

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php



BULLETIN

THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS FELLOWSHIP

MAY-JUNE 1985

Vol. 8, No. 5

\$3.50

EDITORS

Mark Lau Branson
Thomas H. McAlpine

ADVISORY EDITORS

Clark H. Pinnock, McMaster Divinity College
Paul A. Mickey, Duke Divinity School

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Ray S. Anderson, *Systematic Theology*
Fuller Theological Seminary
Stephen T. Davis, *Philosophy*
Claremont McKenna College
Donald Dayton, *News Analysis*
Northern Baptist Theological Seminary
Roberta Hestenes, *Christian Formation*
Fuller Theological Seminary
Robert L. Hubbard, *Old Testament*
Denver Seminary

Stephen C. Mott, *Ethics*
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
Mark Noll, *Wheaton College*
Church History

Grant R. Osborne, *New Testament*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
David Lowes Watson, *Evangelism & Missions*
UMC Board of Discipleship

PERSPECTIVES EDITORS

Keith Bolton, Fuller Theological Seminary
Luis Cortes, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Thomas F. Stransky, Mt. Paul Novitiate
Sze-kar Wan, Harvard University

FACULTY CONTRIBUTORS

Bernard Adeney, New College, Berkeley
Donald Bloesch, University of Dubuque Theological Seminary
Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Fuller Theological Seminary
Harvie M. Conn, Westminster Theological Seminary
Charles Ellenbaum, College of DuPage
Vernard Eller, University of LaVerne
Elouise Renich Fraser, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary
David Gill, New College, Berkeley
Larry Hurtado, University of Manitoba
Susanne Johnson, Perkins School of Theology
Richard Mouw, Calvin College
Richard Lovelace, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
Pheme Perkins, Boston College
Bernard Ramm, American Baptist Seminary of the West
Gerald Sheppard, Union Theological Seminary
Charles R. Taber, Emmanuel School of Religion
Keith Yandell, University of Wisconsin

Anabaptist/Reformed Dialogue:
Reformed vs. Anabaptist Social Strategies:
An Inadequate Typology
John H. Yoder 2

Abandoning The Typology: A Reformed Assist
Richard Mouw 7

Qumran and The Hebrew Psalter
Gerald Wilson 10

The Missiological Implications of An
Epistemological Shift
Paul Hiebert 12

Karl Barth and Evangelicalism:
The Varieties of a Sibling Rivalry
Donald Dayton 18

The Decade in Pentecostal-Charismatic Literature
(1973-82): A Bibliographic Essay
Cecil Robeck, Jr. 23

NEWS STORY: Diversity Marks Wheaton Conference
Douglas Jacobsen 26

Book Reviews and Comments (Itemized on Back Cover) 26

Index: Volume 8 38

TSF Materials Order Form (center pages)

came to rescue the creation from the curse of that sin. What did the fall do to the creation? What did it do to human noetic and volitional capacities? What did Jesus accomplish in his redemptive ministry? What does he call human beings to be and do? Suppose, for example, that because of the ravages of sin, God *has* in some sense "instituted" the exercise of the sword in sinful societies. How has the work of the Lamb altered the ways in which disciples of Jesus relate to this work of the sword? How will the "antithesis" manifest itself in Christian political behavior?

It seems obvious—to Professor Yoder and to me—that these are very Reformed questions. But they are also very Anabaptist questions. If so, then the main dispute between the two positions is not a conflict between radically different types. It is a family argument between Christians who claim to take human depravity and the riches of the Gospel seriously—not only in relation to very personal belief and behavior, but to the full range of human social, political and economic activities.

Toward Family Healing

Needless to say, family arguments can get very tense. Even if the traditional typology, then, is abandoned, there is still much for Reformed and Anabaptist Christians to argue about. It may be that Calvinists have been too quick to view the civil order as the quintessence of culture, and the exercise of the sword as the quintessence of the civil order. But even if these mistaken emphases are remedied, one could still hold—as I am very much inclined to do—that it is legitimate for disciples of Jesus to participate under certain conditions in governmentally-sanctioned acts which utilize the means of lethal violence. I am much more inclined to focus on the "politics of Jesus" than many of my fellow Calvinists in attempting to formulate the nature of Christian political obligation. But I am not convinced that a commitment to the Lamb's War proscribes all Christian use of violent means of problem-solving.

Having said that, though, I must also say that I believe that intense dialogue between Reformed and Anabaptist Christians is a matter of highest priority. This belief is nurtured by three concerns.

First, however legitimate and/or understandable the intra-Protestant struggles were in their original sixteenth century context, they are not as pressing today. Even if the received typology were true, it would be strange for Reformed and Anabaptist people, or for Lutherans and Roman Catholics, for that matter, to view each other as the "real" enemy, whom to struggle against is to exhibit faithfulness to the Gospel. The devils who fill the present world are no longer inclined—if they ever were—to disguise themselves as people who confess the Name of Jesus.

Second, whatever the merits of the debates that occurred in the sixteenth century, we have no right to look at those debates today except through the history that has flowed out of those intense disputes. For me this means that I cannot listen in on the discussions between Anabaptists and Calvinists that occurred in sixteenth century Basel and Geneva and Amsterdam without also listening to the cries of Christians whom my Calvinist forebears have brutalized and persecuted in word and in deed. The history of the Reformed-Anabaptist relationship is not merely one of words and ideas; it is made up of the flesh and blood of human suffering.

Third, even if we could ignore the past, we cannot ignore the pressing challenges of the present. It is one thing for a Calvinist to insist that there are and have been situations in which the Christian endorsement of military violence is justified. It is another thing to take an honest look at the ongoing production of weapons of unthinkable destruction. To view the present arms race with an awareness of the complicated self-deceptions of which human beings, even Christian human beings, are capable—deceptions which involve whole nations in idolatrous militaristic and nationalistic schemes—is to realize how desperately we all need the chiding and challenging and mutual correction that can be gained from intense Christian dialogue. May we abandon outworn typologies and get on with that kind of dialogue!

¹ See James D. Bratt, *Dutch Calvinism in Modern America: A History of a Conservative Subculture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984), Chs. 7 and 8.

² Abraham Kuyper, *Lectures in Calvinism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1931), pp. 71–72.

Qumran and the Hebrew Psalter

by Gerald H. Wilson

Among the thousands of fragments of ancient religious documents discovered nearly forty years ago in caves near the ruins of ancient Qumran and known popularly as the "Dead Sea Scrolls" were numerous fragments of manuscripts containing portions of psalms known previously from the canonical Hebrew Psalter. Of the eleven caves in which manuscripts were found, seven have yielded a combined total of more than 309 different psalm manuscripts. By far the most extensive collections are those of Cave 4 (with 18 distinct manuscripts) and Cave 11 (5 distinct manuscripts). The earliest of these texts were copied in the second century B.C. while the latest are dated by paleographers to approximately A.D. 68.¹

It is hardly possible to overestimate the importance of these texts for our understanding of the canonical Psalter. In the first place, they represent the earliest known examples of the text of the individual psalms. Before the scrolls were uncovered, our earliest Hebrew Psalter texts were dated to the 9th and 10th centuries A.D. This single find pushed our knowledge of the text of the individual psalms back almost 1000 years! In a number of these Qumran manuscripts, psalms are arranged quite differently than in the canonical Psalter. Some of the canonical psalms are ordered differently in relation to each other, others are entirely absent and, in some manuscripts, "apocryphal" compositions are introduced which are not known in the canonical text.

This variation in the Qumran psalm manuscripts has sparked continuing controversy about the nature of these texts, their authority, and where they fit in a history of the canonical Psalter. For

some, the variety of the Qumran texts suggests that the arrangement and contents of the Psalter were still in a state of flux as late as the middle of the first century A.D. Others resist this conclusion and explain the variant manuscripts as liturgical adaptations of the canonical arrangement which was fixed by the 4th century B.C.²

Proponents of the late fluidity of the Psalter (especially James A. Sanders who edited the primary edition of the Qumran Psalms Scroll from Cave 11) emphasize the amount of variation encountered in the Qumran manuscripts as support for their views. On the other hand, those who accept the early fixation of the Psalter (most notably the late Patrick W. Skehan who edited the psalm manuscripts from Cave 4) play down the significance of variant data while stressing that the majority of evidence supports the canonical arrangement. A close look at the Qumran scrolls themselves reveals an unexpected circumstance which points up the complexity of the issue and may help us evaluate these conflicting claims.³

Evidence for the Arrangement of Psalms at Qumran

First, the amount of evidence which supports or contests the canonical arrangement is not always easy to determine. Most of the manuscripts are extremely fragmentary. To determine the arrangement of a manuscript, one must look for "joins" between psalms, where one psalm ends and the next begins. For example, considering the 150 canonical psalms, there are 149 "joins" between them (ps 1 with 2; 2 with 3; and so on). All the Qumran psalm manuscripts together confirm only 54 of these canonical joins (slightly more than 36% of the total). The other 95 joins (about 64%) are not confirmed. On the other hand, 26 of the 149 canonical joins (just over 17%) are contested by the Qumran manuscripts when psalms are placed in different arrangements or apocryphal compositions

Gerald H. Wilson is Assistant Professor of Religion at the University of Georgia.

are introduced. There is no data available for a large number of joins (71 or about 48%).

When all evidence confirming the canonical arrangement is correlated with all data contesting it, there are only *two* instances of conflicting overlap. In other words, of the 26 canonical joins contested by the variant data, only two are among the 54 confirmed by the supportive data. The other 24 contested joins fall among that 64% for which there is no supportive data at all! Because of this lack of overlap, it is difficult to evaluate the significance of supportive data, since, while evidence of variation is unambiguous, it is always conceivable that supportive manuscripts contained variant material in the gaps between their fragments.

Finally, even these two examples of actual overlap have their problems. Both occur in one manuscript from Cave 4 which itself exhibits a major contradiction of the canonical arrangement of the Psalter. It "omits" the whole group of psalms 104-111 and follows psalm 103 immediately by psalm 112. As a result, the confirmation value of this manuscript is weakened and we are left without a single, fully supportive manuscript in direct conflict with evidence of variation.

To summarize up to this point: the amount of evidence for or against the canonical arrangement of the psalms is small and there is even less evidence of conflict between these two bodies of evidence. The value of supportive evidence is somewhat ambiguous since it is taken from fragmentary manuscripts which may have contained variant data in their gaps. Since we cannot fully recover the intent of the editor(s), we cannot know with certainty what relative authority was placed on these conflicting and supporting arrangements. It is dangerous to allow our own knowledge of the present shape of the canonical Psalter to persuade us that the presence of supportive readings necessarily signifies the existence of the fixed, authoritative canonical Psalter. It is quite feasible that supportive readings represent only one *possible* arrangement of the psalms at a time prior to final fixation of the text or (as we will see below) indicate only that certain parts of the Psalter arrangement had been fixed.

The Five-Book Division and the Age of the Manuscripts

Since the limited amount of evidence for support or variation permits no firm conclusions about the history of the canonical text, is there any other way to view the data which illuminates the issue? It has long been accepted that the canonical Psalter is divided into five segments or "books" of unequal size (psalms 1-42; 43-72; 73-89; 90-106; 107-150). Each of these segments concludes with a similar benediction, except for the last in which the concluding collection of five hallelujah psalms (146-150) may serve the same purpose. Recent study of these book sections has demonstrated the existence of different techniques of organization and psalm arrangement in Books Four and Five, as opposed to the earlier three sections. This implies the first three books developed independently of the last two and the final canonical form represents a later marriage of originally separate materials.⁴

In light of this situation, the distribution of evidence of variation from the canonical arrangement over these five books is most interesting. Contested joins, practically non-existent in the first three books (only four of 88 possible joins are contested), increase dramatically in Books Four and Five (22 of a possible 60 joins). This circumstance, while hardly conclusive, is quite consistent with the theory proposed by James A. Sanders that the Psalter only gradually stabilized from beginning to end with the first two-thirds being fixed when the last third was still in a state of flux.⁵

Sanders' theory is further supported by the age of the manuscripts containing variant arrangements. When one arranges all the significant Qumran psalms manuscripts according to the date of origin, a definite correlation emerges between the age of the manuscripts and evidence of support or variation. Variant manuscripts consistently occupy the earliest positions, while fully supportive manuscripts only begin to appear about the middle of the first century A.D., at which time variant arrangements disappear altogether. The general impression is of an early fluidity of psalm arrangement which continued until ca. A.D. 50 and apparently died out soon after.

So, while the Qumran evidence for the arrangement of the psalms

is not exhaustive and cannot, therefore, supply a final commentary on the date of the fixation of the canonical text, it clearly suggests a fluidity in the arrangement and content of the latter third of the Psalter continuing long after the traditionally accepted date for its closure. As a result, if we hope to discover the sociological background of the final form of the Psalter and understand its significance, we must look to a period much later than is usually supposed.

What can we say provisionally about the significance of the final shape of the Psalter? One of the first keys is the recognition of two distinct segments within the Psalter (Books One through Three and Books Four and Five) representing two periods in its development. The earlier stage clearly reflects the concern of the exilic period to understand the apparent failure of the Davidic Covenant. The placement of Royal psalms at the "seams" of this early collection (psalms 2, 41, 72, 89) organizes these books around this theme.⁶ Such a collection might date to the fourth or fifth century B.C. (the traditional date for the closure of the Psalter) and concludes with a plea to YHWH to fulfill his covenant obligations and restore the Davidic kingdom (psalm 89:46-51).

The subsequent addition of the fourth book (psalm 90-106), with its central celebration of the kingship of YHWH, shifts the emphasis of the whole away from the reestablishment of the human kingdom of David toward the more universal and spiritual kingdom of YHWH. One is no longer to place his trust in human princes who will ultimately fail, but in YHWH who rules on high forever (cf. psalms 91, 92, 103).⁷

The similarity of this viewpoint to the "kingdom of the spirit" which Jesus preached and which occupied the vision of the early Church is intriguing. That they both clearly speak to the same human situation lends credence to a late date for the final fixation of the Psalter. Those whose hopes for political independence from Rome are squashed by the realities of their circumstances are called to the inner kingdom of the spirit where YHWH rules directly over the affairs of humankind.

That this viewpoint came to dominate the central religious cult in Jerusalem, where no doubt the Psalter reached its final form, is not unexpected. In light of the highly charged apocalyptic visions of the Qumran sectarians who actively opposed the central cult in this period—visions which culminated in the development of the even more emphatically Davidic Qumran Psalm Scroll⁸ and the

MANUSCRIPT	DATE	RELATIONSHIP TO MT
4QPs ^a	Mid 2nd C BC	Contradictory
4QPs ^f	ca. 50 BC	Contradictory
4QPs ^d	Mid 1st C BC	Contradictory
4QPs ^b	2nd half 1st C BC	Contradictory
4QPs ^e	1st half 1st C AD	Contradictory
11QPs ^a	30-50 AD	Contradictory
11QPs ^b	1st half 1st C AD	Contradictory
MasPs 1039-160	1st half 1st C AD	Supportive
4QPs ^g	Mid 1st C AD	Contradictory
4QPs ^h	50 AD	Supportive
4QPs ^c	50-68 AD	Supportive
5/6 HevPs	2nd half 1st C AD	Supportive

INCONCLUSIVE MSS			
DATE NOT ESTABLISHED		INSUFFICIENT CONTENTS	
11QPs ^c —Supportive		4QPs ^h	4QPs ⁱ
11QPs ^d —Supportive		4QPs ^h	4QPs ^m
11QPs ^e —Supportive		4QPs ^j	4QPs ⁿ
4QPs ^f —Supportive		4QPs ^k	4QPs ^p

Qumran Mss Arranged by Date

sectarian War Scroll which detailed the final battle to destroy Roman power and reestablish the Davidic kingdom; in light of the growing Zealot movement which led to open (though futile) conflict with Rome in the years before A.D. 70, the call to reliance on YHWH's inner kingdom must have represented a pragmatic way to encourage religious cohesion and hope without threatening the existing Roman power structures.

While this viewpoint (and the final shape of the Psalter) may have grown out of pragmatic realism in the face of Roman domination and military superiority and the futility of Zealot resistance, the result is a Psalter cut off from specific nationalistic hopes and set free to speak to the spirit of all people everywhere. It is little wonder that the Psalter enjoyed such popularity in Christian circles, being frequently bound as part of early New Testament manuscripts.⁹ Also, while it is true that messianic hopes continued both in Judaism and Christianity, the final form of the Psalter certainly played an important role in restructuring thought about the present experience of humanity which is no longer understood as a time in which the kingdom is lost, but a time in which YHWH rules directly over the spirit of humankind. In this light, the psalms become sources of individual meditation on the kingship of YHWH in the inner life of the reader (the insight provided by the intro-

ductory psalm 1) rather than communal, cultic celebrations of the nationalistic hopes of Israel.

¹ For a more complete discussion of the evidence, see Gerald H. Wilson, "The Qumran Psalms Manuscripts and the Consecutive Arrangement of Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter," *CBQ* 45 (1983) 377-88; *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985).

² Gerald H. Wilson, "The Qumran Psalms Scroll Reconsidered: Analysis of the Debate *CBQ* 47 (1985) [in press].

³ Sanders has expressed his views in numerous articles, particularly "The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QP^s) Reviewed," *On Language, Culture, and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida* (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), pp. 95-6; "Variorum in the Psalms Scroll (11QP^s)," *HTR* 59 (1966) 86-7. Skehan's most recent and persuasive treatment is found in "Qumran and Old Testament Criticism," *Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* M. Delcor, ed., (Louvain: Duculot, 1978), pp. 163-82.

⁴ Gerald H. Wilson, "Evidence of Editorial Divisions in the Hebrew Psalter," *VT* 34 (1984) 337-52; "The Use of 'Untitled' Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter," *ZAW* xx (1985) [in press].

⁵ James A. Sanders, "Cave 11 Surprises and the Question of Canon," *McCormick Quarterly Review* 21 (1968) 288. This article is also available in *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology* D. N. Freedman and J. C. Greenfield, eds. (New York: Doubleday, 1969/71), pp. 101-16; and in *The Canon and Masorah of the Hebrew Bible*, Sid Z. Leiman, ed. (New York: KTAV, 1974), pp. 37-51.

⁶ See Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, pp. 209-14.

⁷ Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, pp. 214-20.

⁸ James A. Sanders, "Ps 151 in 11QP^s," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 73-86; Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, pp. 70-73, 129-31, 136-37.

⁹ Robert Holmes and J. Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus*, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1798-1827) cite a number of instances of Psalters bound together with manuscripts of the New Testament.

The Missiological Implications of an Epistemological Shift

by Paul G. Hiebert

The current epistemological crisis in science and philosophy has significant implications for western theology (Hiebert 1985). It also affects the integration of theology and science, and our understanding of the missionary task. How we contextualize theology, how we respond to the theological pluralism now emerging in non-western churches, and how we relate to non-Christian religions as systems of thought and to non-Christians as persons are all determined to a great extent by our epistemological premises. At the core, all of these raise the question of how we relate two or more different systems of knowledge.

Systems of Knowledge

When we talk of relationships between systems of knowledge, we must specify their level of abstraction (Figure 1. cf. Kuhn 1970, Schilling 1973, Laudin 1977, and Hofstadter 1980). For our purposes, we will differentiate three levels.

At the bottom are theories. These are limited, low level systems of explanation that seek to answer specific questions about a narrow range of reality, and do so by using preceptions, concepts, notions of causation and the like. Alternative theories may arise which give different answers to the same set of questions. Theories themselves may be on different levels of generality, and broader theories may subsume more limited ones.

Theories are imbedded in higher level systems of knowledge which Kuhn (1970) calls "paradigms," Laudin (1977) calls "research traditions," and I will refer to as "belief systems." In the sciences these would include physics, chemistry, biology and so on. In theology these would include systematic and biblical theology. Belief systems select a domain of reality to examine, determine the critical questions for investigation, provide methods for investigation and integrate one or more theories into a comprehensive system of beliefs. They also mediate between theories and the world view of the culture within which they emerge. In relationship to theories, they set the boundaries of inquiry and determine the legitimacy of problems to be examined. They also generate conceptual problems for theoretical investigation, and serve heuristic and justificatory roles (cf. Laudin 1977:78-120). In relationship to the world view in which they are located, they make explicit its largely implicit assumptions and work out the implications of these assumptions for beliefs and behavior. They also affect changes in the world view by introducing new theoretical constructs, and by mediating changes

forced by experiential input.

The specialists who work in a belief system form a community that sets the standards, defines "proofs," and checks their research and teaching. It also controls the training and entry of new candidates into the discipline (Barnes 1982:10).

Others apply the theories of a belief system to life. Thus we have applied physics, engineers and technologists who draw on theoretical physics. Furthermore, sections of the general public may accept the word of specialists as authority. Most Americans, for instance, are confident that physicists have a great deal of true knowledge about the real world because they see and use the technological fruits of their theories. The public is generally unaware of the theoretical debates taking place between specialists within a research tradition.

Finally, a number of research traditions and a great deal of common sense knowledge are loosely integrated in large "world views." These are the most fundamental and encompassing views of reality shared by a people in a culture, the largely implicit assumptions they have about the nature of things—about the "givens" of reality. To question these assumptions is to challenge the very foundations of their world. People resist such challenges with deep emotional reactions, for they threaten to destroy their understandings of reality. As Geertz points out (1979), there is no greater human fear than a loss of a sense of order and meaning. People are even willing to die for their beliefs if these make their deaths meaningful.

Relationships Between Systems of Knowledge

In considering relationships between different systems of knowledge, we must keep these levels in mind. Although it is important to examine in detail how systems on one level relate to those on another (e.g., how theories relate to paradigms, and paradigms to world views), we will not do so here. Rather, we will briefly examine how theories in a paradigm relate to each other, how paradigms within a world view relate to each other, and how world views relate to each other.

How we view the relationship between systems of knowledge on the same level is largely determined by our epistemological foundations (see Hiebert 1985: figure 1). Naive realists and idealists hold that true knowledge must be precise, objective and certain. Both basically hold to a one-to-one correspondence between human knowledge and reality, but for different reasons. The former see knowledge as a photograph or a mirror of reality (Gill 1981:34-36); the latter see it as creating reality. Consequently, both look for a single comprehensive system of knowledge that will encompass all

Paul G. Hiebert is Professor of Anthropology and South Asian Missions in the School of World Missions, Fuller Theological Seminary.