTICLES

- Cahill, P.J.
"Hermeneutical Implications of Typology," CBQ, 44 (1982), 256-265.
- Carson, D.A.
"Christological Ambiguities in the Gospel of Matthew," in Christ the Lord (Festschrift for D. Guthrie). Ed. N.N. Roindson. Leicester: IVP, 1982, pp. 97-114.
"Frendry on Matthew: A Critical Review," Trin.J., 3 (1982), 71-91.
"Introduction," in From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical and Theological Investigation. Ed. D.A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, pp. 13-19.
"Jesus and The Sabbath in the Four Gospels," in From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical and Theological Investigation. Ed. D.A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982, pp. 57-97.
"The Jewish Leaders in Matthew's Gospel: A Reappraisal," JETS, 25 (1982).
"The Personal God," in Handbook of Christian Belief. Ed. R. Keeley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, pp. 150-162.
"Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel," Tyndale Bulletin, 331 (1982), 59-91.
- Ceresko, A.R.
"The Function of antanaclasis (mq? "to find"/mq? "to reach, overtake, grasp") in Hebrew Poetry, Especially in the Book of Qoheleth," CBQ, 44 (1982), 551-569.
- Corbett, J.M.
"The Saint as Patron in the Work of Gregory of Tours," Journal of Medieval History, 7 (1981), 1-13.
- Cox, C.
"Biblical Studies and the Armenian Bible, 1955-1980," RB, 89 (1982), 99-113.
with M.E. Stone, "Guidelines for Editions of Armenian Biblical Texts," Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 15 (1982), 51-59.
- Craigie, C.
"Amos the NŌQĒD in the Light of Ugaritic," SR, II (1982), 29-33.
- Culley, R.
"Anthropology and Old Testament Studies: An Introductory Comment," Semeia, 21 (1981), 1-5.

- Dion, P.E.
Contributions to D. Pardee, Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.
"Deutéronome 21,1-9: Miroir du développement légal et religieux d'Israël," SR, 11 (1982), 13-22.
"Image et ressemblance en araméen ancien (Tell Fakhariyah)," Science et Esprit, 34 (1982), 151-153.
"Ressemblance et image de Dieu dans l'Ancien Orient et dans l'Ancien Testament," in Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible, vol. 10, fasc. 55 (Paris, 1981), 365-403.
Two articles on Aramaic epistolography in Semeia, 22 (1981).
- Duhaime, J.L.
"Le verset 8 du Psaume 51 et la destruction de Jérusalem," Eglise et Théologie, 13 (1982), 35-56.
- Halpern, B.
With J. Huehnergard. "El Amarna Letter 252," Orientalia, 51 (1982), 227-230.
- Hurtado, L.W.
"The Doxology at the End of Romans," in New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger. Ed. E.J. Epp, and G.D. Fee. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981, pp. 185-199.
"The Study of New Testament Christology: Notes for the Agenda," Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers. Ed. K.H. Richards. Chico: Scholars Press, 1981, pp. 185-197.
- Jeffrey, D.L.
"Encoding and the Reader's Text: Northrop Frye's Great Code," University of Toronto Quarterly, Winter (1983).
"Literature in an Apocalyptic Age," Dalhousie Review, 61 (1981), 426-446.
"Northrop Frye's Creation and Recreation," Canadian Literature, 91 (1981), 111-117.
- Olson, T.
"Covenant, Cross and Resurrection," in Biblical Basis of the Christian Family. Southeast Asian Christian Life Series, Vol. I. Ed. L. Paw and L. Olson. Iloilo City, Philippines: Baptist Council on World Mission, 1982.
- Pummer, R.
"Antisamaritanische Polemik in jüdischen Schriften aus der intertestamentarischen Zeit," BZ, 26 (1982), 224-242.

- "Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," HTR, 75 (1982), 177-188.
- Remus, H.
 "Does Terminology Distinguish Early Christian from Pagan Miracles?" JBL, 101 (1982), 531-551.
- "'Magic or Miracle'? Some Second Century Instances," The Second Century: A Journal of Early Christian Studies, 2 (1982), 127-156.
- "Plotinus and Gnostic Thaumaturgy," Laval théologique et philosophique, 39 (1983).
- "Sociology of Knowledge and the Study of Early Christianity," SR, 11 (1982), 45-56.
- Sandys-Wunsch, J.
 "Before Adam and Eve - Or What the Censor Saw," SR, 11 (1982), 23-28.
- "Spinoza - The First Biblical Theologian," ZAW, 93 (1981), 327-342.
- Scobie, C.H.H.
 "Johannine Geography," SR, 11 (1982), 77-84.
- "The Making and Meaning of the New Testament." The completion of a series of articles in the Presbyterian Record, January, February, April, (1982).
- Trites, A.A.
 Article on I Peter in The Canadian Baptist, January, 1983.
- Yee, G.A.
 "An Analysis of Prov. 8:22-31 According to Style and Structure," ZAW, 94 (1982), 58-66.
3. CURRENT RESEARCH
- Aufrecht, W.E.
 Ammonite Language and Literature.
- Brown, S.
The Origins of Christianity: An Historical Introduction to the New Testament. The Oxford Bible Series. Ed. P.R. Ackroyd and G.N. Stanton (forthcoming).
- "Philology," in The Bible and its Modern Interpreters, 3. Ed. G.W. MacRae and E.J. Epp. Philadelphia: Fortress (forthcoming).
- Carson, D.A.
 Syntactical Concordance to the Greek New Testament.

- Ceresko, A.R.
 "A Poetic Analysis of Ps. 105, with Attention to Its Use of Irony." Presented to the Task Force on Hebrew Poetry at the Annual Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America, Albany, N.Y., August, 1982.
- Corbett, J.H.
 "Fostering in the Bible; A Preliminary Survey of the Evidence."
Gregory of Tours: The Miracles of St. Martin. English Translation and Commentary.
- "Paul in Aphrahat." A paper to be presented to the CSBS, Vancouver, 1983.
- "Recovering Primitive Christianity: Virgin Birth, Incarnation, Bodily Resurrection." Presented to the CSSR, Ottawa, 1982 (being rewritten for publication).
- "The Foster-Child: A Neglected Theme in Early Christian Life and Thought," International Association for the History of Religions: Selected Proceedings. Winnipeg, 1980 (forthcoming).
- "The Odes of Solomon; A Structural Analysis." Presented to the Toronto Semiotic Circle, Spring, 1982.
- "Thither Came Phoenicians," Studia Mediterranea, Autumn, 1982 (forthcoming).
- Cox, C.
 "Origen's Use of Theodotian in the Elihu Speeches." A paper to be presented to the CSBS Meeting, June, 1983.
- "The Textual Character of the Manuscript Printed as Text in Zohrab's Bible." Presented to the meeting of IOSCS, meeting with SBL, New York, December, 1982.
- "The Use of Lectionary Manuscripts to Establish the Text of the Armenian Bible." A paper to be presented to the Third Dr. H. Markarian Conference on Armenian Culture, Univ. of Pennsylvania, November, 1983.
- "The use of the Participium Necessitatis in the Armenian Translation of the Pentateuch." A paper to be presented to the International Symposium on Armenian Linguistics, Yerevan, Armenian SSR, Sept., 1983.
- Culley, R.
 "The Story of the Spies (Num. 13-14) and Narrative Structure." Presented to the SBL, New York, December, 1982.

- Deroche, M.P.
 "Jeremiah 2:2-3 and Israel's Love for God During the Wilderness Wanderings," CBQ (forthcoming).
- The Narrative Structure of the Abraham Story.
- "Structure, Rhetoric, and Meaning in Hos. IV: 4-10," VT (forthcoming).
- "Yahweh's Rīb Against Israel: A reassessment of the So-Called 'Prophetic Lawsuit' in the Pre-exilic Prophets," JBL (forthcoming).
- Dion, P.F.
 Studies in the second part of Isaiah, especially from the viewpoints of poetics and of book composition/redaction.
- Studies in the Tell Fakhariyah bilingual inscription (one in the press, one in preparation).
- Donaldson, T.L.
Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthew Theology. JSNT Supplement Series. Sheffield: The University of Sheffield (forthcoming in 1984).
- Duhaime, J.L.
 "Gn 1,28 et l'éthique de l'environnement."
- Fraikin, D.
 The Authority of Jesus.
- Halpern, B.
 "Baal and Yahweh."
 "Israelite Historiography."
 "Mystery and Scatology: Ehud at Eglon's Throne."
 The nature of the god's existence in Israel and in earlier ancient materials.
- Hurtado, L.W.
 "Jesus as Lordly Example in Phil. 2:5-11," in From Jesus to Paul (Frank Beare Festschrift). Ed. P. Richardson and J.C. Hurd (forthcoming).
- Mystical and apocalyptic Judaism as a background for New Testament Christology.
- The theory of a "Q" community and a distinctive theology.
- Jeffrey, D.L.
 Ed. Chaucer and Scriptural Tradition. Nebraska University Press.
 Commentary on Ezekiel. Harper and Row.

- General editor. Dictionary of Biblical Traditions in English Literature. Eerdmans.
- The Hermeneutics of John Wyclif.
- Miletic, S.F.
 "The Function of 'One Flesh' in Eph. 5:22-23." Presented to the Ephesians Seminar at the Annual Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America, New York, August, 1982.
- Olson, T.
 Ethical implications of canonical apocalyptic documents.
 John Hick's theodicy.
- Richardson, P.
 Ed. with D. Granskou. Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity (forthcoming).
- With M. Shukster. "Barrabas, Nerva and the Tarrean Rabbis," JTS, 34 (1983), 31-55.
- Ed. with J. Hurd. From Jesus to Paul (Frank Beare Festschrift) (forthcoming).
- With P. Good. "Jesus Traditions in I Cor." (forthcoming).
- "Judgement in Sexual Matters," NT, 1983 (forthcoming).
- "On the Absence of Anti-Judaism in I Cor.," in Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Ed. P. Richardson and D. Granskou (forthcoming).
- "The Thunderbolt in Q and the Wise Man in Corinth," in From Jesus to Paul. Ed. P. Richardson and J. Hurd (forthcoming).
- Schuller, Sr. E.
 "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible: An Update of Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls," Bible Today (forthcoming).
- Dissertation in process on the publication of two manuscripts from Qumran, Cave 4, containing non-canonical psalm fragments.
- Scobie, C.H.H.
 The Johannine Community.
 The Structure of Biblical Theology.

4. NEW APPOINTMENTS

- Aufrecht, W.E.
Associate Professor, Religious Studies, The University of Lethbridge.

Chairman, Programme in Religious Studies, The University of Lethbridge.
- Carson, D.A.
Professor of New Testament, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Ill., U.S.A.
- Corbett, J.H.
Cross-Appointment to the Graduate Centre for Religious Studies, University of Toronto.
- Cox, G.
Chairman, Dept. of Religion, Brandon University.
- Dion, P.E.
Professor, Dept. of Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto.
- Donaldson, T.L.
Professor of New Testament Studies, College of Emmanuel and St. Chad, University of Saskatchewan.
- Duhaime, J.L.
Professor agrégé, Fac. de Théologie, Univ. de Montréal.
- Fraikin, D.
Vice-Principal, Queens Theological College.
- Hurtado, L.W.
Associate Professor, University of Manitoba.
- Luedemann, G.
Professor of New Testament, University of Göttingen, West Germany.
- Milne, P.J.
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Religion, University of Manitoba.
- Olson, T.
Coordinator, Alternative Studies, York University Research Programme in Strategic Studies (concurrent with Religious Studies Programme membership).
- Sandys-Wunsch
Vice Chancellor and Provost, University of Thorneloe College, Sudbury, Ontario.
- Schuller, Sr. E.
Lecturer in Old Testament and Hebrew, Atlantic School of Theology.

5. THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

- Donaldson, T.L.
"Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology" (D.Th. dissertation completed, Toronto, 1982).
- Milne, P.J.
"Narrative Structure in Daniel 1-6: An Analysis of Structure in a Group of Old Testament Texts, based on Vladimir Propp's Morphology of the Folktale" (Ph.D. dissertation completed, McGill University, 1982).

Aina, S., P.O. Box 1453, Station "B", Anderson, C.P., 3533 West 26th Ave., Armstrong, C.E., Regent College, 2130 Westbrook Mall, Atkinson, D.W., Religious Studies, University of Lethbridge, Aufrecht, W.E., University of Lethbridge, Barron, R., P.O. Box 341, 3401 Brook Road, Barron, S.M., 367 Terry Drive, Bater, B.R., Queen's Theological College, Baumgarten, A., Dept. of Religious Studies, McMaster University, Beare, F.W., 902 - 21 Dale Ave., Beliefontaine, E., Mt. St. Vincent University, 166 Bedford Highway, Biemann, E., Dept. of English, University of Western Ontario, Block, D.L., Dept. of Biblical Studies, Winnipeg Bible College, Bound, James F., 65 Pendale Street, Brouillard, G., 258 Cardinal Beaulieu Est., Brower, K., 1301 Lee Blvd., Brown, P.S., St. Michael's College, 81 St. Mary's St., Brunet, A.W., 2715 Ch. Cote Ste. Catherine, Burke, D., 344-670 Dalhousie Dr., Cahill, P.J., Dept. of Religious Studies, University of Alberta, Carson, D.A., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2065 Half Day Road, Ceresko, A.R., 81 Reaol Road, Clarke, E.G., Dept. of Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto, Combs, A.E., Fac. of Social Sciences, McMaster University, Cooper, A.M., Dept. of Religion, McMaster University, Corbett, J.W., Humanities Division, Scarborough College, 1265 Military Trail, Cotter, W.J., 74 Wellesley St. W., Couturier, G., University of Montreal, Box 6128, Station "A", Cox, C., Dept. of Religion, Brandon University, Craide, P.C., Dean's Office, Faculty of Humanities, University of Calgary, Culley, R.C., Fac. of Religious Studies McGill University 3520 University St., Dahms, J.V., 4400 Fourth Ave., D'Angelo, M.R., Theology, St. Michael's College, University of Toronto, Davis, P.A., University of Prince Edward Island, Day, P.L., 58 Ibbotson St., # 1, De Filippi, W., 714 - 110 Jameson Ave., DeRoche, M., Dept. of Religion, McMaster University, Demoster, S., 19 Cliff Street, Dion, P.E., Dept. of Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto, Donaldson, T.L., College of Emmanuel A. St. Chad, 1337 Colborne Dr., Dressler, H.H.P., 3358 S. E. Marine Drive, Duggan, M.W., 1320 - 87 Ave., S.W., Eubank, J.L., Theologie 250, Universite de Montreal, C.P. 6128, Eckert, L.E., Concordia College, 7128 Ada Blvd., Eslinger, L.M., 58 Bermuda Court, N.W., Fast, P., 217 Niagara St., Fawcett, S.V., Emmanuel College, University of Toronto, Finlayson, M., 239 Beloravia Ave., Fisher, R.W., School of Religion & Culture, Wilfrid Laurier University, Foley, C.H., St. Thomas More College, 1437 Colborne Dr., Forestell, J.T., St. Michael's College, University of Toronto, Fox, D.J., Huron College, Franklin, D., Queen's Theological College, Frost, S.B., History of McGill Project, 3459 McTavish St., Garnet, P., 108 Strathearn Ave., N., Gaston, L., Vancouver School of Theology, 6000 Iona Dr., Gentry, P.J., 90-J Castlebury Cr., Gooch, P.D., 520 Park Cr., Grenskou, D., School of Religion & Culture, Wilfrid Laurier University, Griedman, S., 10836 - 147 St., Guenther, H., 55 O'Shea Cr., Guillemette, P., Universite-de Montreal, THEOLOGIE, CP 6128 Succursale A, Guillemette, E.M., 61 Admiral Road, Halpern, B., 246 Vanier College, York University, 4700 Keele St., Hannah, Y., Canadian Nazarene College, 1301 Lee Blvd., Harkin, J.J., Dept. of Religious Studies, Memorial University, Helm, R.D., 19 Ranch 14th Ave. S.W., Henderson, W.D., 880 Hallhurst Ave., Hibbitts, J.R., Atlantic School of Theology, 640 Franklin St., Hillmer, W.R., McMaster Divinity College, Hobbs, T.R., McMaster Divinity College, Hollingsworth, R., 10 Mountain Ave., Holmes, B.T., Box 4, Site 2C, R.R. # 3, Hornan, J., 132 Erb St. W., Horsnell, M.J.A., McMaster Divinity College, McMaster University, Huebsch, R.H., Dept. of Religious Studies, Niagara University, Humphries, R.A., 310 Glenlake Ave., Hurd, J.C., Trinity College, University of Toronto, Hurtado, L.W., Dept. of Religion, University of Manitoba, Irwin, W.H., Theology, St. Michael's College, University of Toronto, Jackman, E.J., Box 398, Jeffrey, D.L., Dept. of English, University of Ottawa, Johnston, J.W., Box 163, Johnston, A.F., 85 Charles St., W.,	MONTREAL, Quebec. VANCOUVER, B.C. VANCOUVER, B.C. LETHBRIDGE, Alberta. LETHBRIDGE, Alberta. RICHMOND, Va. NEWMARKET, Ontario. KINGSTON, Ontario. HAMILTON, Ontario. TORONTO, Ontario. M4W 1K3 2121 256 LONDON, Ontario. OTTENBURG, Manitoba. GREENFIELD PARK, P.O. WINNIPEG, Manitoba. TORONTO, Ontario. MONTREAL, Quebec. WINNIPEG, Manitoba. WINNIPEG, Manitoba. EDMONTON, Alberta. DEERFIELD, Illinois. TORONTO, Ontario. TORONTO, Ontario. HAMILTON, Ontario. HAMILTON, Ontario. WEST HILL, Ontario. TORONTO, Ontario. MONTREAL, Quebec. BRANDON, Manitoba. CALGARY, Alberta. MONTREAL, Quebec. REGINA, Saskatchewan. TORONTO, Ontario. CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I. SOMERVILLE, Ma. TORONTO, Ontario. HAMILTON, Ontario. TORONTO, Ontario. TORONTO, Ontario. SASKATOON, Sask. VANCOUVER, B.C. CALGARY, Alberta. MONTREAL, Quebec. EDMONTON, Alberta. CALGARY, Alberta. WINNIPEG, Manitoba. TORONTO, Ontario. WATERLOO, Ontario. SASKATOON, Saskatchewan. TORONTO, Ontario. LONDON, Ontario. KINGSTON, Ontario. MONTREAL, Quebec. MONTREAL WEST, Quebec. VANCOUVER, B.C. WILLOWDALE, Ontario. PICKERING, Ontario. WATERLOO, Ontario. WATERLOO, Ontario. EDMONTON, Alberta. WILLOWDALE, Ontario. MONTREAL, Quebec. TORONTO, Ontario. DOWNSVIEW, Ontario. WINNIPEG, Manitoba. ST. JOHN'S, Newfoundland. CALGARY, Alberta. LONDON, Ontario. HALIFAX, N.S. HAMILTON, Ontario. HAMILTON, Ontario. HAMILTON, Ontario. PORT DOVER, Ontario. WATERLOO, Ontario. HAMILTON, Ontario. NIAGARA UNIVERSITY, TORONTO, Ontario. TORONTO, Ontario. WINNIPEG, Manitoba. TORONTO, Ontario. KLEINGURK, Ontario. OTTAWA, Ontario. ARROW, Ontario. TORONTO, Ontario.	H3B 3L2 V6S 1N6 V6T 1A6 T1X 314 T1X 314 23227 U.S.A. J3Y 2E6 K7L 2N6 L8S 4K1 L8S 4K1 M4W 1K3 B21 256 N6A 3K7 ROA 1G0 J4V 2V9 R3T 3P2 R3T 297 M5S 1J4 H3T 186 R3T 229 T66 2E6 60015 U.S.A. M6H 236 M5S 1A1 L8S 4K1 L8S 4K1 M1C 1A4 M5S 1C4 H3C 3J7 R7A 6A9 T2N 1N4 H3A 2A7 S4T 0H8 M5S 1J4 C1A 4P3 42143 U.S.A. M6K 2X9 L8S 4K1 M6N 4L7 M5S 1A1 V7N 0M6 V5S 2M6 T2V 0N3 H3C 3J7 T5B 4E4 T3C 1H3 R3N 0Y1 M5S 1K7 M6E 2M9 N2L 3C5 J3T 046 M5S 1J4 N6G 1H3 K7L 3N6 H3A 1Y1 H4X 1X9 V6T 1L4 M2N 1A8 L1W 3C9 N2L 3C5 T5N 3E2 M2J 2M4 H3C 3J7 M5B 2L4 M3J 1P3 R3T 297 A1C 5E7 T3G 1V7 N6A 3T8 B3N 3B5 L8S 4K1 L8S 4K1 L8P 2E9 N2A 1N0 N2L 1T8 L8S 4K1 New York 14109 M6P 1G3 M5S 1H8 R3T 2H2 M5S 1J4 L01 1C0 C1W 0M6 N11 100 M5S 1K5	Johnston, G., 399 Clarke Ave., 1C., Joubert, W., Box 84, Kaoedan, I.J., University of Winnipeg, 515 Portage Ave., Kampen, J., 21 Howell Ave., Kazmierczak, J.R., Dept. of Religious Studies, University of Ottawa, Klassen, W., 4257 Eton St., Kloppenborg, J.S., 47 Roswell Ave., Kohn, R.L.E., 207 - 1856 Main St., W., Leske, A.M., Concordia College, 7128 Ada Blvd., Lindenberger, J.M., Vancouver School of Theology, 6000 Iona Dr., Lonnenecker, R.M., Yvcliffe College, University of Toronto, Loster, M.A., Mount St. Bernard, Ludemann, W., Underford 22, 0-3411 WULFEN AN HARZ, Lutz, R.T., Dept. of Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto MacKenzie, R.S., 95 Loyal Bay Road, MacLennan, I.B., 1001 Main Street, W., Magder, S., 27 Ridevale Dr., Martin, B.L., 78 Lonsford Cr., Mason, S.W., 501 - 55 Falby Court, Massey, I.A., 542 Euclid Ave., McCready, W.D., Religious Studies, University of Calgary, McCormac, S.C., Lomaxan University College, Concordia University, Meagher, J.C., St. Michael's College, University of Toronto, Meiklinger, H.A., P.O. Box 1224, Meyer, B.F., Dept. of Religion, McMaster University, Miletic, S., 528 N. 33rd Street, Miller, J.W., 18 Heins Ave., Milne, P.J., 540 Partington Ave., Milton, H.L., 208 Collingwood Street, Morrow, W., 3 Mossom Place, Mosca, P.G., Dept. of Religious Studies, University of British Columbia, Neumann, K.J., 123 Stillwater Dr., Newton, M., Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, Nodwell, R.G., 129 St. Clair Ave., W., Nolland, J., Regent College, 2130 Westbrook Mall, Olshen, B.N., English Dept., Glendon College, 2275 Bayview Ave., Olson, T.M., Religious Studies Program, York University, Oran, B.C., 206 St. George St., Apt. 209, Osborne, R.E., 909 Rand Ave., Page, S.H., 1291 Millbourne Road, E., Parke-Taylor, G.H., 1207 - 15 Graydon Hall Dr., Parker, C.H., 2 Grenville Cres., Plaut, W.G., Holy Blossom Temple, 1950 Bathurst St., Polzin, R., Dept. of Religion, Carleton University, Price, R., Box 848, 89 Lloyd Street, Prybylski, S., North American Baptist Divinity School, 11525 - 23 Ave., Pummer, R., Dept. of Religious Studies, University of Ottawa, Quamie, R.A., United Church Manse, Box 163, Redmond, S.A., 68 Spadina Ave., Reinhartz, A., 6 Yarmouth Gardens, Remus, H., 85 Lonwood Dr., Richardson, G.P., University College, University of Toronto, Riegel, S.K., 31828 Countess Cr., Ridgway, J., 50 Cayley Street, Ridman, H., Memorial University, Rook, J., McMaster Divinity College, Rousseau, F., 3155 rue Lacombe, Runnalls, D.R., Faculty of Religious Studies, 3520 University St., Sanders, E.P., Dept. of Religion, McMaster University, Sandys-Wunsch, J., University of Toronto College, Ramsey Lake Road, Schroeder, D., 745 Coventry Road, Schuller, E., Atlantic School of Theology, 640 Franklin St., Scobie, C.H., Dept. of Religious Studies, Mt. Allison University, Scott, R.B.V., 10 Wm. Morgan Dr., Segal, A.F., Bernard College, Broadway at 120th Street, Shankman, R., Vanier College, 5160 DeCarle Blvd., Soble, W.W., 406-180 George St., Sutherland, C.T., 6904 Bow Cr., N.W., Toombs, L.E., Religion and Culture, Wilfrid Laurier University, Trenchard, W., Canadian Union College, P.O. Box 430, Trites, A.A., Acadia Divinity College, Van Dam, C., 642 Ramsate Road, Van Zutphen, V.H., 1040 Waterloo St., N., Wagner, N., 1356 Montreal Ave., S.W., Walters, S.D., 59 St. George St., Weir, G.A., Huron College, Weissenberger, S.A., Dept. of Religious Studies, University of Ottawa, Whitcomb, A., 426 W. 13th Ave., Williams, B., Dept. of Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto, Wilson, S.G., Dept. of Religion, Carleton University, Winnett, F.V., University College, University of Toronto, Wishart, V.R., 3767 Gray Ave., Wisse, F., 259 Milton Road, Yeo, G.A., 164 Rushmore Road, Yorkie, G., Canadian Union College, P.O. Box 562,	M3Z 2E7 M10 2N0 R3B 2E9 45220 U.S.A. K1M 6N5 V5C 1K2 M5R 1M5 L8S 1M9 T5B 4E4 V6T 1L4 M5S 1H7 B2G 2H5 M5S 1A1 A1A 1J5 L8S 1A9 M5A 1R9 M1W 1P4 L1S 2A4 M6G 2T2 T2N 1N4 H4B 1R6 M5S 1J4 L8S 1E0 L8S 4K1 53208 U.S.A. N2G 1Z8 N9B 2N5 K7L 3X8 M6S 1G4 V6T 1W5 S3J 3N7 A24 6P9 M4V 1N5 V6T 1H6 MAN 3M6 M3J 1P3 M5R 2N6 K1V 6X3 T6K 045 M3A 2M5 K7M 347 M5P 3K9 L1S 5H6 L0H 1L0 T6J 4T3 K1M 5N5 K0H 2N0 K1Y 2C1 M6G 1A4 N2L 4B6 M5S 1A1 V2T 2E4 L91 2E7 A1C 557 HAMILTON, Ontario. MONTREAL, Quebec. H3A 2A7 L8S 4K1 R3C 2E5 R3R 188 B3N 3B5 E0A 3C0 M4H 1E7 10027 U.S.A. MONTREAL, Quebec. H3A 2A7 L8S 4K1 T3B 289 N2L 3C5 T0C 020 B0P 1X0 L7N 2Y1 N5A 3Y1 12T 025 M5S 2E6 M6G 1H3 K1N 1K7 V6R 2T8 M5S 1A1 K1S 5B6 M5S 1A1 H4A 3M9 H4N 1Y4 M11 2Y7 T0C 020
---	--	---	---	---

NOTICES

Members are reminded of the following Newsletters which were initiated under the auspices of the Society.

"NEWSLETTER FOR UGARITIC STUDIES"

For full information write:

The Editor
Newsletter for Ugaritic Studies
Dr. P.C. Craigie
The University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, T2N 1N4

"NEWSLETTER FOR TARGUMIC AND COGNATE STUDIES"

For full information write:

The Editor
Newsletter for Targumic and Cognate Studies
Dr. E.G. Clark
Dept. of Near Eastern Studies
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1A1