



THE JOURNAL OF

Inductive Biblical Study



Fall 2014 • Vol. 1, No. 2

PUBLISHED BY FIRST FRUITS PRESS OF ASBURY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

asbury.to/jibs

CHIEF EDITORS:

David R. Bauer and Fredrick J. Long, *Asbury Theological Seminary*

EDITORIAL BOARD

William J. Abraham

Albert Cook Outler Professor of Wesley Studies, Perkins School of Theology

John C. Cook

Associate Professor of Old Testament, Asbury Theological Seminary

Joseph R. Dongell

Professor of Biblical Studies, Director of Greek and Hebrew Instruction, Asbury Theological Seminary

Michael D. Matlock

Associate Professor of Inductive Biblical Studies and Old Testament, Asbury Theological Seminary

Alan J. Meenan

Founder/President/Chief Executive of the Word is Out

James Miller

Professor of Inductive Biblical Studies and New Testament, Asbury Theological Seminary

Brian D. Russell

Professor of Biblical Studies, Asbury Theological Seminary

David L. Thompson

Emeritus Professor of Biblical Studies, Asbury Theological Seminary

Dorothy Jean Weaver

Professor of New Testament, Eastern Mennonite Seminary

For More Information, Contact:
David R. Bauer or Fredrick J. Long
Asbury Theological Seminary
204 N. Lexington Ave.
Wilmore, KY 40390

<http://place.asburyseminary.edu/jibs/>

© Copyright 2014 by Asbury Theological Seminary

The Journal of Inductive Biblical Study

VOLUME 1:2
FALL 2014

Table of Contents

- 134 From the Editors
Fredrick J. Long
- 140 Introduction to *The Pedagogy of St. Paul*
David R. Bauer
- 142 Foreward
By Herman Harrell Horne, PH.D. (Harv.)
- 144 Introduction
- 146 The Sources of St. Paul's Pedagogy
- 160 The Sources of St. Paul's Pedagogy (Continued)
- 174 Bibliography
- 182 Sociorhetorical Interpretation (SRI) and Inductive Bible Study (IBS): Outlines of Mark, the Lord's Prayer, and the Son's Prayer in John 17
Vernon K. Robbins
- 224 Mark's Inclusion of 'For All Nations' in 11:17d and the International Vision of Isaiah
Mark A. Awabdy and Fredrick J. Long
- BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**
- 256 My Journey with Inductive Bible Study
David R. Bauer
- FROM THE FIELD**
- 268 Biblical Hermeneutics in an African Context
Alan John Meenan

THE JOURNAL OF Inductive Biblical Study

TIMOTHY C. TENNENT
President and Publisher

DOUGLAS MATHEWS
Provost

ISSN 2372-0727

Published in January and July

Content and Articles may be copied for personal or classroom use. Permission to otherwise reprint must be granted permission by the editor and the author.



First Fruits
THE ACADEMIC OPEN PRESS OF ASBURY SEMINARY

204 N. Lexington Avenue
Wilmore, Kentucky 40390

asburyseminary.edu
800.2ASBURY

The Journal of Inductive Biblical Study intends to promote the hermeneutical approach to the study of the Scriptures generally known as Inductive Biblical Studies. By Inductive Biblical Study (IBS) we mean the hermeneutical movement initiated by William Rainey Harper and Wilbert Webster White that was embodied in the curriculum of The Biblical Seminary in New York founded in 1900. This approach had precursors in the history of interpretation and has since the beginning of the twentieth-century enjoyed widespread dissemination, being taught at such institutions as Princeton Theological Seminary, Columbia Theological Seminary, Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, Fuller Theological Seminary, Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminaries, Azusa Pacific University, and Asbury Theological Seminary, as well as hundreds of other institutions and organizations around the world.

FROM THE EDITORS

Fredrick J. Long

For this second volume of *The Journal of Inductive Biblical Study*, we are quite pleased to have articles that show the methodological rigor within the Inductive Bible Study (IBS) movement, its continued dialog with other similar methodological approaches, and its continued implementation and fruit on the field within an African context. In brief, this volume has a theme of pedagogy (instruction) and contexts for our study of Scripture. Reflecting on best methods and procedures, I have offered students the following axiom: “Our careful study of anything should be suited to the *nature* of the material under investigation in its appropriate *environment* as much as possible. This axiom can be stated in a more succinctly in reference to Scripture: *The nature of our study of Scripture should match the nature of Scripture itself.*”¹ Most essentially, all of Scripture is pedagogical within diverse social-cultural contexts (cf. 2 Tim 3:16); so, it would behoove us to pay attention to such dimensions and contexts of the biblical materials.

Beginning with this volume, we are incrementally publishing portions of Howard Tillman Kuist’s 1924 New York University doctoral dissertation entitled *The Pedagogy of St. Paul* (originally published in 1925 by George H. Doran in New York). We are grateful to his family to grant these rights. David R. Bauer provides a brief introduction about Kuist. The following contribution includes, first, the brief preface by Herman Harrell Horne (Ph.D. Harvard), then Professor of the History of Education and the History of Philosophy at New York University, followed by Kuist’s Introduction and, then, the first two chapters, “The Sources of St. Paul’s Pedagogy” (part 1 and 2). Kuist describes the issues succinctly as a question in his introduction: “In the light of his times and his life work, what can be learned regarding the origin, nature, results and value of his [Paul’s] pedagogy?” In these first two chapters, Kuist amasses much data that seeks to contextualize Paul’s pedagogy from early Jewish and

Greco-Roman sources (including Tarsus), and Jesus himself as a master Teacher. Kuist’s appeal to Jesus as originator of Paul’s pedagogy reminds me of the recent recovery of such in historical Jesus studies (esp. N. T. Wright). Although today one would (rightly) evaluate Kuist’s use of Jewish and Greco-Roman primary materials as somewhat uncritical and insufficiently contextualized, in that Kuist accepts particular statements as broadly normative and representative of actual practices instead of as idealized, apologetically conceived discourse, still, Kuist establishes the pervasive valuation of pedagogy within the broader first century Mediterranean context as the environment within which Paul conducted his ministry and wrote his epistles. There is much to appreciate about Kuist’s assembling such statements succinctly in command of his thesis.

As a student at Asbury Theological Seminary, I first encountered Kuist’s thoughts on method in Dr. David Bauer’s Matthew English Bible (now IBS) class. Bauer and Robert A. Traina include the following quotation of Kuist’s: “conceived in its widest possible scope, method is procedure. And the primary consideration in procedure of any kind is that it be suited to the end in view. Experience teaches men that when anything is to be done, some ways are *better*, certain movements more effective, than others.... Method is the conscious accommodation of one’s powers to the *requirements of the situation.*”² But in saying this, we must not wrongly conclude that deployment of a method will guarantee assured and identical results in the study of Scripture. Helpfully, Bauer and Traina provide this illuminating anecdotal (perhaps even apocryphal) story that reveals something of Kuist’s view on method and results: “A story from the lore of Union Theological Seminary in Virginia illustrates this principle of allowing, within limits, for individual differences in interpretive conclusions. During the Second World War, two faculty colleagues at Union—John Bright, professor of Old Testament, and Howard Tillman Kuist, then professor of biblical studies at Union—had a friendly disagreement. Bright insisted that if he took two students of essentially equal ability, gave them the same passage to interpret, provided them with the same tools, and allotted them the same amount of time, assuming they did their work with commensurate skill, they would arrive at exactly the same interpretation of the passage. Kuist disagreed. He declared that those two students, working under parallel conditions and doing their work with equal quality, might well arrive at

1. From “An Introduction to the Study of Scripture” in my exegetical manual, “In Step with God’s Word: An Incremental Exegetical Approach for Studying the New Testament” to be published forthcoming.

2. Howard Tillman Kuist, *These Words upon Thy Heart: Scripture and the Christian Response* (Richmond: John Knox, 1947), 47-48 quoted in David R. Bauer and Robert A. Traina, *Inductive Bible Study: A Comprehensive Guide to the Practice of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 14.

different, though not mutually exclusive or contradictory, interpretive conclusions.”³ Bauer and Train agree with Kuist’s viewpoint, concluding: “We believe that Kuist has the better argument. After all, some passages are multivalent, that is, the evidence points to two or more equally viable interpretations.”

The second article in the current volume is Vernon K. Robbins’ “Sociorhetorical Interpretation (SRI) and Inductive Bible Study (IBS): Outlines of Mark, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Son’s Prayer in John 17.” In this invited article, Robbins helpfully compares SRI and IBS approaches for studying early Christian literature, noting some different underlying assumptions. Notable is Robbins’ disclosure of his vision of biblical interpretation; he has sought to bring various methods and perspectives into an interpretive analytic or heuristic described as being like “textures” of a woven tapestry to be investigated and appreciated distinctly as part of a whole. Having worked closely with IBS and SRI, I quickly saw some very close correspondences. For example, both SRI and IBS are evidence-based, working very closely with primary materials. Indeed, in my estimation, our study sessions are like scholarly Bible studies, allowing respectfully for differing views, but always pressing (cordially!) for an evidential basis for one’s views and positions. Although IBS presents a more rigorous hermeneutical and methodical perspective on making structural observations than is found in SRI (although still present in SRI), SRI in turn invites a more robust inclusion of social-cultural study, both ancient and modern, which is especially welcome to insights about the rhetorical nature of communication in general while also drawing upon recent work to better understand how communication works and is effective (e.g., mental conception theory), all of which, however, would be welcome to IBS methodology as evidence for interpreting biblical materials. So, in my estimation, both interpretive approaches are complimentary.

Here, interestingly, Robbins perceives a difference between SRI and IBS methodology in that IBS appears to assume or to aim at “one correct” structural representation. Instead, Robbins indicates that one of his interests lies in observing the variety of helpful ways that people (interpreters, including beginning students) conceive of structure differently and what this reveals of one’s ideology, context, and interpretation. Robbins is quite “hospitable” here, that is, to recognize that people are variously ideologically located and will yet observe legitimate things differently within texts, even complimentary things.

This openness in interpretation is welcome, but not altogether alien to IBS (see the quotation about Kuist above). So then, in Robbins’ article, readers are treated to see a detailed comparison of the Lord’s Prayer (Matt 6:9-15//Luke 11:2-4) with the Son’s prayer in John 17 (sometimes called Jesus’ High Priestly Prayer) by carefully attending to observation of the respective texts and considering their inter-relationship in terms of “topoi” or rhetorical themes that work together to effectively communicate. Robbins presented this work in an earlier form at annual Society of Biblical Literature Session in San Francisco (Nov 20, 2011), a presentation concerning which one faculty colleague said to me, “Vernon’s was the most engaging session I have ever attended in 30 years of going to the annual SBL meetings.” Robbins has audio files of many such sessions, including this particular one; just contact him to obtain links to these talks.

The influence of both IBS and SRI is seen in the next article by Mark A. Awabdy and Fredrick J. Long, “Mark’s Inclusion of ‘For All Nations’ in 11:17d and the International Vision of Isaiah.” This article arose out of my 2009 doctoral seminar class, NT 820 “Research Methods in New Testament Interpretation,” during which Awabdy (then my student) very studiously and aptly developed a final paper deploying SRI on Mark 11, working with a basic structural observation that I provided him (the chiasmic arrangement in and surrounding Mark 11:17). After that class, we agreed to work together to co-author the current form of the paper. It has been entirely my fault for not getting this article in print earlier, but we are pleased to publish the article now in JIBS vol. 2. I have learned much from Awabdy (now, Dr. Awabdy), who is pursuing a teaching ministry in the mission field while living in the Arabian Peninsula. His dissertation will soon be published as *Immigrants and Innovative Law: Deuteronomy’s Theological and Social Vision for the גר* in the very prestigious series *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.

Our article investigates the critical moment in Jesus’ ministry of entering into the Temple, turning over tables, and teaching by appealing to Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11. Mark 11 is a pivotal moment in Jesus’ ministry thematically and structurally. So important is Jesus’ reaching Jerusalem in Luke’s Gospel that Jesus weeps upon seeing the city, because of failing to recognize the day of God’s visitation and the peace that Jesus was offering (Luke 19:41-44). In particular, Mark’s Gospel preserves the phrase “for all nations” from Isa 56:7—an observation that is either neglected or underappreciated among interpreters, despite the importance of the phrase within the Isaian vision of the international worship of Yahweh. Awabdy’s contribution here is marked; a major nerve of Old Testament

3. Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 58.

theology has been hit squarely by Jesus as presented in Mark's Gospel. Thus, by interpreting Mark 11:17 using SRI textures – intertexture, inner texture, ideological texture, social-cultural texture, and sacred texture – we hope to shed light both on Mark's presentation of Jesus and on what Jesus was concerned himself in Scripture at this critical moment, who acted and taught with divine prerogative to confront not just the economic injustice of the temple system, but also its failure to embrace Yahweh's international vision of worship “for all nations.”

The final two articles represent new features within JIBS. The first is “Biographical Sketch” which in this instance is autobiographical, where David R. Bauer presents “My Journey in Inductive Bible Study.” Here we learn explicitly what many of us have learned implicitly from his classes—the passion, practice, precision, and perseverance of Bauer to teach IBS. He has inspired countless students to delve deeply and passionately into the Word of God. However, don't be fooled into thinking that this is merely a biography—there is much to be learned about Bauer's IBS pedagogy, method, and hermeneutics through his well-articulated self-reflections on God's calling on his life.

The second feature is “Notes from the Field.” In this volume, we are pleased to include “Biblical Hermeneutics in an African Context” by accomplished pastor, teacher, and missionary, Dr. Alan J. Meenan, who cogently reflects on biblical hermeneutics in Africa, discussing and analyzing hermeneutical currents, identifying challenges for the growing church, and giving diagnosis of the need for the IBS hermeneutics within the African church. What Meenan does not mention is his own commitment and endeavor to assist in this latter need: to provide formal IBS training to international pastors and teachers through “The Word is Out” ministry that he has created (see <http://thewordisout.com/>). So, we think you will enjoy this edition of *JIBS*, which is concerned with pedagogy, method, and contexts of IBS.

In order to honor the original printing of this book and for citation purposes, the original page numbers have been inserted into the text with brackets: [vii]. These numbers indicate the start of the page as previously printed. The Bibliography included is for the book in its entirety, not just the chapters printed in this journal's edition.

INTRODUCTION TO *THE PEDAGOGY OF ST. PAUL*

David R. Bauer

The Editorial Board of the *Journal of Inductive Biblical Studies* has decided to include from time to time contributions to inductive Bible study from scholars of the past. We are proud that the first of these contributions comes from the pen of Howard Tillman Kuist. Kuist was a student of Wilbert Webster White at The Biblical Seminary in New York. Because Kuist showed great promise as a scholar and teacher, White urged him to pursue his doctoral studies and hired him to teach at The Biblical Seminary. After serving on the faculty at The Biblical Seminary for several years, Kuist taught biblical studies, employing the inductive approach, at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia and finally at Princeton Theological Seminary, where he served until his death in 1964. The following article represents the Foreword, Introduction, and initial two chapters of Kuist's book, *The Pedagogy of St. Paul*; the remainder of the book will appear in subsequent issues of the *Journal*. This book is based upon the doctoral dissertation Kuist wrote under the direction of the great educator at New York University, Herman Harrell Horne. Horne himself had a personal and professional relationship with W. W. White and was closely associated with The Biblical Seminary and with the inductive approach to the study of the Bible. One of the emphases of the early stages of the inductive Bible study movement was a concern with pedagogy, i.e., the proper method for teaching the Bible. This book by Kuist thus integrates an inductive study of the Pauline Epistles with insights into pedagogy. This book reflects the thinking and approach of Dr. Kuist at the beginning of his professional career in 1925. Of course, his thought developed; and readers may find his more mature thinking in *These Words Upon Thy Heart: Scripture and the Christian Response*, which encapsulates the Sprunt Lectures that Kuist delivered at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia in 1947. The editors wish to express their appreciation to Dr. James Kuist, the son of Howard Tillman Kuist, for his kind permission to reprint his father's book.

FOREWARD

[vii]

A Selection from *The Pedagogy of St. Paul* by Howard Tillman Kuist

By Herman Harrell Horne, PH.D. (Harv.)

*Professor of The History of Education and The History of Philosophy,
New York University*

There are those who say frankly that religion has no place in education, that education should be concerned with facts, not with faith. Many educational writers imply the same by omission of all references to religion in education. Such a view is short-sighted, in that it fails to see religion as a part of life, man as an heir of eternity, and the Scriptures as a portrayal of life in true perspective.

The field of what may be called Biblical Pedagogy is practically an unworked mine. A few rich nuggets of rare promise have been turned up here and there, an earnest of many discoveries sure to reward the worker who digs zealously. The Proverbs, the Psalms, the Prophets, the Law, the Gospels, the Epistles, are veritable treasures of educational wisdom. These writings have nourished the souls of peoples for hundreds of generations. They are literature of power rather than information. Their content, their aim, their methods await exploration, discovery, analysis, and presentation. The worker finds richest return both for himself and his readers. The Bible is the greatest collection of educational masterpieces we possess. Our very appreciation of the tutelage of Scripture has perhaps led us to neglect its pedagogical study.

The most influential figure in human history, next to Jesus of Nazareth, is probably Saul of Tarsus. He became the accepted expositor and interpreter of [viii] Christianity. He did not lay a new foundation but he built upon the foundation laid by Jesus. Though some have gone so far as to regard him as the real founder of Western Christianity, he did not so regard himself, teaching instead: "Other foundation can no man lay than is laid in Christ Jesus." St. Paul helped to give to Christianity what was

essential if it was to become a system of thought and a practical working organization as well as the life of God in the soul of man. Let any reader say something about Christianity and he is likely to find himself, perhaps unconsciously, quoting the phrases of Paul. Try it! At the moment it occurs to me to ask, "What is Christianity?" and the answer comes: It is "The life hid with Christ in God."

The author of the present work, Dr. Howard Tillman Kuist, sees that education without religion is incomplete,—lacking in dynamic and in goal. He also sees that the Bible is the source-book for much that is best in modern educational theory and practice. He also recognizes in St. Paul a master teacher second in greatness only to the Master himself. He brings to his study a first-hand knowledge of his Greek New Testament, a scholarly technique of investigation, organization, and presentation, and a readable, interesting, literary style.

The critical reader will sense here a contribution of first importance among available literature to our knowledge of "the Pedagogy of St. Paul." Let no reader be deterred by the practical term "Pedagogy" in the title, doubtless used for alliterative reasons, from seeking here the profoundest possible educational insight concerning man's wisest way of reaching his greatest goal,—the knowledge of God and the service of mankind.

What influences shaped St. Paul as a teacher? What are his qualifications as a teacher? At what did he aim as a teacher? What are the psychological [ix] elements in his appeal? What methods did he use? What results did he accomplish? How should his pedagogy be evaluated? What literature is available on this subject? What similar studies are possible? The interested reader will find answers to these questions, and many similar ones, in the following pages. Especial attention is directed to the treatment of Romans 1-8 in Chap. VIII.

The subscriber esteems it a distinct privilege and honor to have his name associated with this masterpiece of scholarship in dedication and sponsorship. Each week during the winter of 1923-1924 our Seminar in the History of Modern Education would be thrilled with the exhibit of latest findings in this virgin mine. He confidently promises and predicts that all those who sense their indebtedness to the great "Apostle to the Gentiles" will be grateful to Dr. Kuist for this new and valuable portraiture of him as a teacher of the human race.

INTRODUCTION

[xi]

A Selection from *The Pedagogy of St. Paul* by Howard Tillman Kuist

In the preface to his recent volume (1923) entitled, “The Apostle Paul and the Modern World,” Francis G. Peabody calls attention to the fact that “The Library of the Theological School in Harvard University contain more than two thousand volumes dealing with the life and letters of the Apostle Paul, or more than one for each year since his time, not to speak of the multitudinous commentaries and histories in which the teaching of Paul has an important place.” As a brilliant gem excites interest and invites the closest scrutiny, so does the personality of the great apostle. His influence has spanned twenty centuries and encircles the globe.

What place then is to be assigned to him in educational history? Or, Is the Apostle entitle to recognition as an Educator at all? True it is that he did not discuss pedagogy, but of necessity he was faced by pedagogical problems! The purpose of this study is to bring together, somewhat more fully than can easily be found in one place elsewhere, the material for making an estimate of the man from a pedagogical point of view. The problem briefly stated is this: In the light of his times and his life work, what can be learned regarding the origin, nature, results and value of his pedagogy?

It may be asked whether such an inquiry if worth undertaking. Pasteur is said to have glowed with enthusiasm whenever he read the life of an illustrious person, and was kindled with the ambition to imitate him. He once said: “From the lives of men who have marked their passage with a trail of enduring light, let us piously gather, for the benefit [xii] of posterity, every detail, down to the slightest words, the slightest acts calculated to reveal the guiding principles of their great souls.”¹

Paul was a great soul who devoted himself with whole-hearted

1. Albert Keim and Louis Lumet: Louis Pasteur. Published by Stokes, New York, 1914. Cf. title-page.

enthusiasm to teaching and influencing men. That he succeeded is written boldly on the pages of history. It is in the detail of his life experience as exhibited in his words and acts that we should discover how he taught and influenced men.

It is not at all surprising to find instructive “teaching situations”² in his career, *e.g.*, at Antioch of Pisidia,³ and on Mars Hill in Athens,⁴ from which one may learn with profit how he sensed problems, found points of contact, secured interest, and captured attention; how he framed and called forth questions; how he drew conclusions and shaped his appeals. In short, certain principles of modern pedagogy are discernible in his contacts, which invite most thoughtful study.

Our present interest, therefore is rather in St. Paul the teacher, than in the teachings of St. Paul. As an embodiment of Hebrew education; as a reflection of that which was best in Greek culture in the first century; as a Christian teacher and traveler in the Roman world, St. Paul in his manifold experiences furnishes a study of genuine interest and of practical worth to the Educator.

The following chapters have been worked out inductively. The historical sources of his racial heritage and educational environment were first investigated, then “the cameo-like pictures of St. Luke and the self-revelations of St. Paul’s Epistles,”⁵ in their original Greek setting were examined [xiii] for evidence of his qualifications as a teacher, his pedagogical aims, his educational views, psychological elements in his appeal, his pedagogical methods, and the results of his pedagogy. A critical estimate of the facts thus secured has led to a conclusion concerning his rightful place in educational history.

“Thou therefore that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?” This questions propounded originally to the Romans (2:21) is pertinent to-day and always will be. The Pedagogy of St. Paul though actually wrought out in a generation endures forever.

2. Horne: Jesus the Master Teacher. Published by Association Press, New York, 1920, which is largely the inspiration of the present study. Cf. pp 1-3.

3. Acts 13:13 ff.

4. Acts 17:16-34.

5. Stalker: The Life of St. Paul, p. 169.

DOI: 10.7252/JOURNAL.02.2014F.05

Chapter 1 THE SOURCES OF ST. PAUL'S PEDAGOGY

[21]

A Selection from *The Pedagogy of St. Paul* by Howard Tillman Kuist

1. RACIAL INFLUENCES.

Saul of Tarsus was conspicuously a son of his race. He could well say that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews.¹ He had advanced in the religion of the Jews beyond many who were of equal age with him in his nation, being more exceedingly zealous than they of the traditions of his fathers.² His whole training had been geared to the watchwords, "Learn—teach; teach—learn."³ To him, as to all the sons of Israel, piety and education were inseparable.⁴ Education was the handmaid of religion; religion was the sponsor of education.

The principles of his religion and his education were the product of a remarkable history and are preserved in a unique literature. A study of this literature should reveal to us some of the sources of his pedagogy. The Bible as a whole may be described not only as "centuries of intense religious experience made poignantly articulate";⁵ it is an

1. Phil. 3:5. Contrary to Kauffmann, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. XI, p. 79, who rigorously contends Saul was a Hellenist, not a Hebrew scholar, and refers to Phil. 3:5 as "a rather unusual term, which seems to refer to his nationalistic training and conduct." (Cf. Acts 21:39; 22:2.)

2. Gal. 1:14.

3. Deutsch, *Literary Remains*, p. 139.

4. Wellhausen, *Israelische und jüdische Geschichte*, p. 159.

5. Hough, *Life and History*, p. 56.

educational code, and its history is a history of [22] education.⁶ "The genius of the Hebrew lay in his masterful absorbing function, by which he transformed and transfigured the products thereof in the alembic of his soul. Whatever served this instinct was utilized and sublimated. He religionized everything into an ethical monotheism and preserved it immortally in a book, and with his pedagogical instinct, made his Holy God the world's Educator."⁷

Saul had inherited from his race a strongly didactic nature. He was true to type. Edersheim's characterization of this "peculiar people"⁸ well befits him: "Excitable, impulsive, quick, sharp-witted, imaginative; fond of parable, pithy sayings, acute distinctions, or pungent wit; reverent towards God and man, respectful in the presence of age, enthusiastic of learning and of superior mental endowments, most delicately sensitive in regard to the feelings of others; zealous; with intensely warm Eastern natures, ready to have each prejudice aroused, hasty and violet in passion but quickly assuaged."⁹

He fell heir to a unique educational ideal.¹⁰ As a Pharisee¹¹ he was brought up to consider the study and observance of the Laws of Jehovah as the supreme aim in life. "The honor of father and mother, acts of benevolence and kindness, hospitality to strangers, visiting the sick, devotions in prayer, promotion of peace among man and man, and study in general (remain intact against the [23] exigencies of the world

6. See Imber, U.S. Commissioner of Education Report, 1894-95, Vol. II, p. 1802.

7. Simon, *The Principle of Jewish Education in the Past*, p. 8.

8. Deut. 14:2.

9. Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ*, p. 89.

10. This ideal has been variously described: Gudemann, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. V, p. 42, calls it "Moral and religious training." Simon, *The Principle of Jewish Education*, p. 9, calls it "Religious culture." Imber, U.S. Commissioner of Education Report. 1895-96, Vol. I, p. 701, describes it as a "Sleepless care over the culture of the spiritual sense." Swift, *Education in Ancient Israel*, p. 62, sums it up in one word, "Holiness." Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, p. 124, says, "To the pious Jew the knowledge of God was everything; and to prepare for or impart that knowledge was the sum total, the sole object of his education."

11. Acts 26:5; Pihl. 3:5.

to come), but the study of the law outweighs them all.”¹²

This fundamental aim was to be attained, according to Josephus, by instruction in words and by exercises in practice.¹³ The method of Saul’s education thus combined the theoretical and the practical, learning with doing. It made its appeal to the whole man: to the spirit—“The fear of Jehovah is the beginning of knowledge”;¹⁴ to the mind—“First learn, then understand”;¹⁵ to the body—“Not learning but doing is the principal thing.”¹⁶ It therefore called for a response *from* the whole man: the emotions, the intellect, and the will. It involved feeling, thinking, acting. His education had sought not only to combine instruction in the *positive truths* of the ancestral faith with preparation for the practical duties of life,¹⁷ but it also had made these positive truths the controlling and dominating discipline both of the theoretical and the practical. It was religio-centric! Saul had therefore inherited the unique contribution of ancient Israel to the treasure-house of education, namely the principle of religious culture as the organizing center of all education, and as the ruling discipline for the cultivation of character and life.¹⁸

In his reverent survey of the history of his race [24] Saul could not but have been appreciably influenced by the personalities and principles of the great master teachers of his fathers. What a succession

12. Tract Kiddushin, fol. 39B.

13. Shilleto, *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, Book II, pp. 242, 243. Josephus points out that various nations have chosen one or other of these methods: “Thus did the Lacedæmonians and the Cretans teach by their exercises in practice, and not by words; while the Athenians and almost all the other Greeks made laws about what was to be done or left undone, but neglected exercising people thereunto in practice. The Jews carefully joined these two methods of instruction together; for he (Moses) neither left these exercises in practice to go without verbal instruction, nor did he permit the hearing of the law to proceed without exercises in practice.” (Against Apion.)

14. Prov. 1:7; cf. 9:10.

15. Tract Shabbath, 63a.

16. Tract Aboth 1:17.

17. Kennedy, *Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, p. 646.

18. For a succinct discussion of this point as it is related to the History of Education and the Modern Ideal, cf. Simon, *The Principle of Jewish Education in the Past*, p. 7 ff., paragraph beginning “Out of this has grown our Modern Educational Ideal,” etc. Cf. also S.S. Laurie, *Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education*, Introduction, pp.65-78.

of teachers Israel had! They represented almost every type of leadership among his people: the Legislator, the Priest, the Psalmist, the Prophet, the Scribe, the Wise! Their combined contributions to the cause of moral and intellectual culture provide “a catena of pedagogic principles without a parallel in ancient literature.”¹⁹

There was Moses, who won for himself the well-deserved title “The Father of Wisdom.”²⁰ He possessed forty-nine of the fifty divisions of wisdom. His personality fairly radiated the truth which he communicated.²¹ As the mouthpiece of Jehovah,²² he taught “by the power of a tremendous and impressive example,”²³ in public²⁴ and in private,²⁵ by word²⁶ and symbol,²⁷ by command²⁸ and by act.²⁹ He sagaciously sensed the significance of critical situations, and courageously shaped them to beneficent ends.³⁰ To every Israelite he was as a prince among teachers.³¹ He was Israel’s greatest schoolmaster. His influence on Saul’s pedagogical sense, therefore, was not a little. Paul refers to Moses (or

19. Kennedy, *Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, p. 646.

20. Lauterbach, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. “Moses: Personal qualities.” (Reference also to Megillah 13a; Leviticus Raba 1:15)

21. Ex. 34:27-35. Some one has defined Education as “The communication of the truth by the contagion of personality.”

22. Ex. 3:14; Deut. 4:14. Constant repetition through Pentateuch of such phrases as, “Thus shalt thou say; “Thus saith Jehovah”; and “As Jehovah commanded Moses, so did he,” etc.

23. Numbers 12:3, 7; Heb. 3:2, 5. Cf. Simon, *The Principle of Jewish Education*, p. 21.

24. Ex. 19:7-25; 24:1-11; 32:3-35; Deut. 32, 33, etc.

25. Lev. 16:1-5 ff.; Numbers 6:22-27; 8:1-4 ff., etc.

26. Ex. 19: 1-6; Deut. 1:1, 9-17; 4:1-24, etc.

27. Ex. 7:8-13; 17:14-16; Numbers 15:37-41; 17:1-11.

28. Ex. 14-10-31; 20:1-17; Deut. 1:18; 5:1-21, etc.

29. Ex. 15: 1-18, 22-26; 17:1-7; Deut. 15:17-19, etc.

30. Ex. 32:21-35; Numbers 16:1-50 (in this case “Morale”), etc.

31. Cf. Laurie, *Pre-Christian Education*, p. 66. “Moses was the greatest of schoolmasters.”

quotes him) twenty-five times. When he stood before King Agrippa³² he based his defense on the fact that he [25] “stood unto this day, testifying both to small and great, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come.” To Saul, Moses as a teacher, “mighty in his words and works,” was significantly real.

The Priests exercised with their priestly function a powerful educative influence. Their long spotless linen robes³³ and solemn bearing³⁴ clothed them with peculiar dignity. They projected the spiritual into the secular and the secular into the spiritual (sometimes at the baneful expense of the spiritual).³⁵ When they were faithful in teaching ordinances,³⁶ the law of Jehovah, worship,³⁷ and the fear of Jehovah,³⁸ they “strengthened moral conscience, softened public manners, and educated society.”³⁹ They taught by symbol and ceremony,⁴⁰ by giving practical advice⁴¹ and in presiding over judicial matters.⁴² Their appeal was not so much to the conscience as to the feelings; not so much to the imagination as to the emotions.⁴³ On this basis they sought to educate the will. “Keep the Law, carefully observe the ceremonies,” was their never varying exhortation to the nation and individual alike.⁴⁴ They added their speech to the educative voices of the past that rang in the ears of Saul of Tarsus. But they exercised their influence on Saul also, in person. “Then Paul took the men, and the next day, purifying himself

32. See Acts 26:22.

33. Ex. 28: 39-43.

34. Ex. 29:1-9; Lev. 8:1 ff.

35. Jer. 5:30, 31.

36. Mal. 2:1, 5-9.

37. Deut. 33:10.

38. II Kings 17: 27-28.

39. Stade, quoted by Montefiore in Laurie, *Pre-Christian Education*, p.

72.

40. Ex. 29:38-46; Lev. 9:22-24.

41. Lev. 10:11; Deut. 31:9-13.

42. Deut. 17:8-13.

43. Simon, *The Principle of Jewish Education*, p. 19.

44. Kent, *The Wise Men of Ancient Israel and Their Proverbs*, p. 13.

with them, went into the temple, declaring the fulfilment of the days of purification, until the offering was offered for every one of them.”⁴⁵

No less was the educative influence of the Psalmists. It was in the sublimity and tenderness of [26] expression of the Psalms that Saul learned as was prepared to teach the “universal language of religious emotion.”⁴⁶ “The beauty of image, boldness of expression, and the brevity and elegance of Hebrew poetry would render it wonderfully suitable to the romantic fervor of the youthful mind, more especially as to those characteristics are added, with uncommon freedom of metaphor and vividness of ornament, the blending of references to the natural objects of the country, the occupation of the people, the history of their nation, and the manners of common life. The parallelisms of sentiment in the sacred hymns must greatly have assisted the learner in committing those hymns to memory.”⁴⁷

The Prophets too made their contribution to the teaching Ideal that built itself up into the consciousness of Saul. Like lofty peaks and majestic pyramids the Prophets arose above the common plane of ordinary life, into strong religious and pedagogical perspective. They were the masters of the art of persuasive speech.⁴⁸ They faced the task of opening blind eyes and deaf ears to the perception of truth.⁴⁹ Theirs was the mission to impel weak wills to right living. They rubbed shoulders with their fellows and knew and understood them. They knew how to teach. They won attention not only because their enthusiasm was contagious, but because they called for and expected it. They introduced

45. Acts 21:26.

46. Noyes, *New Translation of the Book of Psalms*, 8vo., Introduction, p. vi.

47. Benham, *Hebrew Education*. A lecture read before the Subscribers to the Sunday-School Union Library in 1848, p. 20.

48. Beecher, *The Prophets and the Promise*, p. 132.

49. Isa. 6:9; 42: 18-25. The following references are merely suggestive, selected as typical in the Prophets indicated. It is suggested that such a study be made of all the Prophets still more extensively.

their lessons with: “Ho!”⁵⁰ “Come near!”⁵¹ “Hear ye!”⁵² “Behold!”⁵³ “Listen!”⁵⁴ “Awake, [27] awake!”⁵⁵ “Arise, shine!”⁵⁶ They utilized likely occasions to impart truth.⁵⁷ They found points of contact in their immediate circumstances.⁵⁸ They chose concrete illustrations from life all about them, from nature⁵⁹ and from history.⁶⁰ They used pointed questions to probe sluggish minds.⁶¹ They proceeded from the known to the unknown.⁶² They used proverbs,⁶³ parables,⁶⁴ figures of speech,⁶⁵ to accommodate their truth to the understanding of their hearers. They employed visions,⁶⁶ symbols,⁶⁷ object lessons,⁶⁸ and dramatic actions⁶⁹ to stir the imagination and touch the conscience. They cast their messages

50. Isa. 29:1; 55:1

51. Isa. 34:1.

52. Isa. 1:10; 44:1; 46:3; 48:1; 12; Jer. 2:4.

53. Isa. 24:1; 32:1; 42:1; 59:1, etc.

54. Isa. 49:1.

55. Isa. 51:9, 17, etc.

56. Isa. 52:1; 60:1.

57. Jer. 7:1-7; 20:1-6; 26:1-7, etc.

58. Ezek. 24:15-18.

59. Jer. 8:7; 12:8-10; 13:23; 14:2-6.

60. Micah 7:18-20; Hosea 11:1-4.

61. Isa. 40:6, 12, 27, 28; 53:1, etc.

62. Isa. 28:23-29. Is there not a possible parallelism between the use of this principle (apperception) here and the use of it by Jesus in the parable of the Sower, Mark 4:1-20?

63. Ezek. 18:1-4 ff.; Jer. 31:29.

64. Isa. 5:1-7; 27:2-6; Ezek. 17:1-24, 24:1-5.

65. Isa. 48:18, 19; Jer 2:13, 17:1, etc.

66. Jer. 1:11, 12, 13 ff.; 24:1-10; Ezek. 1, 2, 37:1-14, etc.

67. Ezek. 4:1-4; 19:1-9, etc.

68. Jer. 13:12-14; 18:1-4 ff.; 36:1-8 ff.; Ezek. 4:4 ff.; 9 ff.; 5:1 ff.; 21:1-7.

69. Jer. 13:1-7 ff.; 16:1-4, etc.

into acrostics⁷⁰ and poetic form, choosing the meter best adapted to their message.⁷¹ They atmosphered all their contacts with a tremendous earnestness.⁷² They met adverse situations with a courage that defied their antagonists.⁷³ They spoke not because they had to say something, but because they had something to say.⁷⁴ They were the spokesman of Jehovah.⁷⁵ They clothed their words with a ring of authority that made their message glow with conviction.⁷⁶ Who can read their messages without being stirred and thrilled, unless one's [28] eyes, too, are dull, and one's ears are heavy? Surely the alert mind of Saul not only grasped their tremendous truths, but read also the message of the personalities that gave form and living expression to those truths. Deissmann⁷⁷ says: “The real characteristic of the man, the prophetic force of his religious experience and the energy of his practical piety have been only too often underestimated.” He places Paul with the prophets, and likens him especially to Amos, the herdsman of Tekoa. That Paul spoke “as one of the prophets” is seen in his discourses, especially in that given in the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia.⁷⁸

The Scribes, whose activity began with the cessation of that of the Prophets, had occupied themselves with plans for raising Hebrew thought to a higher intellectual plane.⁷⁹ “They caused the people to understand the law...And they read in the book of the law of God distinctly; and they gave the sense, so that they (the people) understood the reading.”⁸⁰ Through their influence, ability to write came to be

70. Cf. Lamentations 1-5.

71. Cf. Swift, *Education in Ancient Israel*, p. 36.

72. Of which I Kings 18 is typical.

73. Jer. 38:1-13; 21:9, etc.

74. As C. Alphonso Smith, *What Can Literature Do for Me?* New York, 1918, p. 18.

75. Isa. 6:6 ff.; Jer. 1:17 ff.; Amos 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 13; 2:1, 4, 6, etc.

76. Isa. 44:6, 21; 45:1, 14; 48:17.

77. Deissmann, *St. Paul*, p. 6.

78. Acts 13:16 ff.

79. Seligsohn: *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol XI, pp. 123, 124.

80. Nehemiah 8:7, 8.

generally accepted as the mark of an educated or learned man.⁸¹ It has been said that through Ezra and the Scribes, the Jews became, in the words of Mohammed, “The People of the Book.”⁸² The educative service of the Scribes was sternly practical. It required leisure and application:

“The wisdom of the Scribe cometh by opportunity of leisure, And he that hath little business shall become wise.”⁸³

[29]“Howbeit he that hath applied his soul,
And meditateth in the law of the Most High;
He will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients,
And will be occupied in prophecies.
He will keep the discourse of the men of renown,
And will enter in amidst the subtilties of parables.
He will seek out the hidden meanings of proverbs,
And be conversant in the dark sayings of parables.”⁸⁴

The Scribes started a stream in its course that in Saul’s time flowed like a mighty river. “Political, social, and religious life came to be dominated by a burdensome system of traditions, laws, and minute regulations, the external form of which instead of the spirit and underlying principles came to be the focus of interest and attention.”⁸⁵ Thus Saul, “a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees,”⁸⁶ was borne along by this mighty current which affected both his religious and educational principles. Beside the Bible, this vast aggregate of Hebrew lore and knowledge now in the process of accumulation became the content of

his education, as we shall see.⁸⁷

The influence of Israel’s ancient Wise men on Saul’s pedagogy should not be underestimated. “Gifted with a rare prudence and penetration, King Solomon is prominent not as the founder of an order of the Wise, but rather as the most conspicuous representative of that practical cleverness which Semitic antiquity designated as wisdom.”⁸⁸ When Saul [30] of Tarsus studied the Book of Proverbs he had in his hands a repository of rich pedagogic experience, the oldest known text-book on pedagogy.⁸⁹ Here are sentences on education which were not written for one age but for all time. Here he found all life and all education regarded as a disciplinary process.⁹⁰ Here, as in the other Wisdom Literature of his race,⁹¹ Saul found men who sought not merely to instruct, but to educate; who aimed to develop sane, happy, and efficient men and women; who endeavored not only to impart knowledge but to train in experience.⁹² This process having begun and atmosphered in the home was to be continued at the hands of those who were instructed in wisdom. Jesus ben Sira⁹³ expressed this wisdom thus:

87. “The Talmud, that great written museum containing untold treasures of a civilized world of six bygone centuries, that wonderful and universal encyclopedia, which with the Mishna and Midrash which follow in its train, presents twice as many volumes as the Encyclopedia Britannica...Not the work of a few individuals, but a work of great scientific importance. It is a work by the whole Jewish nation, as well as by others who indirectly contributed to that remarkable gazette of the world...It is a tale of the struggle between light and darkness, between education and ignorance, with the final victory of the schoolmaster.” –Imber, U.S. Commissioner of Education Report, 1894-95, Vol. II, p. 1808.

88. Kent, *The Wise Men of Ancient Israel*, p. 19. Cf. also I Kings 4:29-34.

89. Kennedy, *Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. I*, p. 648. *Güdemann, Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. IX, p. 571.

90. Cf. Holtzmann, in *Stade’s Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Band 2, Berlin, 1889, pp. 297, 298.

91. The Wisdom Literature is comprised chiefly of the books of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiastes, and Wisdom of Solomon.

92. Cf. Kent, *Makers and Teachers of Judaism*, p. 164.

93. Jesus ben Sira flourished in the first third of the second century B.C. Cf. Levi, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, XI, 389a.

81. Cf. Swift, *Education in Ancient Israel*, p. 81. Cf. also I Chron. 27: 32.

82. Kennedy, *Hastings’ Bible Dict.*, Article, Education.

83. Ecclesiasticus 38:24.

84. Ecclesiasticus 39:1-3.

85. Swift, *Education in Ancient Israel*, p. 84. For a contrary view see S. Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, Chapter IV, “The Law and Recent Criticism,” pp. 233-251, especially p. 248 ff.

86. Acts 23:6.

“My son, if thou wilt, thou shalt be instructed;
 And if thou wilt yield thy soul, thou shalt be prudent.
 If thou love to hear, thou shalt receive;
 And if thou incline thine ear, thou shalt be wise.
 Stand thou in the multitude of the elders;
 And whoso is wise, cleave thou unto him.
 Be willing to listen to every godly discourse;
 And let not the proverbs of understanding escape thee.
 If thou seest a man of understanding, get thee betimes unto him;
 And let thy foot wear out the steps of his doors.
 Let thy mind dwell upon the ordinances of the Lord,
 And meditate continually in his commandments:
 He shall establish thine heart,
 And thy desire of wisdom shall be given unto thee.”⁹⁴

The Wisdom Literature cemented and reinforced the foundation of that remarkable superstructure [31] which finally was organized into the school system of the Talmud,⁹⁵ which even in Saul’s day was already exercising a strong influence, and which largely environed and shaped the training of Saul; a foundation to which Legislator, Priest, Psalmist, Prophet, Scribe, and Sage, each as an instrument of his holy God,⁹⁶ had contributed. This superstructure was first domestic, then scholastic, in the training it afforded. The fundamental pedagogical principles of this system, now in its development, as applied in home and school, constitute our next points of interest.

2. DOMESTIC INFLUENCES.

One impression that certainly projected itself into Saul’s pedagogical sense was the supreme importance of the home as an educational institution. The personality of his parents and the atmosphere of his home were among the most potent educational factors in his early life. Long after he had left his home the fundamental principles of domestic education remained stamped in his consciousness.⁹⁷

94. Ecclesiasticus 6:32-37.

95. Spiers, *School System of the Talmud*, London, 1898, is an excellent treatise setting forth this system.

96. Simon, *The Principle of Jewish Education*, p. 8.

97. Cf. Eph. 5:22-33; 6:1-4; Col 3:18-20.

First and foremost of these principles was the duty and responsibility of parents. “The modern Rousseauian theory that parents must win their authority over their offspring by the superiority of parental wisdom and goodness found no place in Hebrew thought. On the contrary, parents ruled by divine right.”⁹⁸ The mother kept the home. The chief responsibility for the education of the children fell upon the father as head of the household.⁹⁹ On [32] the other hand, the first duty of children was to honor and obey their parents absolutely.¹⁰⁰ Contrary also to Rousseau,¹⁰¹ child nature was considered to be irresponsible, foolish, and rebellious.¹⁰² Stern discipline was advocated as the best teacher,¹⁰³ in this way the child’s will would be properly trained,¹⁰⁴ and his life rightly ordered.¹⁰⁵ Thus happiness and prosperity would follow, to parents and children alike,¹⁰⁶ attended by virtues not a few.¹⁰⁷

Life in the Hebrew home was a series of object-lessons. Each symbol, ceremony, and festival in family observance exerted an educative influence. The great reservoir of the child’s consciousness was stirred at the turn of every event. The order of instruction followed the order of events. Interest and attention were aroused by an appeal to the child’s

98. Swift, *Education in Ancient Israel*, p. 51. Cf. also Ecclesiasticus 3:2, 30:1-13; Proverbs 1:8, 4:1-4, 6:20-22, 13:1, 30:17.

99. His duties were fourfold: To bring up and rear his children in all branches of knowledge, to teach his son a trade, to compel his son to swim, and to care for his religious training and education. Cf. Imber, U.S. Commissioner of Education Report, 1894-95, Vol. II, p. 1813.

100. Ex. 20:12; Ecclesiasticus 3:1-16, 7:27, 28; Prov. 23:22.

101. Emile, first sentence: “All is good as it comes from the hand of the Creator; all degenerates under the hands of man.”

102. Proverbs 22:15.

103. Proverbs 13:24; 19:18; 22:6; 23:13, 14; 29:15.

104. Ecclesiasticus 30:8; Proverbs 17:10.

105. Proverbs 20:11; 22:6.

106. Ex. 20:12; Prov. 23:15, 16; Deut. 30:15, 16.

107. For a fine survey of this point, cf. Swift, *Education in Ancient Israel*, pp. 66-72. A thoughtful reading of Proverbs will reveal the large number of virtues taught.

curiosity. The Mesussah,¹⁰⁸ the unusual rites and utter change of food at Passover,¹⁰⁹ the removal of the family to a tent during the feast of tabernacles, the candles at the feast of dedication, the good cheer and boisterous merriment at Purim, all called forth innumerable questions.¹¹⁰ The parents, seizing this moment of excited curiosity, imparted that knowledge to the child which was so dear to themselves; [33] the origin of each festival, the meaning of each symbol and ceremony, as the case might be, in the history and religion of their race.

The process of retailing these traditions in story, by word of mouth, accompanied by all the added expressions of the parent's personality, stirred the child's imagination and satisfied his credulity. His whole being was made to glow with loyalty and pride in the traditions of his race.¹¹¹ His emotions being aroused, he began to express himself in word¹¹² and in deed;¹¹³ in reverence, prayer, and song. This imitative process was enhanced through the avenue of the eye¹¹⁴ and ear by the sights and sounds in the hourly experience of the child.¹¹⁵ The repetition of precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little, there a little, helped to make these experiences permanent. The content of these stories and precepts pricked the conscience and educated the will.¹¹⁶ Thus

obedience was inculcated, habit was formed, conduct was regulated, and the foundations of character were laid. Pervaded by a continuous sense of the reality, holiness, purity, and graciousness of Jehovah in the manner and atmosphere of his home life, the child's religious consciousness was awakened, stimulated, and nurtured. "Train up a child according to its nature, and even when he is old he will not depart from it,"¹¹⁷ was the dictum of the Wise. Whatever crises and experiences changed Saul's religious views, he never got away from these fundamental principles of domestic education, for he made it a point to reaffirm his conviction that fathers should bring up their children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."¹¹⁸

108. Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, p. 107, describes the Mesusah as a kind of phylactery for the house, serving a purpose kindred to that of the phylactery for the person; a small longitudinally folded parchment square on which, on twenty-two lines, Deut. 6:4-9 and 11:13-21 were written. It was fastened at the door-post of every "clean" apartment, and always was found wherever the family was Pharisaiically inclined. The father and all others going out or coming in would reverently touch the case and afterwards kiss the finger, speaking at the same time a benediction.

109. Ex. 12:25-27; 13:8-10, 14-16.

110. Imber, U.S. Commissioner of Education Report, 1894-95, Vol. II, p. 1814.

111. Psalm 78:1-4.

112. Deut. 6:4-9.

113. Philo says: "Having been taught the knowledge of the laws from earliest youth, they bore in their souls the image of the commandments."

114. Deut. 4:9.

115. Deut. 11:18-21.

116. Josh. 4:4-7; Deut. 6:20-25.

117. Prov. 22:6.

118. Ephesians 6:4.

Chapter 2
THE SOURCES OF ST. PAUL'S
PEDAGOGY (CONTINUED)
[34]

A Selection from *The Pedagogy of St. Paul* by Howard Tillman Kuist

3. SCHOLASTIC INFLUENCES.

What a rich and varied influence the Hebrew school system exerted upon the sons of Israel! In the first century a mental atmosphere had been created which brought it to full bloom. "Education: catholic, compulsory, and gratuitous" was the cry of the day. "Strenuously and indefatigably, the Pharisees advocated education; and by their unceasing efforts, hundreds of synagogues, colleges, and schools arose, not only in Judea but throughout the whole Roman Empire."¹ The ignorant were left without excuse. He who could not read was no true Jew! The Hebrew Scriptures had become a spelling-book; every Jewish community supported a school; religion itself was considered a matter of teaching and learning.² Centuries of educational practice had crystallized into a system! A study of the teacher, the pupil, the aim, and the method as uniformly presented in this system adds many instructive points of interest to the present inquiry.

To what greater eminence might a Hebrew youth of Saul's time aspire than to be a teacher? Honor and obedience were due to parents; reverence and greater honor to the teacher. "Your teacher and your father have need of your assistance," was the counsel to the pupil. "Help your teacher before [35] helping your father, for the latter has given you only the life of this world, while the former has secured you the life of

1. Emmanuel Deutsch, "Notes of a Lecture on the Talmud," Chapter 3. *Literary Remains*, pp. 139, 140.

2. Cf. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, p. 159.

the world to come."³ The teacher was advised: "Let the honor of the pupil be as much to thee as thine own; and the honor of thy companions as much as the reverence for thy teacher and the reverence for thy teacher as much as the reverence for God."⁴ Teachers were regarded as Lights of Israel, the Princes of the people, the Pillars of Israel. What ambitious youth would not aspire to become a teacher?

The ideal teacher,⁵ then, as now, had a high standard set for him. He must be pleasant, prudent, wise, learned, well read, thoughtful; he must have a good memory; he must know how to frame questions, and answer readily⁶ and correctly; he must be open-minded, humble,⁷ open-hearted, and practical. He must be patient,⁸ kind,⁹ and meek. He must be married and not young,¹⁰ wholly devoted to the needs of the pupil. No woman could teach. Her sphere was the home. The teacher was expected to give his services gratuitously, or earn part of his living at least by some other livelihood.¹¹

The Hebrew equivalents for the various teachers are wonderfully suggestive of the exalted conception [36] of the teacher's function. The

3. See Deutsch, quotation from the Talmud, p. 24.

4. Tract Aboth IV, 17. (Taylor.)

5. Tract Aboth V, 10 (Taylor): "The wise man speaks not before one who is greater than he in wisdom; and does not interrupt the words of his companion; and is not hasty to reply; he asks according to canon, and answers to the point; and speaks on the first thing first, and on the last last; of what he has not heard he says, 'I have not heard'; and he acknowledges the truth."

6. Tract Kiddushin 30a, "If one asks thee a question, do not stammer, but answer without hesitation."

7. Tract Maccoth XVII, 25, "I have learned much from my teachers, more from my associates, most from my pupils."

8. See Tract Erubin 54 B: "Unwearidly must the teacher explain a matter until the pupil thoroughly understands it." (Spiers.)

9. Tract Aboth II, 6 (Taylor): "Hillel said...the shamefast is not fit to learn, nor the passionate to teach."

10. Tract Aboth IV, 20 (Spiers): "Instruction by young teachers is like sour grapes and new wine; instruction by older teachers, however, is like ripe grapes and old wine."

11. Cf. the article by Kandel and Grossman, in *Monroe's Cyclopædia*, on Jewish Education, Vol. III, p. 544.

Melamed Tinoketh¹²— the teacher who *goads* the children by the rigid will of discipline; the Hazzan, literally “he who oversees” the training of the older children; Moreh, the *guide* who points out the way to be trod; Alef, the *leader*, who goes before and leads the way; Rabbi, “My Master,” literally “My great one,” who taught by the power of his example.¹³ The teacher’s function thus conceived was not to inform the mind or to impart knowledge for its own sake, but to train up the pupils to self-activity, by goading, overseeing, guiding, leading, and by exemplifying to them the Ideal. This is pedagogy par excellence.¹⁴

On the part of the pupil, both industry and the most painstaking application were required in study.¹⁵ The sages recognized four classes of pupils; “There are four characters in those who sit under the wise: a sponge; a funnel; a strainer; and a bolt-sieve. A sponge, which sucks up all; a funnel, which lets in here and lets out there; a strainer, which lets out the wine and keeps back the dregs; a bolt-sieve, which lets out the pollard (bran) and keeps back the flour.”¹⁶ The pedagogical applications of this classification are apparent. Still other characteristics of pupils are suggested: “There are four characteristics in scholars. Quick to hear and quick to forget, his gain is canceled by his loss; slow to hear [37] and slow to forget, his loss is canceled by his gain; quick to hear and slow to forget, is wise; slow to hear and quick to forget, this is an evil lot.”¹⁷

The aim of education as it was projected into Saul’s consciousness

12. “A term which in Biblical times denoted a teacher or instructor in general (e.g., Psalm 119:99 and Prov. 5:13), but which in the Talmudic period was applied especially to a teacher of children, and was almost invariably followed by the word ‘tinokot’ (children.)”—Lauterbach, in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. VIII, p. 448.

13. For a fuller consideration of these terms cf. U.S. Commissioner of Education Report, 1894-95, Vol. II, p. 1816 ff., and Kennedy, *Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, p. 650.

14. “Since Paul came from Tarshish he must have had a Babylonian education: and also in the school of Gamaliel the Babylonian system was adopted, he (Gamaliel) having been one of the disciples of the great Babylonian Hillel, whose deeds and teachings resemble those of Christ.” Imber, p. 1809.

15. See Tract Aboth II, 16. “Set thyself to learn Thorah, for it is not an heirloom unto thee.” See also Aboth III, 11.

16. Tract Aboth V, 21 (Taylor).

17. Tract Aboth V, 18 (Taylor).

has been sufficiently described already.¹⁸ It was further reflected, however, in the methods which were the great guiding principles for the attaining of the Hebrew ideal.

All methods were employed to fix knowledge accurately and permanently in the memory, either directly or indirectly. Instruction was chiefly oral,¹⁹ for “to speak aloud the sentence which is being learned fixes it in the memory.”²⁰ Oral instruction also helped to create atmosphere: “As a small chip of wood sets fire to a large one, so the younger pupils sharpen the older, or just as steel whets steel, so is one scholar sharpened by another.”²¹ The different senses were all regarded as important avenues of the learning process. “The Jews had learned,” says Graves, “to make a practical appeal to various memories through the different senses—to the visual memory by reading, the motor by pronunciation and writing, the auditory by hearing, and the musical by singing the portions to be committed.”²² As further aids to memory, various mnemonic devices were employed: acrostics,²³ catch-words, rimes, and rhythm.²⁴

“*Non multa sed multum*” is the great underlying principle that these schoolmasters proclaimed.²⁵ To this end, concentration and thoughtfulness in study [38] were enjoined: “If you attempt to grasp too much you grasp nothing at all,”²⁶ and “He who studies hastily and crams too much at once, his knowledge shall diminish; but he who studies by

18. Cf. above under “Racial Influences,” p.22, note 10.

19. Benham, *Hebrew Education*, p. 27, discusses this point splendidly.

20. Both of these statements are quoted from the Talmud in the article on Jewish Education, in *Monroe’s Cyclopædia of Education*. (See Tannith 7, A.)**

21. **

22. Graves, *History of Education*, Vol. I, p. 129.

23. Good examples in Biblical literature are the 119th Psalm and Lamentations.

24. For instance: “Alef, Beth, learning follows wisdom: Gimel, Daleth, be kind to the poor,” etc. (See *Jewish Encyclopædia*, Article Pedagogics, Vol. IX, p. 572)

25. Deutsch, *Literary Remains*, p. 140.

26. Tract Kiddushin 17, A (Spiers), Megillah 6, B (Grossmann).

degrees or step by step, shall accumulate much wisdom and learning,”²⁷ Brevity in imparting knowledge was also suggested: “Always teach your pupils in the shortest possible manner.”²⁸ Conciseness was also recommended, so that far-fetched digressions might be avoided and that a superfluity of words might not confuse the thought.²⁹

The principle of association was employed. Vivid appeals were made to the Oriental imagination of the pupils in teaching the alphabet by associating with each word some tale of childish fantasy.³⁰ This tale always had some moral or religious application which not only served to fix the letter in the memory but also remained permanently associated with it. It is no wonder that the idealistic spiritual education thus implanted in the heart of the child inspired later the grown Hebrew to endure temptation as well as persecution.

The keynote of this method is most aptly described in the Latin maxim, “*Repetito mater studiorum*.”³¹ Reviews and plenty of them, was the constant [39] practice.³² “To review one hundred and one times is better

27. Laurie, *Pre-Christian Education*, p. 97.

28. Pesachim 3, B, and Chullin 63, B (Spiers).

29. Laurie, *Pre-Christian Education*, Cf. p. 97.

30. The Letters of Rabbi Akibah, or The Jewish Primer as it was used in the Public Schools two thousand years ago. Discovered and translated by Rabbi N.H. Imber, 1896, in U.S. Commissioner of Education Report, 1895-96, Vol. I, p. 702 ff. This is a fascinating and suggestive article. Is it possible that Saul may have been taught according to the methods of this primer? A typical instance of instruction taken from this primer is as follows: “As the A, or Aleph, heard and saw how the Lord said unto the A, ‘Why art thou silent?’ and the A replied, ‘Because I do not count for much, as I represent only number one, while the other letters represent much, as B number two, G number three, D number four, and so on.’ Then said the Lord, ‘Be not afraid, as thou art the king of all the letters; thou art one, and I am one, the law is one, and with thee will I give it to Israel my people who are called one (Nation), as the first letter of the Ten Commandments is the A in the word “Anochi”—“I am the Lord,” etc.’ “

31. *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, p. 651.

32. Haggith IX, 6 (Güdemann, quoted in *Jewish Encyclopædia*, Vol. V, p. 43). “It is well known that in Mishnic Hebrew the characteristic word for both ‘to learn’ and ‘to teach’ is *sannah*, ‘to repeat,’ whilst *misnah* (properly, ‘repetition’) is ‘instruction.’ The Biblical Hebrew words are *lamdah*, ‘to learn’; *pi*, ‘to teach’; *sinnen*, ‘to inculcate’; *horah*, ‘to instruct,’ etc.” Box, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, s.v. “Education,” col. 1191.

than to review one hundred times,” was a favorite saying. Thoroughness and perseverance were urged. “Turn it again and again (the Torah), for everything can be found therein; study it, get old and gray with it, and never depart from it, for there is no better gauge of a moral life than the Torah.”³³

“Learning by rote,” says Laurie,³⁴ “was an inevitable and leading characteristic...We can easily understand that instruction of this kind must have inflicted a grievous burden on young minds and crushed out all spontaneity of life. Doubtless this was quite understood and intended by the authorities: all were to be cast in one mold.” Yet as Swift³⁵ appropriately remarks: “We should never lose sight of the fact that passages which the boy would be required to learn by heart, setting forth the details of rites and laws,...were in many cases merely descriptions of acts the pupil had witnessed from his earliest years,...this memorizing of the law in its threefold content, ceremonial, civil, and criminal...was in reality a distinctly socializing process.”

In the Rabbinic school, training in discussion and argumentation was united with memorization. “The professors did not deliver lectures which the disciples, like the student in ‘Faust,’ could comfortably take home in black and white. Here all was life, movement, debate; question was met by counter-question, answers were given wrapped up in allegories or parables, the inquirer was led to deduce the questionable point for himself by [40] analogy--the nearest approach to the Socratic method.”³⁶

It was in the Rabbinic college at Jerusalem that Saul was brought up “at the feet of Gamaliel and instructed according to the strict manner of the law”³⁷ of his fathers. It was here that Saul acquired his peculiar dialectics,³⁸ his antithetic and piquant style of instruction,³⁹ and his

33. Tract Aboth V, 32 (Taylor). See also Tract Sanhedrin, fol. 99a, (Goldschmidt).

34. *Pre-Christian Education*, p. 93.

35. *Education in Ancient Israel*, p. 97.

36. Deutsch, *Literary Remains*, p.24.

37. Acts 22:3.

38. On this point cf. Neander, *History of the Planting and Progress of the Church*, Vol. I, pp. 80, 81. Also Fosdick’s translation of Hug’s Introduction, pp. 511, 512.

39. Tholuck, *The Life, Character, and Style of the Apostle Paul*, p. 42.

characteristic brevity which leaves many things to be supplied by the reader.⁴⁰ It was in the catechetical atmosphere of this environment that he was trained in submitting cases and asking questions. “The questions might be *ethical*: ‘What was the greatest commandment of all?’ or *casuistic*: ‘What must a man do or leave undone on the sabbath?’ or *ceremonial*: ‘What did or did not render a man unclean?’ etc.”⁴¹ It was here too that he became well versed in the stories of mystical interpretation, that he might be able to answer such questions readily by citing these allegories as luminous examples.⁴² Here he also learned how to draw conclusions and apply the argumentative principles adhered to so rigorously by the Rabbis, which often involved hair-splitting distinctions and ingenious twisting of texts.⁴³

In Gamaliel, religion and its handmaid, education, was exhibited to Saul as a concern of one’s whole life. Gamaliel was the grandson of Hillel, the founder and head of the liberal school known by his name. The grandson was distinguished for his [41] lofty character, enlightened mind, and breadth of learning.⁴⁴ He imbued the instruction in Jewish law more fully with the spirit of practical life. Perhaps his son Simeon (possibly St. Paul’s own classmate) expressed this spirit best in his saying, “Not learning but doing is the chief thing.”⁴⁵ Gamaliel was called “The Glory of the Law” and was esteemed as the last of the great Rabbans of Israel.⁴⁶ Before his time the teachers stood to instruct; he introduced the novelty of sitting to give his lessons.⁴⁷

Some of his best known sayings are:

40. Cf. Michaelis, Introduction, Part I, p. 165.

41. Plumptre, in Smith’s *Dictionary of the Bible*, pp. 1167, 1168.

42. Polano, *The Text of the Talmud, Selections*, p. 245, *The Law and Its Study*.

43. “We are initiated into the principles of this logic, and especially its terms, by Bashuysen in his *Clavis Talmudica Maxima*, Panoviae, 1714.”—Tholuck. With this also may be compared Baring-Gould, *A Study of St. Paul*, pp. 54-57.

44. Acts. 5:34-39.

45. Tract Aboth I, 17.

46. Tract Sotah, XV, 18: “When Rabbi Gamaliel died, the glory of the law ceased.”

47. Tract Megillah, fol. 21. 1. Cf. also Lightfoot’s works, Vol. VII, pp. 44-48.

“Make to thyself a master, and be quit of doubt; and tithe not much by estimation.”⁴⁸

(Taylor interprets this as follows: Let duties be defined as far as may be by rule; let doubts be resolved by authority; leave as little scope as possible for personal bias and the temptations of self-interest.)

“Excellent is Torah study together with worldly business, for the practice of them both puts iniquity out of remembrance; and all Torah without work must fail at length, and occasion iniquity.”⁴⁹

He demanded sincerity and a high moral standard of his pupils. “Rabban Gamaliel had issued a proclamation: ‘A disciple who is not inwardly the same as outwardly will not be allowed to enter the house of study.’”⁵⁰

His classification of pupils according to different varieties of fish is interesting.⁵¹ [42]

1. “A son of poor parents who has learned everything by study but who has no understanding is like an unclean fish” (ritually uneatable), *i.e.*, useless.
2. “A son of rich parents who has learned everything and who possesses understanding is like a clean fish,” *i.e.*, useful.
3. “A pupil who has learned everything but does not know how to reply is like a fish from the Jordan,” *i.e.*, provincial.
4. “A pupil who has learned everything and knows also how to reply is like a fish from the great ocean,” *i.e.*, cultured.

Gamaliel believed in teaching by the avenue of the eye as well as the ear. He had hanging on the walls of his room various tablets showing

48. Tract Aboth I, 17. See Taylor, *Sayings of the Fathers*, p. 38.

49. Tract Aboth II, 2.

50. Berach. 28:1, Cohen’s translation, fol. 21a. Cf. also Strassburger, p. 166, *Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts bei den Israeliten*, Breslau, 1885.

51. See *Jewish Encyclopædia*, Vol. V, pp. 558, 559.

different shapes and figures of the moon.⁵²

Gamaliel was an enthusiastic student of Greek literature, considerably free from the ordinary narrowness of the Pharisees.⁵³ Contrary also to their spirit, he took a special pleasure in the beauties of nature. His freedom of spirit went so far that when he made a visit to Ptolemais he did not hesitate to “bathe in an apartment where stood a statue of Venus. Being asked by a heathen how he could reconcile this with his law, he gave the liberal and sensible answer: ‘The bath was here before the statue; the bath was not made for the service of the goddess, but the statue was made for the bath.’”⁵⁴

His discourse before the Sanhedrin,⁵⁵ in which he sets forth his convictions about the course to be taken in dealing with the Christians, is most prudent and sagacious. He gave neither a negative decision nor a verdict in their favor. He was willing to [43] suspend judgment till further light could be thrown upon this new phenomenon.

Certainly the instruction and personality of such a teacher must have exerted a great influence upon the susceptibly eager mind and heart of Saul of Tarsus and instilled into his consciousness many ideas and principles that later found expression in his remarkable teaching qualities. This fact will become more and more distinct as our study proceeds.

4. CULTURAL INFLUENCES.

Saul was a Pharisee indeed, but a Hellenistic Pharisee, “of Tarsus in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city,”⁵⁶ “a Roman born.”⁵⁷ “As the colored threads in the weaver’s loom flashed to and fro till the eye could not follow, so the three threads of this boy’s life”—Jewish, “The thread of

52. Cf. Spiers, *The School System of the Talmud*, p. 34. Reference to *Misnah Rosh Hashanah*, II, 18.

53. “It is said that among the pupils of the celebrated Gamaliel there were five hundred who studied the philosophy and the literature of Greece.” See *Dictionnaire de Pedagogie, 1ere Partie, Article Juifs*. See Compayre’s *History of Pedagogy* (Payne), p. 11, and footnote.

54. Cf. Tholuck, p. 43.

55. Acts 5:34-39.

56. Acts 21:39.

57. Acts 22:28.

the centuries”; —Greek, “The thread of beauty”; Roman, “The thread of Empire”—“crossed and re-crossed till they were all blended in one wonderful pattern in the brain of this boy—the mind that was to become one of the swiftest, most daring, and yet tenderest that have ever lived.”⁵⁸

For a cosmopolitan mission his preparation had been cosmopolitan. “He came from a classical seat of international intercourse, and his home itself was to him from childhood a microcosmos, in which the forces of the great ancient cosmos of the Mediterranean world were all represented.”⁵⁹ His traditional Hebrew training had given him *the teacher’s technique*, as we have seen. It remains for us to [44] note briefly how his life in Tarsus awakened within him *the teacher’s sense of appreciation*, and that his contact with the surge of the Roman world gave him *the teacher’s vision*.

Strabo says that “the inhabitants of Tarsus were so zealous in the pursuits of philosophy and the whole circle of Greek study that they surpassed even the Athenians and Alexandrians, and indeed the citizens of every other place which can be mentioned, in which schools and lectures of philosophers and rhetoricians were established.”⁶⁰ Does not this source throw light on Paul’s experience as related in Acts 21:27–Ch. 22? In 21:37 Paul addresses the chief captain evidently in Greek, for the captain replies in surprise, “Dost thou know Greek?” Paul answers, “I am a Jew, of Tarsus,” just as though he meant to say: “Who could live in Tarsus and not know Greek?” The question of Saul’s Greek learning has been much disputed. Ramsay⁶¹ believes that since Paul’s father was a Roman citizen he was a man of wealth and importance in Tarsus. If this were true, Saul had abundant opportunity to take advantage of all the cultural influences Tarsus had to offer. Sihler raises the question,⁶² “Why shrink from the assumption that he had some course with a *grammatikos* in his native town, before he essayed a graduate course in Hebraism and Pharisaism at Jerusalem? I believe he heard the Septuagint

58. Matthews, *Paul the Dauntless*, p. 31.

59. “In the streets, in the market, all nations met, jostled, and talked in a babel of many tongues. There were beautiful, straight-nosed, oval-faced Greeks, bullet-headed Romans, dark-eyed Armenians, fair-haired fresh-looking Celts from Galatia, and sallow, almond-eyed men of Turanian ancestry.”—*Baring-Gould, A Study of St. Paul*, p. 45.

60. Strabo, *Geogr.* XIV, 5, 13.

61. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen*, p. 31.

62. *Biblical Review*, October 1923, Vol. III, p. 625.

every Sabbath at Tarsus...He picked up Greek as easily as an American child of Scandinavian or German descent would gain English in Fort Wayne, St. Louis, or St. Paul.” On the other hand Hensen⁶³ limits any interference as to the extent of Saul’s Greek learning by two reasons. “First, the Hellenistic Jews kept themselves at a great distance [45] from the Greeks. In the case of Paul, too, there is a peculiar improbability of any very intimate connection with the Greeks, as he belonged to a family of very rigid Pharisaical principles. But secondly, Paul was sent away from the influences of Tarsus when he was between ten and thirteen years of age.”⁶⁴ Deissmann⁶⁵ also would limit Paul’s contact with Greek life in Tarsus. He stresses the artisan and craftsman in Saul, citing Acts 18:3, and that passages which state that he earned his whole living by the work of his hands, as evidence that his contact with broader cultural influences was very limited.

With regard to his quotations from Greek Literature,⁶⁶ Moulton refers to the discovery of Dr. [46] Rendall Harris in one of his Syriac manuscripts of a passage in which two of these quotations are found

63. Hensen, *Der Apostel Paulus*. Cf. pp. 1-10.

64. Henke, on the question as to whether Paul was or was not well versed in Greek literature, says: “It is not to be determined by his number of quotations from the Greek authors; but by the general structure of his style, by his mode of argumentation, and by the whole arrangement of his thoughts.” Henke’s Translation of Paley’s *Horæ Pauline*, Remarks, pp. 449-457.

65. Deissman, *St. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*, p. 50 ff. Also, a number of references in his *Licht vom Osten*, 4th edition, Tübingen, 1923.

66. There are three of them:

I. Acts 17:28, “For we are also his offspring,” quoted in his discourse before the Athenians on the Areopagus. This quotation is either from the *Phænomena* of Aratus (270 B.C.), fifth line, or from the Hymn to Jupiter by Cleanthes (300 B.C.), fourth line. Since St. Paul used “certain even of your own poets,” might he not have referred to both poets? It would be natural for him to quote from Aratus, as he was a Cilician; it would also be natural for him to quote from Cleanthes, because he had resided at Athens, and St. Paul was now addressing an Athenian audience. Since both quotations are near the beginning of the two poems, they would be easily recognized by his hearers.

together:⁶⁷

“A grave have they fashioned for thee, O Zeus, highest and greatest, the Cretans, always liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons. But thou art not dead, for everlastingly thou livest and standest; for in thee we live, and move, and have our being.”

How far these quotations prove Paul’s reading in Greek Literature is not easy to say. Moulton suggests, however: “If you found an Englishman saying, ‘To be or not to be: that is the question,’ you could not inevitably prove he had read *Hamlet*. It might be he got the tag out of a newspaper. If, however, he continued the speech beyond that line, it would be a little better evidence that he knew his Shakespeare...He was just the sort of man to search the literature for traces of these higher things.”⁶⁸ To all of which the present writer would add this question: What about the learning and the example of the illustrious Gamaliel?

II. I Cor. 15:33, “Evil companionships corrupt good morals.” Clement of Alexandria (200 A.D.) calls this “a tragic iambic line” (*Stromata* I. 14), and the historian Socrates (439 A.D.), *Hist. Eccles.* III. 16, ascribes it to a tragedy or Euripides (480-406 B.C.), a line not to be found in his extant writings, but possibly original with him. (See Meineke, *Fragm. Comic. Graec.*, Vol. IV, p. 132.) But Jerome, Letter LXX. 2 (420 A.D.) and Eusebius (340 A.D.) attribute it to Menander, and refer it to his lost comedy of *Thais*. Possibly it may have been first composed by Euripides and copied from him by Menander. (See Lewin, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, Vol. I, p. 401.)

III. Titus 1:12, “Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons.” This is to be found in the *Concerning Oracles* of Epimenides (600 B.C.) [according to Diogenes Laertius (200 A.D.), Book I. 109, and according to Chrysostom (407 A.D.), *Homily* III. 1. 12-14]. It also occurs in the Hymn to Zeus by Callimachus (285 B.C.), verse 8. The latter is evidently a quotation from the former. “The evil beasts,” etc., is found in Hesiod, *Theogony*, line 26, applied to shepherds. Downes suggests that Epimenides may have borrowed from Hesiod and Callimachus from him. See Schaff, *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, Vol. XIII, p. 528.

Clement of Alexandria (200 A.D.), *Stromata* I. 14, says: “...Epimenides the Cretan, whom Paul knew as a Greek prophet, whom he mentions in the Epistle to Titus, where he speaks thus: ‘One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said, The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.’ “ Concerning which Coxe says in a footnote: “Though Canon Farrar minimizes the Greek Scholarship of St. Paul, as is now the fashion, I think Clement credits him with Greek learning. The apostle’s example seems to have inspired the philosophical arguments of Clement, as well as his exuberance of poetical and mythological quotation.”

67. Moulton, *From Egyptian Rubbish Heaps*. London, 1916, p. 66.

68. *Ibid.*, p. 67.

Is not he the key to the problem? We can well believe he not only gave direction by hint and comment, but that the stimulus of his example sent Saul enthusiastically into the cultural sources of Greek literature with which he was more or less acquainted from his earliest days in Tarsus.

In the cosmopolitan atmosphere of Tarsus, Saul's pedagogical sense was considerably enhanced. On the pedagogical sense was considerably enhanced. On the practical side of life he had learned a trade, [47] and had acquired a language. The impact of Greek life all about him, the sights and sounds and the countless impressions of innumerable experiences enriched his imagination and awakened the teacher's sense of appreciation in him. His contact with the surge of the Roman world gave him a knowledge of men and an insight into human nature, and beside all this a vision that encompassed the world, a vision colored indeed by his Pharisaic nature, but one which became clarified and real when the truth had made him free.

To summarize: The racial influences which shaped and qualified St. Paul's Pedagogy are sourced in a remarkable history and are preserved in a unique literature. He inherited from his race a strongly didactic nature and a unique educational ideal. The practice of Israel's educational leaders through centuries was in the process of crystalizing in Saul's day into a system. This system largely environed and shaped his training first in the home, then in the school. Home education involved such principles as these: The absolute authority of parents by divine right; strict obedience of children according to divine command. Stern discipline was regarded as the best teacher. Instruction followed the order of events in the nature of object lessons explained orally, by using the moment of excited curiosity to impart knowledge. The child's imagination being stirred, his credulity satisfied and his emotions aroused, he began to express himself in word, deed, reverence, prayer, and song. Imitation, repetition, and obedience formed habit, regulated conduct, and laid the foundations of character. Thus the child was brought up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." The scholastic influences which shaped the training of Saul might be mentioned as: a passion for universal education among his people, the preeminence of the [48] teaching profession, high standards of teaching, and an exalted conception of the teacher's function. Instruction was chiefly oral, and characterized by brevity and conciseness on the part of the teacher. Knowledge was secured by encouragement of concentration, thoroughness, thoughtfulness, association, and repetition on the part of the pupil, for the sake of fixing knowledge accurately and permanently in memory. In the Rabbinic College discussion and argumentation by questions, answers, allegories,

and parables were united with memorization. As Saul's teacher, Gamaliel exhibited religion and education as concerns of one's whole life. He had a lofty character, enlightened mind, and breadth of learning. He was strongly practical in spirit, and was esteemed as the last of the great Rabbans of Israel. He introduced the seated posture of the teacher in Israel, and enlivened his instruction by wise sayings. He demanded sincerity and a high moral standard of his pupils. He imparted knowledge by eye as well as ear. He was an enthusiastic student of Greek literature. He influenced Saul considerably, as is seen in his later experience. This traditional Hebrew training having given Saul the teacher's technique, the cultural influences of Tarsus awakened within him the teacher's sense of appreciation, and his contact with the surge of the Roman world gave him the teacher's vision, distorted at first by his Pharisaic nature, but clarified and focused when the truth had made him free. Then Saul of Tarsus became Paul the Teacher, as it is now for us to see.

DOI: 10.7252/JOURNAL.02.2014F.07

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[151]

A Selection from *The Pedagogy of St. Paul* by Howard Tillman Kuist

AUTHENTIC SOURCES

H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ Text with critical apparatus. British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1920. Prepared by Professor Eberhard Nestle, D.D., of Maulbronn. (Text a resultant of a collection of three of the principle recensions of the Greek Testament which appeared in the latter half of the 19th century: Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Weiss.)

The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments. American Revision. Nelson, New York, 1900.

Historical: The Acts of the Apostles. Chapters 9:1-30, and 13-28.

Literary: The Epistles of St. Paul. (Arranged in their probable chronological order.) Note: "Of the Epistles of St. Paul the four most important, Galatians, Romans, I and II Corinthians, are universally acknowledged as genuine even by the most exacting critics; Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians are admitted by nearly all critics; the Pastoral Epistles, especially I Timothy and Titus, are more or less disputed, but even they bear the stamp of Paul's genius." Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I. p. 281.

Epistles written during the period of his missionary activity (45-63?):

[152] To the Thessalonians. I.

To the Thessalonians. II.

To the Corinthians. I.

To the Corinthians. II.

To the Galatians.

To the Romans.

Epistles written during his first imprisonment (63-?)

To the Philippians.

To the Ephesians.

To the Colossians.

To Philemon.

Epistles written during his second imprisonment (-65?)

To Titus.

To Timothy. I.

To Timothy. II.

Legendary and Apocryphal Sources. (For a list of these together with manuscripts and dates see Schaff, Vol. I, p. 281 ff.)

The Apocryphal New Testament: being all the Gospels, Epistles, and other pieces now extant: attributed in the first century to Jesus Christ, His Apostles, and their companions, and not included in the New Testament by its compilers. Translated and not first collected into one volume, with prefaces and tables and various notes and references. New York. DeWitt, Publisher.

Sources on Jewish Education as they are related to this subject. The reader is referred to:

The Babylonian Talmud: Tractate Berakot. Translated by Rev. A. Cohen. Cambridge, 1921.

Eighteen Treatises from the Mishna. DeSola and Raphall. London, 1845.

Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, Gorfinkle. New York, 1913. A popular edition.

Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, comprising Pirke [153] Aboth and Pereq R. Meir. In Hebrew and English, with critical and illustrative notes. Charles Taylor, Cambridge, 1877. This is considered one of the most scholarly attempts to translate and comment upon this source.

Shabbath and Eruvin: Two titles of the Misna or Code of the Traditional Laws which were observed by Scribes and Pharisees in our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ's time. Translated into English with annotations, by W. Wotton, D.D. London, 1718.

Der Babylonischer Talmud, Goldschmidt. Berlin, 1900. A scholarly and dependable translation of the Talmud into German.

The Babylonian Talmud, edited by M.L. Rodkinson, 11 Vol. New York, 1900. Not regarded as a satisfactory translation.

SECONDARY AUTHORITIES

(The Literature on the Life and Work of the Apostle Paul is so vast that the reader is referred to the Bibliographies appended to such articles as A.T. Robertson in *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*; Orr, Chicago, 1915, under Paul, the Apostle; and G.G. Findlay, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, New York, 1901, under Paul, the Apostle. On Jewish Education see Bibliography in Swift, *Education in Ancient Israel*, Chicago, 1919; and Bibliography in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, article on Education by Gudemann, and article on Pedagogics by Grossmann.)

Abbott, Lyman, *Life and Letters of St. Paul*. New York, 1898.

Abbot, T.K., *Ephesians and Colossians*. Scribners. 1905. In *International Critical Commentary Series*.

Barclay, *The Talmud*. London, 1878.

Baring-Gould, S., *A Study of St. Paul*. London, 1897. [154]

Beecher, *The Prophets and the Promise*. New York, 1905.

Beet, *A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, Ephesians to Philemon*. London, 1895. Second Edition.

Benham, *Hebrew Education*. London, 1870.

Betts, *How to Teach Religion*. New York, 1919. *Biblical Review*, October, 1923. Vol. III, p. 625.

Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*. London, 1911.

Burrell, *Paul's Companions*. New York, 1921.

Burrell, *Paul's Letters*. New York, 1921.

Burton, *Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. New York, 1920. In *International Critical Commentary Series*.

Burton, *Moods and Tenses of the New Testament*. Chicago, 1906.

Chrysostom, *Homilies*. In the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series. Vol. XI-XIII. Schaff, 1899.

Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. Two volumes. New York, 1906.

Cubberley, *The History of Education*. New York, 1920.

Deissmann, Adolf, *Paulus, Eine Kultur-und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze*. Tübingen, 1911. *St. Paul, a Study in Social and Religions History*. English Edition, translated by Strachan. New York, 1912.

Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*. Fourth Edition. Tübingen, 1923. (English Edition translated by Strachan, New York, 1910, from Second Edition, Tübingen, 1909.)

Delitzsch, Franz, *Jewish Artisan Life in Times of Jesus*. Translated, B. Pick. New York, 1885.

Deutsch, Emmaneul, *Literary Remains*. London. 1874. [155]

Dewey, John, *Democracy in Education*. New York, 1920.

Dewey, John, *Psychology*. New York 1887.

Dill, Samuel, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*. London, 1911.

Driver, *Introduction to Literature of Old Testament*. New York, 1898.

Du Bois, *The Natural Way*. New York 1903.

Du Bois, *The Point of Contact in Teaching*. New York, 1900.

Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ*. Boston, 1876. *Education Report, U.S. Commissioner of:*

1894-95, Vol. II. Education and the Talmud. N.H. Imber, p. 1795-1820.

1895-96, Vol. I. The Jewish Primer. .H. Imber, pp. 701-719.

Ellicott, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles*. Andover, 1863.

Encyclopedia Biblica, Article on Education, by Box.

Encyclopedia Britannica, Articles on Gamaliel and Paul.

Farrar, *The Life and Work of St. Paul*. New York, 1896.

Felkin, *Herbart's Introduction to the Science and Practice of Education*. Boston, 1900.

Fisher, *Beginnings of Christianity*. New York, 1887.

Fitch, *The Art of Securing Attention*. New York, 1883.

Fitch, *Lectures on Teaching*.

Gairdner, *Helps to the Study of the Epistle to the Romans*.

Garvie, *Life and Teachings of St. Paul*. 1909.

Gilbert, G.H., *The Student's Life of St. Paul*. New York, 1910.

Godet, *Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles: Romans*. London, 1892. [156]

Graves, *A History of Education*. Three volumes. New York, 1909.

Greenough, *The Apostles of Our Lord*. Armstrongs, New York, 1904.

Hall, *Adolescence*. Two volumes. New York, 1904.

Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*. Articles, Paul the Apostle, by G.G. Findlay; Feasts and Fasts, by Harding; Synagogue, by W. Bacher; Education, by Kennedy.

Hausrath, *Der Apostel Paulus*. Second Edition, Heidelberg, 1872.

Hemsen, *Der Apostel Paulus*.

Horne, *The Philosophy of Education*. New York, 1906.

Horne, *Psychological Principles of Education*. New York, 1909.

Horne, *Leadership of Bible Study Groups*. New York, 1912.

Horne, *Story-Telling, Questioning, and Studying*. New York, 1916.

Horne, *Jesus the Master Teacher*. New York, 1920.

Howson, *The Metaphors of St. Paul*. American Tract Society, Boston, 1872.

Humphries, *Timothy and Titus*. In *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*. Cambridge, 1897.

- International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Ed. Orr, Chicago, 1915. Articles on Education, Pedagogy, School, Teacher, Tutor.
- Iverach, Jas., *St. Paul, His Life and Times*. New York, 1890.
- Jacobson, *Bible Commentary, Vol. II, Acts*. New York 1902.
- James, William, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology; and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals*. New York, 1899.
- James, William, *Psychology*. New York, 1900.
- Jefferson, Chas., *The Character of Paul*. New York, 1923. [157]
- Jewish Encyclopedia. Ed. Singer, New York, 1906. Articles on Education, Gamaliel, Jesus ben Sira, Moses, Saul of Tarsus, Scribes, Tarsus, etc.
- Kent, C.F., *The Wise Men of Ancient Israel and Their Proverbs*. Boston, 1895.
- Kent, C.F., *Makers and Teachers of Judaism*. New York, 1911.
- King, C.F., *Personal and Ideal Elements in Education*. New York, 1915.
- Lange and De Garmo, *Herbart's Outlines of Educational Doctrine*. 1909.
- Laurie, S.S., *Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education*. New York, 1900.
- Lewin, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, Two volumes. London, 1878.
- Lewit, *Darstellung der Theoretischen und Praktischen Pädagogik im jüdischen Altertume*. Berlin, 1896.
- Leipziger, H.M., *Education Among the Jews*. New York. 1890. Vol. III, No. 6, of Educational Monographs published by the New York College for the Training of Teachers.
- Lias, *Commentary on II Corinthians*. Cambridge, 1897. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.
- Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford. Eighth Edition, 1897.
- Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. Andover, 1899.
- MacDuff, *Footsteps of St. Paul*. New York, 1890.
- Marcus, S., *Die Pädagogik des israelitischen Volkes*. Vienna, 1887.
- Matthews, *Paul the Dauntless*. New York, 1916.
- McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*. New York, 1900.
- Meyer, *Commentaries on Pauline Epistles*. New York, 1890. [158]
- Milligan, G., *Greek Papyri*. Cambridge, 1910.
- Milligan, G., *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*. London, 1908.
- Milman, *History of the Jews*. Three volumes. Fifth Edition. London, 1883.
- Moffatt, *A New York Translation of the New Testament*. New York, 1913.
- Monod, Adolphe, *Der Apostel Paulus*. (Five Discourses from the French.) Elberfeld, 1854.
- Monroe's *Cyclopedia of Education*. Articles on Jewish Education and Gamaliel. New York, 1911.
- Monroe, Paul, *Textbook in the History of Education*. New York, 1905.
- Moule, *Ephesian Studies*. London, 1900.
- Moule, *Philippian Studies*. London, 1902.
- Moule, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge, 1899.
- Moulton, *From Egyptian Rubbish Heaps*. London, 1916.
- Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. I, Prolegomena. Edinburgh, 1908.
- Moulton and Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*. New York, 1914.
- Myers, F.W.H., *St. Paul*. London, 1892.
- Neander, *History of Planting and Progress of the Christian Church*. English Translation in Bohn's Standard Library.
- New York *Independent*, May 5, 1887. Article, The Apostle Paul in the Talmud.
- Noyes, *New Translation of the Book of Psalms*. 8vo. 1831.
- Palmer, *The Teacher*. New York, 1908.
- Peabody, *St. Paul and the Modern World*. Boston, 1923. [159]
- Polano, *The Talmud: Selection from the Contents of That Ancient Book, Its Commentaries, Teachings, Poetry, Legends*. Philadelphia, 1896.
- Ramsay, Sir William. *St. Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen*. Third Edition. New York, 1898.
- Ramsay, Sir William, *The Church in the Roman Empire*. New York, 1894.
- Ramsay, Sir William, *The Cities of St. Paul: Their Influence on His Life and Thought*. London, 1907.
- Ribot, *Psychology of the Emotions*. New York, 1903.
- Robertson, *Epochs in the Life of St. Paul*. New York, 1909.
- Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. New York, 1914.
- Robertson and Plummer, *Commentary on I Corinthians*. International Critical Commentary Series. New York, 1911.
- Rosenau, *Jewish Education; Historical Survey*. Philadelphia, 1912.
- Salmond, *Commentary on Ephesians*. Expositor's Greek Testament. New York, 1903.
- Sanday, *Commentary on Romans*. International Critical Commentary Series. New York, 1895.
- Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*. Vol. I-III. New York, 1903.
- Schaff, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. First Series. New York, 1899.
- Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*. Philadelphia, 1896.
- Seeley, *History of Education*. New York, 1904.
- Seeley, *A New School Management*. New York, 1903.
- Shilleto, *The Works of Flavius Josephus*. Book II.

- Shürer, Emil, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. English Translation. [160] Five volumes. Second Edition. New York, 1896.
- Simon, *The Principle of Jewish Education in the Past*. Two Essays. Washington, D.C., 1909.
- Simon, J., *L'Education et l'instruction des Enfants chez les anciens Juifs*. 1879.
- Smith, David, *Life and Letters of St. Paul*. 1920.
- Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*. Three volumes. London, 1863. Article by Plumptre on Education.
- Soares, *The Social Institutions of the Bibles*. New York, 1915.
- Speer, *The Man Paul*. New York, 1900.
- Spence, *Pulpit Commentary Series on St. Paul's Epistles*. Funk and Wagnalls, New York.
- Spiers, *School System of the Talmud*. London, 1898.
- Stade. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Band II. Berlin, 1889. Article by Holtzmann on Proverbs.
- Stalker, *Life of St. Paul*. Revell.
- Storrs, *Divine Origin of Christianity*. 1884.
- Strassburger, *Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts bei den Israeliten*. Breslau, 1885.
- Strayer and Norsworthy, *How to Teach*. New York, 1918.
- Stifler, *The Epistle to the Romans*. New York, 1897.
- Sully, *Outlines of Psychology*. New York, 1887.
- Swift, *Education in Ancient Israel*. Chicago, 1919.
- Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon*. New York. 1892.
- Tholuck, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Vol. VIII, pp. 364-393. Essay on the Life, Character and Style of the Apostle Paul. English Translation in *Selections from German Literature*, edited by Edwards and Clark, New York, 1839.
- Thorndike, *Elements of Psychology*. New York, 1914. Second Edition.
- Titchener, *An Outline of Psychology*. New York, 1902. [161]
- Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*. London, 1891.
- Vincent, *Epistle to the Philippians and to Philemon*. International Critical Commentary Series. New York, 1906.
- Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*. Fourth Edition. Berlin, 1901.
- White, *School Management*. New York, 1893.
- Winer, *A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*. Edition VIII. Andover, 1869.
- Wisn, *Geschichte und Methodik des Schulwesens in Talmudischen Altertume*. Strassburg, 1892.
- World Almanac*, 1924.

Young, *Analytic Concordance*. New York, 1899.

SOCIORHETORICAL INTERPRETATION (SRI) AND INDUCTIVE BIBLE STUDY (IBS): OUTLINES OF MARK, THE LORD'S PRAYER, AND THE SON'S PRAYER IN JOHN 17

Vernon K. Robbins

Abstract: There are many things in common between Inductive Bible Study (IBS) and Sociorhetorical Interpretation (SRI) as I practice it in the context of the Rhetoric of Religious Antiquity (RRA) project.¹ Many of the similarities are a result of detailed focus on texts. The multiple strategies of interpreting both the inner texture and the intertexture of texts in SRI share much in common with IBS. As a result, many of the strategies of analysis and interpretation in the sections on “Observing and Asking” and “Answering or Interpreting” in particular are highly congenial with or naturally integral to SRI.

1. See <http://www.rra-sri.org/> for the regular meetings of the SRI and RRA project. I am deeply grateful to the following people for reading a penultimate version of this essay and making substantial suggestions that I have incorporated in the final version: L. Gregory Bloomquist; Robert H. von Thaden, Jr.; Alexandra Gruca-Macaulay; Roy R. Jeal; Susan E. Hylan; Juan Hernández, Jr.; Fredrick J. Long; Michal Beth Dinkler; and Robert L. Foster.

2. David R. Bauer and Robert A. Traina, *Inductive Bible Study: A Comprehensive Guide to the Practice of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 75-175, 177-277.

BOOKS-AS-WHOLES

I did not include “books-as-wholes”³ either in *Exploring the Texture of Texts* or *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse*,⁴ but I have been engaged in this especially energetically during the last decade. Instead of “determining” “the” division of the book (88), “the” main units (90), “the” book’s subunits (90), and thereby “the” structure of the book (94) as is done in *Inductive Bible Study*, I am interested in the “implications” of displaying the sections of a book and its units in a certain way. IBS recognizes that different interpreters reach different conclusions about the sections in books, and that these differences regularly lead to different decisions about the nature of the book (89). The discussion in IBS gives me the impression that in the end there is “a correct” way to display the sections of a particular book. In my experience, the outline of a book and its units that an interpreter displays is a combination of careful analysis and artistic, or perhaps rhetorical, perception of the progressive texture of the book. I have become more and more fascinated with the different ways in which interpreters (and my very bright students) display sections of books and units, and what they see when they display them differently. This indicates to me that books and units of writings regularly have such complex, interwoven structures that it is often beneficial even for one interpreter to explain how different ways of displaying a sequence of text may lead to highly informative insights into things going on in the text.

An outline of the Gospel of Mark is a case in point. A display of only five of the many outlines of Mark during the past half century shows the remarkable variety of perceptions of divisions in the text. In the context of this variety, it does not seem good to me for an interpreter to assert that she or he will present the “definitive” outline of Mark. It would be better for interpreters to assert that they will introduce an outline that shows a particular aspect of the text that is related to the interpreter’s choice of analytics and point of view about the text.

3. *Ibid.*, 79-142.

4. Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, ©1996, 2012); *idem*, *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

Vincent Taylor’s outline was influenced especially by Mark’s geographical framework.⁵ In contrast, Vernon K. Robbins’s outline highlighted stages of interaction between the teacher and his disciples.⁶ Adela Yarbro Collins’s outline makes use of multiple criteria like geography, themes, and various literary devices like *inclusio*.⁷ C. Clifton Black’s outline emphasizes thematic structure along with summary transitions.⁸ Mary Ann Beavis’s outline highlights transitions and interludes throughout the story.⁹

Outlines of Gospel of Mark				
V. Taylor 1963	V. K. Robbins 1981	A. Y. Collins 2007	C. C. Black 2011	M. A. Beavis 2011
1:1-13	1:1-13	1:1-15	1:1-15	1:1-13 Prologue 1:14-15 Tran.
1:14-3:6	1:14-20 Tran. 1:21-3:6	1:16-45 2:1-3:6	1:16-3:6	1:16-3:35 Act 1
3:7-6:13	3:7-19 Tran. 3:20-5:43 6:1-13 Tran.	3:7-35 4:1-34 4:35-6:6a	3:7-12 Tran. 3:13-6:6a	4:1-34 Int. 4:35-6:56 Act 2
6:14-8:26	6:14-8:26	6:6b-8:26	6:6b-8:21	7:1-23 Int. 7:24-9:29 Act 3
8:27-10:52	8:27-9:1 Tran. 9:2-10:45 10:46-11:11 Tran.	8:27-10:45 10:46-52 Tran.	8:22-10:52	9:30-10:52 Int.
11:1-13:37	11:12-12:44 13:1-37 Tran.	11:1-13:37	11:1-13:37	11:1-12:44 Act 4 13:1-37 Int.
14:1-16:8	14:1-15:47 16:1-8	14:1-16:8	14:1-15:47 16:1-20	14:1-15:47 Act 5 16:1-8 Epilogue

*Int. - Interlude, Tran. - Transition

5. Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1963), 107-111.

6. Vernon K. Robbins, “Summons and Outline in Mark: The Three-Step Progression,” *NovT* 23 (1981): 97-114; idem, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress, ©1984; 2009).

7. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 85-93.

8. C. Clifton Black, *Mark* (Abingdon New Testament Commentaries; Nashville: Abingdon, 2011).

9. Mary Ann Beavis, *Mark* (Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011).

There is one constant in these five outlines: all agree that 14:1 is the beginning of the ending of the Gospel of Mark. Beyond this, at least one person has an alternate point of view concerning the beginning and ending of a section. Does this mean that at least one person out of five is “always wrong” in the way they display sections of a text? I do not think so. The issue is what a person is looking at in a text, what they see, and how what they see in one portion of the text leads them to see particular things in additional portions of the text. It is important, in my view, to indicate where an author has included repetitive clauses or other formulations that signal an introduction, conclusion, or transition, like the repetitive statements in Matthew at the end of long speeches by Jesus.¹⁰ Even where clauses or other formulations like these are present, however, there still may be quite different ways of displaying its overall outline.

At the beginning of my career, I searched for “the correct way” to outline books in the NT. As a result, when I first taught I regularly “corrected” the way students identified the opening, middle, and closing of texts. I distinctly remember the day when I displayed the work of two students who had made noticeably different decisions about opening, middle, and closing in a unit of text. When they were displayed on two drop-down screens in the classroom, I asked the crucial question to each student, “What did you see that caused you to divide the text in this way?” The result was remarkable. Both students had cogent, persuasive reasons for determining the opening, middle, and closing for the unit, and both students called attention to very interesting phenomena in the text on the basis of their division. I had to revise my “scientifically precise” insistence for “my” way of determining opening, middle, and closing. To be sure, certain students did not make good decisions as they made the opening or closing just one line and lumped everything in the middle. And, to be fair, there was always a “range of variation” rather than “anything goes.” I have concluded that texts are so complex that various ways of determining their opening, middle, and closing provide the opportunity to see different clusters or constellations of emphases within texts.

10. Matt 7:28-29; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1-2.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMES GUIDING ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

A major difference between IBS and SRI, as I experience it, is in the conceptual frame that guides them.¹¹ My experience of the description of procedures in IBS suggests that it is framed by what I understand to be “philosophical-theology in a canonical mode.” In this mode, one major goal is to move steadfastly toward “truth claims.” Another goal is to interpret scripture within canonical boundaries.¹²

My version of SRI is framed by an understanding of texts as social-cultural-ideological-religious discourse.¹³ This means that the goal is to describe how the language in the text functions as a social-cultural-ideological-religious “tool” of communication among humans during a particular time in a particular locale or region. This means that practitioners of SRI perceive words always to be interactive within contexts as they attempt to discern meanings and meaning-effects of texts of any kind, whether these are biblical or other texts. For me, philosophical-theology is a very important form of discourse, and discourse in the biblical canon has special authority within Christian belief, tradition, and practice. But there is no special reason that interpretation of the Bible should remain either within the confines of philosophical-theology or texts in the Bible. A major reason that leads me to resist these confines is context, which always reaches beyond the boundaries of any particular text. Another reason lies in the polymorphous components of any corpus of literature. Indeed, the initial biblical texts were written precisely to engage alternative stories and texts in their contexts. Thus, to close off this horizon delimits the texts in quite an unnatural way in relation to

11. For conceptual frames and framing, see Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities* (New York: Basic Books, 2002), 251-55, 261-62. For application of conceptual blending within an SRI framework to the New Testament, see Robert H. von Thaden, Jr., “Pauline Rhetorical Invention: Seeing 1 Corinthians 6:12-7:7 through Conceptual Integration Theory. A Cognitive Turn,” in *Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies* (ed. B. G. Howe and J. B. Green; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014), 101-21; idem, *Sex, Christ, and Embodied Cognition: Paul's Wisdom for Corinth* (Emory Studies in Early Christianity 16; Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing, 2012).

12. See especially Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 66-70, 343, 346, with very important clarification and application in 346-60.

13. Robbins, *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse*; idem, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*.

their function in the contexts in which they were composed. In addition, the multiple modes of discourse in any corpus of literature evoke an emergent environment of conceptual blending that produces ever-productive networks of ongoing reconfiguration.¹⁴ The reconfiguration occurs, however, in contexts of persistent restraint activated through interplay with other modes of discourse either in one writing itself or in an overall corpus of select writings. In other words, all human communication occurs through interplay between discourse that has a certain degree of rhetorical power or stability through its acceptance as somehow “conventional” and discourse that subtly or dramatically reconfigures or reacts against this discourse.

This leads to another aspect of SRI which, if I understand correctly, differs from IBS. It seems to me that IBS is a “canonical” discipline as mentioned above. In other words, the interpretive strategies function centripetally so that intertextual interpretation is designed to move “inward” to interpret meanings and meaning-effects of books inside the canon. SRI, in contrast, is a “comparative” discipline. This means that intertextual interpretation is designed to move both centripetally and centrifugally. Not only are intertexture strategies designed to move from “outside” phenomena into canonical biblical texts to display potential meanings and meaning-effects evoked by them, but intertexture strategies also function to move from phenomena “inside” the biblical canon out into the Mediterranean world. These strategies display the manner in which biblically canonical texts functioned as emergent environments where phenomena moved “centrifugally” out from the texts and moved the texts “forward” conceptually in time and space.¹⁵

A major aspect of my view is that practices of analysis and interpretation grounded in the social and cognitive sciences hold great promise for 21st century Christians to participate fruitfully and faithfully in activities that can help Christianity find a rich and abundant home among all the religions of the world. Indeed, the social and cognitive sciences may help Christians to move beyond division and even hatred in the present global context of religious belief and practice. Humans

14. Vernon K. Robbins, “Conceptual Blending and Early Christian Imagination,” in *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science* (ed. P. Luomanen, I. Pyysiäinen, and R. Uro; Biblical Interpretation Series 89; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 161-95.

15. Vernon K. Robbins, “Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation,” in *The Blackwell Companion to the New Testament* (ed. D. E. Aune; London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 192-219 at 195.

always have the ability to use their tools of communication for conflict, divisiveness, and destruction. My goal, in contrast, is to move toward understanding, cooperation, and building a highly complex world together with highly diverse people in our midst. Indeed, underlying my SRI approach is a belief that Christians have a responsibility to move toward cooperative relationships with other religious communities and traditions, rather than to foreground competitive relationships with them. The primary reason that the social and cognitive sciences may help Christianity with this responsibility is that these sciences seek to understand the overall nature of humans in the world, in their communities, and in their bodies. This kind of understanding naturally provides resources for being interested in people who are different from us, rather than disengaging from them or attempting to dominate them especially out of fear that otherwise they may dominate us. It is natural for a particular tradition of humans to think they are genuinely superior to other humans. While this ambience of superiority may create remarkable personal and cultural energy, it also naturally harbors and nurtures conflict, hatred, and destruction.

FROM WORD USAGE TO TOPOS AND RHETOROLECT ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The difference between the conceptual frames that guide IBS and SRI has a substantive effect on how a person understands “words” in a text. There are excellent guides for analyzing and interpreting “Word Usage” in *IBS*.¹⁶ A primary difference for SRI lies in the perception that many words and phrases evoke *topoi*, namely “locations” of social, cultural, ideological, and religious “reasoning.”¹⁷ Words and phrases, therefore, are not so much “things in themselves” as things related to other things. They are “locations of reasoning” within constellations or clusters of meanings and meaning-effects that function within social,

16. Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 186-201.

17. Vernon K. Robbins, *The Invention of Christian Discourse. Volume 1* (Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing, 2009), 81-88; Carolyn R. Miller, “The Aristotelean *Topos*: Hunting for Novelty,” in *Rereading Aristotle’s Rhetoric* (ed. A. G. Gross and A. E. Walzer; Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000), 130-46; Barbara Warnick, “Two Systems of Invention: The Topics in the *Rhetoric* and *The New Rhetoric*,” in *Rereading Aristotle’s Rhetoric* (ed. A. G. Gross and A. E. Walzer; Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000), 107-29.

cultural, ideological, and religious networks of meanings. In the words of L. Gregory Bloomquist: “*Topoi*, thus, can be understood as those landmarks on the mental geography of thought, which themselves evoke a constellation of networks of meanings as a result of social, cultural, or ideological use—and the argumentative embedding of these *topoi* in the presentation of the argument(s) of the text.”¹⁸

The focus in SRI on *topoi* in their social, cultural, ideological, and religious contexts has led to a taxonomy of “rhetorolects”¹⁹ in emerging Christian discourse. A rhetorolect is “a form of language variety or discourse identifiable on the basis of a distinctive configuration of themes, images (rhetography), topics, reasonings, and argumentations (rhetology)...By their nature, rhetorolects blend with one another, interacting like dialects do when people from different dialectical areas converse with one another.”²⁰ Conceptual blending in the first century Jesus-to-Christ movement²¹ featured six major rhetorolects: wisdom, prophetic, apocalyptic, precreation, miracle, and priestly.²² Interaction between rhetography, the rhetoric of a text that evokes argumentatively effective graphic images and pictures in the mind, and rhetology, the rhetoric of a text that relies upon word-based argumentation, is especially important for understanding the internal processes at work both in a

18. L. Gregory Bloomquist, “Paul’s Inclusive Language: The Ideological Texture of Romans 1,” in *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins* (ed. D. B. Gowler, L. G. Bloomquist, and D. F. Watson; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003), 165-93 at 174.

19. Pronounced rhetorolects, an elision of “rhetorical dialects.”

20. Robbins, *The Invention of Christian Discourse*, 1:xxvii-xxviii.

21. In the present context where many scholars are still searching for what might be the best way to describe the first century Mediterranean people who were gaining an identity as believers that Jesus was Messiah and Lord, I prefer either the “emergent” phrase “Jesus-to-Christ movement” or the phrase “emerging Christianity,” rather than Jesus movement, Christ movement, Messianite movement, members of The Way, or some other terminology.

22. Robbins, “Conceptual Blending and Early Christian Imagination”; Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*; George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh: the Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought* (New York: Basic Books, 1999). Conceptual blending can also be called conceptual integration: see Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, 328-29.

rhetorolect and in the blending of rhetorolects with one another.²³

This essay starts with analysis of the two versions of the Lord’s Prayer in Luke and Matthew and moves toward a display and interpretation of the reconfiguration of certain Lord’s Prayer *topoi* in “the Son’s Prayer” in John 17. My perception is that the Son’s Prayer contains an elaborate reconfiguration of major *topoi* in the Lord’s Prayer in a mode of precreation conceptuality.²⁴ The Synoptic versions of the Lord’s Prayer contain a blending of priestly, wisdom, and prophetic-apocalyptic rhetorolect. The Lord’s Prayer is “composition” that makes the *topoi* in the blend available, and the blend evokes “emergent structure” for new configurations of the *topoi*. Jesus’ prayer in John 17 remolds the “emergent structure” in an enactment of precreation rhetorolect in emerging Christianity. The conceptual blending prompted by the Lord’s Prayer makes the following eighteen *topoi* available to participants in the Jesus-to-Christ movement: Father; heaven(s); sanctify/hallow/be holy (ἀγιάζομαι/ἅγιος); your (God’s) name; come; kingdom; your (God’s) will; earth; daily bread; give; this day; forgive; debts/debtors; sins; trespasses; time of testing; the evil one; and rescue. As shown in the table below, six are “open-use-*topoi*,” namely they may readily appear in any rhetorolect, while twelve are foundational for a particular rhetorolect.

“Open-Use” Topoi		
HEAVEN(S); your will; EARTH; trespasses; time of testing; rescue		
Foundational Topoi		
Wisdom	Priestly	Prophetic-Apocalyptic
FATHER	SANCTIFIED/HALLOWED	kingdom
daily bread	YOUR NAME	COME
GIVE	forgive	THE EVIL ONE
debts	sins	
this day		

23. Vernon K. Robbins, “Rhetography: A New Way of Seeing the Familiar Text,” in *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy’s Rhetoric of the New Testament* (ed. C. C. Black and D. F. Watson; Studies in Rhetoric and Religion 8; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2008), 91-106.

24. Many, perhaps most, previous interpreters have foregrounded a relationship between Jesus’ prayer in John 17 and Jesus’ prayer in Gethsemane in the Synoptic Gospels.

We will see below that the Son’s Prayer explicitly reconfigures the eight Lord’s Prayer *topoi* in bold capital letters in the table above. Two are open-use *topoi* that can regularly appear in any rhetorolect: heaven(s) and earth. Six play a central role in a particular rhetorolect: two in wisdom (father; give); two in priestly (sanctified/hallowed; the name of God); and two in prophetic-apocalyptic (come; the evil one). The meanings and meaning-effects of the eight Lord’s Prayer *topoi* that appear explicitly in the Son’s Prayer are reconfigured conceptually into a “precreation blend” through composition, elaboration, and completion in John 17.²⁵ In addition, I propose that the five *topoi* in italics have been reconfigured into other terminology: “your will” into “the work you gave me,” “daily bread” into “eternal life,”²⁶ “kingdom” into “above,” “this day” into “the hour,” and “rescue” into “be with me.” The last three concerning the kingdom, the hour, and being with the Son require further comment.

In John, the kingdom is above and remains above—a place that a person may “see,” if one is born from above (3:3), and “enter,” if one is born of water and Spirit (3:5). In the Fourth Gospel, the kingdom does not “come,” “draw near,” or “appear,” as it does in the Synoptic Gospels,²⁷ which means it does not come on earth or into the world; but in John the Son takes people to the place they will go.²⁸ In relation to this, in John there are no “days of the Son of Man,”²⁹ and there is no “day” of the revelation of the Son of Man³⁰ or of the coming of the Son of Man “on the clouds.”³¹ Instead, the precreation Son of Man has already “descended from heaven” (John 3:13), become flesh, and tabernacled as light and life in the world. In this reconfigured scenario, “the hour” of the Son of man

25. Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, 44-50.

26. John 6:51, 58.

27. Come (ἔρχομαι): Matt 6:10; Mark 9:1; 11:10; Luke 11:2; 17:20; 22:18; φθάνω: Matt 12:28//Luke 11:20; draw near (ἰγγίζω): Matt 3:2; 4:17; 10:7; Mark 1:15; Luke 10:9, 11; 21:31; appear (ἀναφαίνω): Luke 19:11; ἐπιφαίνω: 2 Tim 4:1.

28. John 12:32; 14:2-3; 17:24 (but see 13:33; 17:15).

29. Luke 17:22, 26.

30. Luke 17:24, 30.

31. Mark 13:26//Matt 24:30//Luke 21:27. One should not think this means there is no apocalyptic rhetorolect blended into the precreation rhetorolect in the Fourth Gospel. Rather, as the “host” rhetorolect precreation discourse substantively “reconfigures” apocalyptic *topoi* as they are brought into its particular precreation blend. Thus, the Son “will come again” in John

comes (12:23) rather than “the day,” and the Son of Man “comes to the hour” (12:27), which means he comes to the time of his crucifixion in Jerusalem when he is “lifted up” and glorified on the cross (3:14), before he ascends to where he was before (6:62).

In the Synoptics, the apocalyptic “tribulation of those days” (αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλίψεις)³² are the “birth pangs” (ὠδίνων)³³ of the cosmos that start the end (τὸ τέλος)³⁴ until “the day” of the coming of the Son of Man. In the Fourth Gospel, the day of the precreation Son of Man is reconfigured into “the hour” of pain (λύπη) both for those whom the Father gave to him and for the world (16:20) until all is “finished.”³⁵ The hour of the precreation Son is like the hour when a woman is in labor and tribulation (θλίψις), until her joy when she has brought a human being into the world (16:21). The work of the precreation Son as light in the world is to give birth to children of the Father (1:12). In the Fourth Gospel, therefore, the apocalyptic “end” in the Synoptics is reconfigured into the “finishing” of the work of the precreation Son before he returns to the Father. The Synoptic apocalyptic drama of the day of the Son of Man at the end-time is reconfigured in John into the hour of the Son of Man when he finishes the will of the Father on earth and returns to where he was before.

There is one more very important difference between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. God and Jesus never “forgive” (ἀφίημι) sin(s) in the Fourth Gospel.³⁶ In relation to this, the *topos* of forgiveness in the Synoptic Lord’s Prayer does not occur in the Son’s Prayer in John 17. In John, “the sin of the world”³⁷ is “taken away” (αἰρέω) by the Son, according to John the Baptist’s words: “Behold the lamb of God who

14:3, 18, 28, but as an event within the precreation drama rather than an apocalyptic event at the end-time. Likewise, the precreation Son of Man has been given “authority” to execute judgment in John (5:27), but the manner in which he does and does not (5:24) execute it, again, is configured by precreation conceptualization: cf. 3:19; 5:22, 29, 30; 7:24; 8:16; 12:31; 16:8, 11.

32. Mark 13:19, 24; Matt 24:21, 29; cf. Rom 2:9.

33. Mark 13:8//Matt 24:8; 1 Thess 5:3.

34. Mark 13:7-8, 13//Matt 24:6, 13-14; cf. Luke 21:9; Matt 10:22.

35. John 19:28, 30: τετέλεσται; cf. 4:34; 5:36; 17:4.

36. 1 John refers twice to God forgiving sin.

37. In John there is reference to people dying in sin (8:21, 24[2]); being a slave to sin (8:34); being born in sins (9:34); having sin (15:22, 24); being guilty of sin (20:23); and having their sin remaining (9:41).

takes away (ὁ αἴρων) the sin of the world” (1:29). Humans are to forgive the sins of other humans after the Son returns to the Father, according to John 20:22-23,³⁸ but they do not forgive sins in a reciprocal relation to God’s forgiving of their sins, nor is it clear that those who forgive have been sinned against. To understand these things further, we must first do a careful *topos* analysis of the Synoptic versions of the Lord’s Prayer.

OPENING-MIDDLE-CLOSING (OMC) TEXTURE AND COMPARISON

One of the results of using *Exploring the Texture of Texts* and *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse* in the classroom since 1996 is a conclusion that I should have put provisional opening-middle-closing texture as a first activity with any length of text, whether the text is an entire book in the Bible (or some other writing) or a particular section of a writing in a text.³⁹ Since of necessity such a first activity yields a “provisional” view, interpreters should always be ready to adjust their initial view on the basis of more specific patterns that emerge during further analysis. This leads to a second insight. In the context of any textural or subtextural analysis, the emphasis needs to be on “patterns.” Patterns are constellations of words and concepts that point to “locations” of thought, belief, and practice, namely to *topoi* and constellations of *topoi*. In other words, interpreters should not observe and display repetition simply for its own sake. Rather, the task of interpreters is to seek patterns of meaning and meaning-effects as they apply various textural and subtextural strategies of analysis and interpretation.

Let us start, then, with opening-middle-closing texture of the two versions of the Lord’s Prayer in Matthew and Luke, which my students some time ago began to refer to as OMC texture. Indeed, where possible we will not only observe OMC texture in the overall version of the prayer but OMC texture in the opening, middle, and closing respectively. A display of OMC texture of the two canonical versions of the Lord’s Prayer

38. After he said these things, he breathed on them and said to them, “Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive (ἀφῆτε) the sins of any, they are forgiven (ἀφέωνται) them; if you retain (κρατήτε) the sins of any, they are retained (κεκράτηνται).”

39. One of the noticeable strengths of IBS is its focus on “books-as-wholes” and careful attention to divisions, sections, and segments of texts (Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 79-158).

can look as follows:⁴⁰

<i>Luke 11:2-5</i>	<i>Matthew 6:9-13</i>
<p><i>Opening:</i></p> <p>O: Father,</p> <p>M: hallowed be <i>YOUR</i> name.</p> <p>C: let come <i>YOUR</i> kingdom.</p>	<p><i>Opening:</i></p> <p>O: (a) ⁹Father of us (b) the one <i>IN THE HEAVENS</i>, (c) hallowed be <i>YOUR name</i>.</p> <p>M: ¹⁰ let come <i>YOUR kingdom</i>.</p> <p>C: (a) let be done <i>YOUR will</i>, (b) as <i>IN HEAVEN</i> (c) also on earth.</p>
<p><i>Middle:</i></p> <p>O: ³ <i>OUR</i> daily bread give <i>US</i> each day.</p> <p>M: ⁴ And <i>forgive US OUR</i> sins, C: for even <i>WE OURSELVES</i> forgive everyone indebted to <i>US</i>.</p>	<p><i>Middle:</i></p> <p>O: ¹¹ <i>OUR</i> daily bread give <i>US</i> this day.</p> <p>M: ¹² And <i>forgive US OUR</i> debts, C: as also <i>WE</i> have <i>forgiven OUR</i> debtors.</p>
<p><i>Closing:</i></p> <p>O: And do not</p> <p>M: bring <i>US</i></p> <p>C: to the time of trial.</p>	<p><i>Closing:</i></p> <p>O: ¹³ And do not bring <i>US</i> to the time of trial,</p> <p>C: but rescue <i>US</i> from the evil one.*</p>

*There are additional expansions in the textual tradition including variations of: (a) because the kingdom and the power and the glory are forever. Amen; (b) because you are the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen; and (c) because you are the kingdom and the power and the glory, Father and Son and Holy Spirit forever [and ever]. Amen.

40. As is evident from the display, within the overall OMC texture there may be OMC within each opening, middle, and closing, and then another possible O:a, O:b, O:c, etc.

The Luke version exhibits an abbreviated opening in relation to Matthew’s expanded opening. This does not mean that the Luke opening is earlier, since the Luke version could be an abbreviation of the Matthew version or the Matthew version could be an expansion of the Luke opening.⁴¹ The Luke opening exhibits strong progressive texture from “Father” to “name” to “kingdom.” There is no presence of heaven or earth in the progression. Also, there is no mention of God’s will. The progression moves quickly and decisively from acknowledgement of God as Father to sanctification of God’s name and petition to let God’s kingly power and rule come. This movement evokes the cognitive frame of prophetic-apocalyptic rhetorolect.⁴²

The opening in Matthew shows significant repetitive texture with the occurrence of “your” three times in the center of the opening that creates progressive texture featuring “your name,” “your kingdom,” and “your will.” In addition, “in the heavens/in heaven” occurs in the center of the opening statement and the center of the final statement. Thus, overall repetition in the opening creates an environment of progressive texture from hallowing (sanctifying) God’s name as “Father” to the coming of God’s kingdom and enactment of God’s will. An important part of the progression in the Matthean opening is downward movement from God’s presence “in the heavens” to the actualization of God’s will on earth.

The middle in both versions emphasizes first person plural “we,” “us,” “our,” and “ourselves.” There is no mention of God, God’s name, or God’s kingdom. Rather, there is petition from “us” in a context of what

41. Vernon K. Robbins, “The Woman who Touched Jesus’ Garment: Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Synoptic Accounts,” *NTS* 33 (1987): 502-15 at 504-11; idem, “Writing as a Rhetorical Act in Plutarch and the Gospels,” in *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy* (ed. D. A. Watson; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 157-86 = idem, *Sea Voyages and Beyond: Emerging Strategies in Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (ESEC 14; Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing, 2010), 233-57; Burton L. Mack and Vernon K. Robbins, *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels* (Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf & Stock, ©1998, 2008), 11-22.

42. See prophetic and apocalyptic rhetorolect in Robbins, “Conceptual Blending and Early Christian Imagination,” 163-81; idem, “Rhetography,” 88-92; idem, *The Invention of Christian Discourse*, 1:xxi, xxvi, 219-482. It is not possible to distinguish prophetic from apocalyptic in the Synoptic Lord’s Prayer; rather, the coming of the kingdom evokes a prophetic-apocalyptic blend.

“we” already have done or regularly do. The first *topos* is giving bread in a context of asking, and the second *topos* presents reciprocal forgiveness that creates a qualitative progression from requesting and receiving the staple of daily life within God’s created world to reciprocal forgiving: in the context of petitioning for daily bread, humans petition God to forgive them as they also forgive others. In Luke, the forgiveness concerns both “indebtedness” and “sinful actions,” while the Matthean version focuses strictly on indebtedness. Since the Gospel of Luke frequently highlights the relation of the poor to the wealthy, one might expect the emphasis in Luke to be on indebtedness. In contrast, the Lukan version interweaves forgiveness of sins by God with forgiving of indebtedness by humans, while the Matthean version focuses solely on debts and indebtedness until, as we will see below, the addition of commentary beyond the prayer itself.

In an abbreviated mode, the Lukan version of the closing moves quickly and directly through a progressive request for God “not” to bring testing. One can see “elaboration” in the Matthean version, where God’s bringing of a test could invite personified evil to do evil work. The Matthean closing has no middle, presumably as a result of Semitic *parallelismus membrorum*. It contains a double statement that, again focusing on “us,” petitions God not to bring testing but to rescue us from “the evil one,” who presumably is Satan or the devil. The Matthean version, then, exhibits additional prophetic-apocalyptic rhetoric as it envisions a personified evil force at work in the world in the context of the coming of God’s kingly activity.⁴³ Progressive texture is notable in both closings as the prayer moves to a concluding petition for God “not” to act in a way that could “invite” evil into a human’s life. A major function of rhetorical contraries and opposites is clarification.⁴⁴ The “contrary” ending in the Synoptic Lord’s Prayer highlights God’s primary nature as beneficent towards humans on earth. Thus, the opening and middle focus on beneficial actions “to be done” both by humans and by God. The closing, in contrast, petitions that certain specific things “not”

43. Robbins, *The Invention of Christian Discourse*, 1:341-43, 361-66, 464-68.

44. Vernon K. Robbins, “A Comparison of Mishnah Gittin 1:1-2:2 and James 2:1-13 from a Perspective of Greco-Roman Rhetorical Elaboration,” in *Mishnah and the Social Formation of the Early Rabbinic Guild: A Socio-Rhetorical Approach* (ed. J. N. Lightstone; Studies in Christianity and Judaism/Études sur le christianisme et le judaïsme 11; Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press for the Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Corporation Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses, 2002), 201-16.

be done by God, lest these things produce evil on earth rather than good.

Once we have seen the opening, middle, and closing in each Synoptic version of the Lord’s Prayer, it is instructive to see the broader context of the presentation of the Lord’s prayer in each Gospel.⁴⁵ The prayer in its broader context in Luke looks as follows:

<i>Luke 11:1-13</i>	
<i>Opening</i>	<p><i>Opening:</i></p> <p>11:1 He was <i>praying</i> in a certain place, and after he had finished, one of his disciples said to him, ‘Lord, <i>TEACH</i> us to <i>pray</i>, as John <i>TAUGHT</i> his disciples.’</p> <p>²He said to them, ‘When you <i>pray</i>, say:</p>
<i>Middle</i>	<p><i>Opening:</i></p> <p>O: Father, M: hallowed be <i>your</i> name. C: let come <i>your</i> kingdom.</p> <p><i>Middle:</i></p> <p>O: ³ <i>our</i> daily bread <i>GIVE</i> us each day. M: ⁴ And <i>forgive</i> us our sins, C: for even <i>we ourselves forgive</i> everyone indebted to us.</p> <p><i>Closing:</i></p> <p>O: And do not M: bring us C: to the time of trial.</p>

45. Attention to the broader context is another common emphasis in SRI and IBS: see Bauer and Trainer, *Inductive Bible Study*, 63-65; cf. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 8-14.

*Closing**Opening:*

5 And he said to them, ‘Suppose one of you has a *friend*, and you go to him at midnight and say to him, “*Friend*, lend me three loaves of bread; ⁶for a *friend* of mine has arrived, and I have nothing to set before him.” ⁷And he answers from within, “Do not bother me; the door has already been locked, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot get up and *GIVE* you anything.” ⁸I tell you, even though he will not get up and *GIVE* him anything because he is his *friend*, at least because of his persistence he will get up and *GIVE* him whatever he needs.

Middle:

9 ‘So I say to you, *ASK*, and it will be *GIVEN* to you; search, and you will find; knock, and the door will be opened for you. ¹⁰For everyone who *ASKS* receives, and everyone who searches finds, and for everyone who knocks, the door will be opened. ¹¹Is there anyone among you who, if your child *ASKS* for a fish, will *GIVE* a snake instead of a fish? ¹²Or if the child *ASKS* for an egg, will *GIVE* a scorpion?

Closing:

¹³If you then, who are evil, know how to *GIVE* good gifts to your children, how much more will the heavenly Father *GIVE* the Holy Spirit to those who *ASK* him!’

Let us notice first the disciples asking Jesus to “teach” them how to pray, as John the Baptist taught his disciples to pray. In SRI, teaching is perceived to evoke wisdom rhetorict, which is prominent in Luke, where people call Jesus teacher fourteen times,⁴⁶ and Jesus is described as teaching thirteen times.⁴⁷ Let us notice second that Jesus is engaged in prayer as the scene opens. In SRI, prayer is a central *topos* in priestly rhetorict, which focuses on ritual performance that activates beneficial exchange between humans and the divine. A survey of praying in Luke shows people outside the Jerusalem temple praying while Zechariah, who will become father of John the Baptist, experiences the presence of an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense

46. Luke 3:12; 7:40; 8:49; 9:38; 10:25; 11:45; 12:13; 18:18; 19:39; 20:21, 28, 39; 21:7; 22:11.

47. Luke 4:15, 31, 32; 5:3; 6:6; 11:1; 13:10, 22; 19:47; 20:1[2]; 21:37; 23:5.

(1:9-11). The next context for prayer in Luke is Jesus’ praying after he has been baptized. While Jesus prays, the heaven opens, the Holy Spirit descends on Jesus in bodily form like a dove, and a voice comes from heaven saying, “You are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased” (3:21-22). Later while Jesus travels around speaking to crowds and curing diseases, the narrator says Jesus regularly “would withdraw to deserted places and pray” (5:15-16). In chapter six, after a dispute with Pharisees about plucking and eating grain on the Sabbath and healing a man with a withered hand on a Sabbath (6:1-11), Jesus goes up on “the mountain” and spends “the night in prayer to God” (6:12) before he selects twelve of his disciples and names them apostles (6:13-16). Then in 6:28 Jesus tells his disciples to “pray for those who abuse” them. Later in chapter nine, Jesus is “praying alone, with only the disciples near him” when he asks them, “Who do the crowds say I am?” (9:18). About eight days later, when Jesus takes Peter, James, and John up on “the mountain” to pray, while Jesus was praying “the appearance of his face changed, and his clothes became dazzling white” (9:28-29). Two chapters later, then, after Jesus finished praying “in a certain place” his disciples ask him to teach them “to pray, as John taught his disciples” (11:1).

While it seems obvious that special “divine” things often happen when Jesus prays, it also appears that Jesus’ “regular prayer life” has made him an “example to be imitated.” This is the nature of wisdom rhetorict, where people learn how to think and act by what they both hear and see. When the disciples ask Jesus to “teach” them to pray, like John taught his disciples, the overall context for the Lord’s Prayer in Luke is a teaching context. If the prayer “teaches” something to the disciples, “what” does it teach them? This leads us to the “closing,” which focuses on one particular *topos* in the prayer, “giving,” in a context of asking and receiving.

When Jesus completes his recitation of the prayer the disciples should pray, he continues immediately with a story about “friends.” In relation to the way in which Jesus himself has functioned as “an example” for the disciples, now Jesus presents an “example story” of how “friends” interact with one another. This is a natural progression in wisdom rhetorict, which foregrounds households, neighborhoods, and networks of kinfolk and friends as an environment of learning, growing, and becoming “fruitful” through reciprocal exchange. The story features a friend asking another friend for three loaves of bread, because a friend has arrived and he has “nothing to set before him” (11:5-6). The story, of course, has an unusual dimension: the friend does not want to get up and give his friend anything, because the door is already locked and

his children are in bed with him. Then Jesus says that the friend will get up and give him “whatever he needs” not “because he is his friend” but “because of his shamelessness” (ἀναίδεια: 11:7-8).⁴⁸ This story about “giving,” then, introduces the *topos* of “shamelessly asking.” This leads to the middle of the closing.

After telling the disciples the story about the friends, Jesus teaches with a saying that functions as a “thesis” followed by an elaboration of the saying with a rationale and two rhetorical questions that present an argument from the contrary.⁴⁹ The thesis is: “Ask, and it will be given to you; search, and you will find; knock, and the door will be opened for you.” The rationale reiterates the topics of asking, searching, and knocking, but the rhetorical questions make it clear that the primary focus is on asking and being given in the context of a parent-child relationship: “Is there anyone among you who, if your child asks for a fish, will give a snake instead of a fish? Or if a child asks for an egg, will give a scorpion?” (11:11-12). The obvious answer to both questions is, “No.”

Then Jesus brings his argumentative elaboration about asking and giving to a conclusion with reasoning from lesser to greater: “If you, then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the heavenly Father give holy spirit to those who ask him!” (11:13). There are a number of things about this conclusion that are interesting. First, Jesus refers to God as “the heavenly Father” when there is no mention of heaven in the Lukan version of the Lord’s Prayer. Second, Jesus calls his disciples evil (πονηρός), but surely this is simply a contrast between humans and “the heavenly Father.” Third, human fathers give “good gifts” to their children, but God gives “holy spirit.” Here it is interesting that “holy spirit” has no articles, like holy spirit that fills John the Baptist while he is still in the womb (1:15), comes upon Mary (1:35), fills Elizabeth (1:41) and Zechariah (1:67), and rests on Simeon (2:25). Even more, the one coming after John (namely, Jesus) “will baptize with holy spirit” (3:16), Jesus himself is “full of holy

48. The NRSV translates this “because of his persistence.”

49. See the natural steps in a rhetorical elaboration in Vernon K. Robbins, “Progymnastic Rhetorical Composition and Pre-Gospel Traditions: A New Approach,” in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (ed. Camille Focant; BETL 110; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 111-47 at 121-31. Cf. idem, “From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13,” in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: A Collection of Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (ed. R. P. Thompson and T. E. Phillips; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998), 191-214 = Robbins, *Sea Voyages and Beyond*, 349-71.

spirit” when he returns from the Jordan (4:1), and Jesus reads from Isaiah saying holy spirit is upon him (4:18). These anarthrous formulations of “holy spirit” in Luke appear to have a dynamic relation to the heavenly Father’s gift of holy spirit to people who ask. In conclusion, an especially noticeable aspect of the context of the Lord’s Prayer in Luke is the wisdom rhetorlect context: Jesus teaches the disciples about asking and giving, using examples from the daily lives of friends, parents, and children. The progressive texture moves from Jesus teaching his disciples to households of friends to fathers in households to “the heavenly Father” who gives greater gifts than “earthly” fathers. This is a natural progression in wisdom rhetorlect from observation of daily activities on earth, regularly foregrounding household imagery, to conclusions about God “the Father” in heaven.

The prayer in its overall context in Matthew looks as follows:

<i>Matthew 6:5-15</i>	
<i>Opening</i>	<p><i>Opening:</i></p> <p><i>O:</i> ⁵And whenever you <i>pray</i>, <i>DO NOT</i> be like the hypocrites; <i>M:</i> for they love to stand and <i>pray</i> in the synagogues and at the street corners, so that they may be seen by others (humans, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις). <i>C:</i> Truly I tell you, they have received their reward.</p> <p><i>Middle:</i></p> <p><i>O:</i> ⁶But whenever you <i>pray</i>, go into your room and shut the door <i>M:</i> and <i>pray</i> to your Father who is in secret; <i>C:</i> and your Father who sees in secret will reward you.</p> <p><i>Closing:</i></p> <p><i>O:</i> ⁷ ‘When you are <i>praying</i>, <i>DO NOT</i> heap up empty phrases as the Gentiles do; <i>M:</i> for they think that they will be heard because of their many words. <i>C:</i> ⁸<i>DO NOT</i> be like them, for your Father knows what you need before you ask him.</p>

<p><i>Middle</i></p> <p>⁹ PRAY then in this way:</p> <p><i>Opening:</i></p> <p>O: (a) Father of us (b) the one <i>IN THE HEAVENS</i>, (c) hallowed be <i>YOUR name</i>.</p> <p>M: ¹⁰ let come <i>YOUR kingdom</i>.</p> <p>C: (a) let be done <i>YOUR will</i>, (b) as <i>IN HEAVEN</i> (c) also on earth.</p> <p><i>Middle:</i></p> <p>O: ¹¹ <i>OUR</i> daily bread give <i>US</i> this day. M: ¹² And <i>forgive US OUR</i> debts, C: as also <i>WE</i> have <i>forgiven OUR</i> debtors.</p> <p><i>Closing:</i></p> <p>O: ¹³ And do not bring <i>US</i> to the time of trial, C: but rescue <i>US</i> from the evil one.*</p>
<p><i>Closing</i></p> <p>O: ¹⁴For if <i>YOU forgive</i> others their trespasses, <i>YOUR</i> heavenly Father will also <i>forgive YOU</i>; C: ¹⁵but if <i>YOU</i> do not <i>forgive</i> others, neither will <i>YOUR</i> Father <i>forgive YOUR</i> trespasses.</p>

*There are additional variations and expansions in the textual tradition, including versions of: (a) because the kingdom and the power and the glory are forever. Amen; (b) because you are the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen; and (c) because you are the kingdom and the power and the glory, Father and Son and Holy Spirit forever [and ever]. Amen.

In contrast to the short opening and long closing around the Lord's Prayer in Luke, Matthew contains a long opening and short closing. The opening before Jesus recites the Lord's Prayer to the

disciples in Matthew functions as new Torah about what "not" to do and what "to do" when performing prayer ritual. As Jesus speaks, the Matthean opening evokes priestly rhetorlect, which concerns human ritual action performed to activate beneficial exchange between humans and the divine.

As the Matthean opening brings priestly rhetorlect into the foreground, it exhibits the presence of already existing prayer practices, to which Jesus' instruction presents an alternative. This context creates an opening with three negatives:

DO NOT be like the hypocrites; ...

DO NOT heap up empty phrases as the Gentiles do; ...

DO NOT be like them....

This opening in Matthew is reminiscent of Exod 20:2-8:

I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt...;

You shall have *NO* other gods before me.

You shall *NOT* make for yourself an idol,...

You shall *NOT* bow down to them or worship them,...

You shall *NOT* make wrongful use of the name of the Lord your God,

for the Lord will *NOT* acquit anyone who misuses his name.

In the middle of the Matthean opening that refers to things "not to do," there are specific guidelines for what "to do":

1. go into your room;
2. shut the door;
3. pray to your Father who is in secret; and your Father who sees in secret will reward you.

This is like the transition to things "to do" in Exod 20:8, 12:

1. Remember the Sabbath day, and keep it holy...
2. Honor your father and your mother, so that your days may be long in the land that the Lord your God is giving you.

Much like the assertion that "your Father ... will reward you" in Matt 6:6, the directive in Exod 20:12 ends with a statement that "your days" will be "long in the land that the Lord your God is giving you." Habitual action by humans in the Exodus context is conceptualized as enactment of God's will on earth. Therefore, the activity generates reciprocal beneficial exchange between humans and God. In Matthew, regular

prayer by humans in secret creates a context of benefit for both God and humans. Humans acknowledge God in heaven as Lord over all things, and the result for humans is the presence of God's life-giving benefits on earth.

The Matthean focus on private ritual prayer in a secret room creates a "priestly" emphasis on "forgiving" in the closing in Matt 6:14-15 that is an alternative to the "wisdom" emphasis on "giving" in Luke 11:5-13. The foregrounding of forgiving is related to emphases in the Matthean beatitudes that establish the overall context for Jesus' teaching at the opening of the Sermon on the Mount. The beatitudes in Matt 5:1-12 highlight the special relation among "inner spiritual" qualities, beneficial actions toward other humans, belonging to the kingdom of heaven, establishing justice in the world, and being called "children of God." Those who are poor in spirit and pure in heart exercise restraint (meekness) if they are in positions of power, they hunger and thirst for righteousness, they are merciful, and they are peacemakers.⁵⁰ How do people attain such a richly complex, beneficially-oriented disposition while on earth? The answer appears to lie in regularized or ritualized practices "in secret" that SRI calls "priestly" in conceptuality. The first step towards prayer is sacrifice of public honor: the rewards that accrue from public displays of prayer are sacrificed through a discipline that nurtures divinely inspired beneficence. The goal of being "perfect... as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt 5:48) requires ritualized nurturing of "inner qualities" that make it possible for a person to turn the other cheek (5:39), give one's cloak as well (5:40), go the second mile (5:41), give to everyone who begs and not to refuse anyone who wants to borrow (5:42), and even to love one's enemies and pray for those who persecute (5:44). These beneficent abilities cannot be acquired by "practicing your piety before others in order to be seen by them" (6:1). In contrast, a person is to give alms in secret (6:4), pray in secret (6:6), and fast in secret (6:18), thereby storing up "treasures in heaven" (6:20).

For Matthew, then, praying in secret creates inner qualities that transcend being willing to give to a friend if he shamelessly asks (Luke 11:8). Forgiving others is more like giving to "everyone who begs

50. Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 190-202, to which I would add the special orientation toward "doing justice" in Robert L. Foster, *Wrestling with God and the World: The Struggle for Justice in the Biblical Tradition* (Dallas, Tex.: A Journey Publication, 2013), 106-43. For "meekness" as exercising restraint when one is in a position of power, see the entry on PRAUTES in *Contexticon of New Testament Language*, www.contexticon.com, forthcoming.

from you" and not refusing "anyone who wants to borrow from you" (Matt 5:42). In Matthew, there is to be no limit on the number of times a person is to forgive, as Jesus makes clear to Peter with a number either of seventy-seven or seventy times seven (18:22).

Overall the movement toward inner spirituality—nurtured in Matthew through activities like praying in secret, giving alms in secret, and fasting in secret—reaches its highpoint in Matt 25:37-39, when those who gave food, drink, and clothing, welcomed a stranger, took care of the sick, and visited those in prison asked when it was they did these things. They did not remember, because their actions were "natural" responses toward the needs of others. Their responses came forth spontaneously, virtually automatically, "from the heart" (15:18). Their regularized, ritual actions "in secret" had nurtured an inner disposition that made it possible for them to hear the words of Jesus and act on them, as Jesus emphasizes at the end of the Sermon on the Mount (7:24).

Instead of emphasizing the *topos* of "giving," then, the progressive texture of Jesus' teaching of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew foregrounds "forgiving." This produces a cluster of six references to "forgive" in the closing of the Matthean unit:

1. *FORGIVE* us as we *FORGIVE*;
2. if you *FORGIVE*, your heavenly Father will *FORGIVE*;
3. if you do not *FORGIVE*, your Father will not *FORGIVE*.

It also produces a concluding emphasis on "your heavenly Father" who either will or will not forgive depending on the willingness of humans to forgive. This means that the opening repetitive references to "your (heavenly) Father" begins a repetitive sequence that extends to the final statements in the unit about forgiving:

Opening:

1. pray to *YOUR FATHER* who is in secret;
2. *YOUR FATHER* who sees in secret will reward you;
3. *YOUR FATHER* knows what you need before you ask him.

Middle:

OUR FATHER in the *HEAVENS*

Closing:

1. if you forgive, *YOUR HEAVENLY FATHER* will forgive you;
2. if you do not forgive, *YOUR FATHER* will not forgive you.

In the end, “forgiving” becomes the central focus of “doing” and “not doing.” The petition in the prayer is, “forgive us ... as we forgive ...” The closing foregrounds the “as we forgive” with the stipulation that “if you forgive, your heavenly Father will forgive you, but if you do not forgive, neither will your Father forgive you.” So the warnings “not to do” in the opening of the entire unit have been reconfigured into “if you do not do” in the closing.

There is still another *topos* to observe in the Matthean unit. What appears to be an incidental word in the opening of the unit translated “others” (6:5: humans: ἀνθρώποις) becomes a key repetitive *topos* in the context of forgiveness at the end of the unit:

If you FORGIVE “HUMANS” (others) their trespasses,
Your heavenly Father will also forgive you;
But if you do not FORGIVE “HUMANS” (others),
Neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

Instead of standing and praying in the synagogues and on the street corners to be “seen by humans” (others), a person must engage in continual practice of “forgiving humans” (others). This focus on forgiveness of other humans is emphasized in Matthew 18 in the conclusion to Jesus’ story about the slave who did not forgive the debt of a fellow slave. When the slave whose master had forgiven his debt is unwilling to forgive the debt of a fellow slave, the other slaves tell the master of the slave, and he turns the slave over for torture until the slave pays the entire debt of which he had been forgiven. Jesus concludes the story with: “So my heavenly Father will also do to every one of you, if you do not forgive your brother or sister from your heart” (Matt 18:35). The heart is the key to forgiveness, and for Matthew humans acquire the “inner spiritual ability” to forgive only through a blend of wisdom, prophetic, and priestly understanding and nurture. Wisdom learning and growth that is focused and energized by prophetic reasoning and understanding must become disciplined “in secret” through regularized, ritualized practice grounded in sacrifice of public honor. This “priestly” blend of understanding, motivation, and action foregrounds the development of “inner being” that is naturally inclined toward divinely inspired beneficent action related to being “perfect as your heavenly

Father is perfect” (Matt 5:48).⁵¹ In contrast to the foregrounding of teaching in Luke that emphasizes the importance of asking and giving, therefore, a priestly-wisdom-prophetic blend of understanding and action in the broader context of Matthew’s presentation of the Lord’s Prayer emphasizes the ability to forgive as the heavenly Father forgives.

From Comparison to Reconfiguration: The Synoptic Lord’s Prayer and “the Son’s Prayer” in John 17

John 17 exhibits reconfiguration of major Lord’s Prayer *topoi*. The reconfiguration represents a transition from the blend of wisdom, priestly, and prophetic-apocalyptic rhetorlect in the Lord’s Prayer to the particular blend of precreation rhetorlect in the Gospel of John. At the center of the reconfiguration is a dramatic reconceptualization of God as Father and Jesus as Son. Instead of focusing on a heavenly Father whose kingdom comes on earth and who gives daily bread, forgiveness, and holy spirit, the Johannine heavenly Father gives his Son to the world because of his love, so that all may believe in this Son and receive eternal life. This reconceptualization of God the Father and Jesus the Son is a major manifestation of the cognitive explosion that occurred in first century Christian precreation rhetorlect during a period of time ca. 40-90 CE.

In the conceptuality of first century Christian precreation rhetorlect, there is a “fullness” in God (John 1:16; Col 1:19; 2:9; Eph 1:23; 3:19) that causes internal aspects of divine being to “emanate” or “generate” out from God. Within human thinking, emanation or generation naturally implies a time sequence. Within divine non-time, however, emanation or generation has no narrative sequence: it is simply “timeless movement” within divine non-time, non-space, and non-visibility. An especially “emergent” phase in the Jesus-to-Christ movement occurred when first century Christians conceptualized emanation or generation “out of” God in relation to “time” as it was

51. For wisdom growth that nurtures the heart, see Robbins, *Invention of Christian Discourse*, 1:178-80, 185-90, 193; for prophetic action in Matthew that comes from the heart, see *ibid.*, 284-92. Also see Matt 13:19: When anyone hears the word of the kingdom and does not understand it, the evil one comes and snatches away what is sown in the heart; this is what was sown on the path.

conceptualized within prophetic and apocalyptic rhetorict.⁵² The result was the emergence of multiple “precreation storylines” that used alternative terminologies. There was no uniform storyline, but envisioning internal attributes of God “coming out” of God created storylines that presupposed time, space, and visibility outside of the invisible non-time, non-space realm in which “eternal God” dwells.

One precreation storyline appears in Philippians 2, where the Son was in the “form” (μορφή) of God but “emptied himself” and took the “form” of a human. Still another is in Colossians 1, where “image” (εἰκὼν) came out of divine invisibility into visibility as the “firstborn of all creation” and “head of the body,” the church, ... “for in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell” (Col 1:15, 18-19). In another formulation “the Son” is the “reflection” (ἀπαύγασμα) of God’s glory and the exact imprint (χαρακτήρ) of God’s very being (ὑπόστασις) (Heb 1:3). In the midst of these alternatives, the Gospel of John presents a precreation narrative of the Word (λόγος) who came out of God “the Father” into the cosmos, became flesh, and “tabernacled”⁵³ as “the Son” on earth until his crucifixion, burial, resurrection, and return to “the Father.” This fully-developed precreation storyline created the context for reconfiguration of major Lord’s Prayer *topoi* in the Son’s Prayer in John 17.

The Johannine story starts with “the beginning” (ἀρχή), which can also mean origin, first cause, or ruling power. The beginning occurred when divine Word and divine “life” generated out of invisibility into the visible-world called the “cosmos” (κόσμος; 1:1-5, 9). At the “time” when λόγος/life generated out of invisible divine-being, all things that came into being “became” (ἐγένετο; 1:10). In other words, out of “being-being,” divine being that always “is,” emerged a “becoming-event,” an

52. Since humans naturally think in “time sequence” modes, it would not theoretically have been necessary for blends of prophetic-apocalyptic to play a particular role in the emergence of first century Christian precreation rhetorict. As a result of the pervasive presence of those blends, however, “emergent structures” within those blends played a major role in first century Christian precreation rhetorict.

53. John 1:14: ἐσκήνωσεν, from σκηνώω, to live in relation to a tent, temporary shelter, or tabernacle.

activity that created “time,” which is a “becoming-being” environment.⁵⁴ In Johannine precreation terminology, the “becoming-event” established the environment for λόγος/life “to be light that shines” in “the world” (κόσμος), which means that the world is a “place of darkness.”⁵⁵ It is not necessary to think that the darkness in the world is primarily evil: it is a place where there is no “light” without the presence of “life.” Another way to think about it is that darkness is a “ready environment” for life to function as light and light to function as life.

The world (κόσμος), then, is a place of darkness where humans live in the context of “created flesh” (cf. 17:2). In the Johannine precreation storyline, λόγος/life/light became (ἐγένετο) flesh as “the Son” of “the Father” and “tabernacled” among humans (1:14). As the Son tabernacled, the darkness in the cosmos did not “grasp” the light, which means either that it did not “overcome” or did not “receive”/“understand” the light (1:5). This storyline sets the overall context for the reconfiguration of Lord’s Prayer *topoi* into major *topoi* in the Son’s prayer in John 17 that evoke precreation meanings and meaning-effects.

There are, however, two special moments in the Johannine storyline that are important to notice before turning directly to John 17. The Son prays to the Father on two occasions prior to the extended prayer in John 17, and on both occasions he addresses God as Father and speaks to the Father in second person singular. This direct address by the Son to the Father three times in the storyline means that the Son’s Prayer in John 17 is not a scripted prayer for the disciples, as it in the Synoptic Gospels, but an inside look into the prayer-life, if you will, of the Son from the perspective of Johannine precreation discourse. On the first occasion, at the tomb of Lazarus, Jesus thanks the Father for having heard him and says he knows that the Father “always” (πάντοτε) hears him (11:42). On the second occasion, after people greet him with palm branches as he comes to the festival in Jerusalem, Jesus tells Andrew and Philip that “the hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified” (12:23). Then Jesus embeds speech to the Father as he continues, reasoning “out loud” if he should ask the Father to “save him” from this hour.” When Jesus answers his own question with “No” and says, “Father, glorify your

54. I am especially indebted to L. Gregory Bloomquist for a number of specific observations in this section. Foremost, these include his distinction between being-being and becoming-being, and the importance of second person singular in all of the Son’s praying to the Father, as observed below.

55. It is noticeable that λόγος/life does not “become” light; rather, it “is” light that shines in the cosmos, which is a place of darkness.

name,” a voice comes from heaven, “I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again” (12:27-28). In this context, then, the Son not only speaks to the Father but the Father speaks to the Son. Jesus’ praying in John, therefore, is not scripted prayer that Jesus teaches his disciples, but ongoing dialogue with the Father as he “tabernacles” among humans on earth. This ongoing dialogue sets the more immediate context for Jesus’ prayer to the Father in John 17.

Our initial task is to show the presence of Lord’s Prayer *topoi* in John 17, where “the Son” speaks directly to “the Father” before he goes “out with his disciples across the Kidron valley to a place where there was a garden” (18:1). In the prayer, God’s “precreation” Son, who was with (παρά w. dative) the Father before the world had “being” (πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι) (17:5) and who is “not of the world” (17:16: οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου), petitions the Father to “glorify” his Son so that the Son “may glorify” the Father. To the casual reader there may seem to be no significant relation between the Synoptic Lord’s Prayer and the Son’s prayer in John 17. A well-informed SRI approach, however, shows that *topoi* in the Lord’s Prayer pervade John 17 even as additional new *topoi* drive the progressive texture of the precreation Son’s prayer forward. The reason for the particular blend in John 17, we propose, is the dramatic reconfiguration of Lord’s Prayer *topoi* through the rhetorical force of precreation rhetorolect in Johannine discourse.

Major Lord’s Prayer Topoi in the Son’s Prayer in John 17

Our approach to John 17 views the opening of the Son’s Prayer to be 17:1-8, the middle 17:9-21, and the closing 17:22-26. At the opening of the Johannine prayer, Jesus looks “up to heaven” and says, “Father ...” (17:1). This opening evokes the same blending of “Father” and “in heaven” that is in Matt 6:9-10. Instead of further evoking the priestly, wisdom, and prophetic-apocalyptic rhetorolect characteristic of Matthew and Luke, however, it invites argumentative petitionary discourse by “the precreation Son” to “the invisible Father” who sent the Son into the world. As the Son speaks, he presents a progression that uses eight *topoi* in the Matthean version of the Lord’s Prayer: 1) Father; 2) your (God’s) name; 3) come; 4) sanctify/hallow/make holy (ἀγιάζομαι/ἅγιος); 5) the evil one; 6) heaven(s); 7) earth; and 8) give.

<i>Conceptual Reconfiguration Using the Same Word</i>		
<i>“Open-Use” Topoi</i>		
<i>HEAVEN(S); EARTH</i>		
<i>Foundational Topoi</i>		
<i>Wisdom</i>	<i>Priestly</i>	<i>Prophetic-Apocalyptic</i>
<i>FATHER</i>	<i>SANCTIFY/HALLOW/ MAKE HOLY</i>	<i>COME</i>
<i>GIVE</i>	<i>YOUR NAME</i>	<i>THE EVIL ONE</i>

Since the discourse in John is driven by precreation rhetorolect rather than the blend of priestly, wisdom, and prophetic-apocalyptic rhetorolect evident in Luke and Matthew, the argumentation has a dramatically different conceptual range. In many instances it is possible to see how certain meanings and meaning-effects generated out of conceptuality in the Lord’s Prayer. The overall conceptuality in John 17, however, is the result of multiple reconfigurations of meanings and meaning-effects that emerged out of wisdom, priestly, prophetic, and apocalyptic discourse. It will not be possible in this essay to exhibit and/or explain the processes at work in most of the reconfigurations. I hope, however, the reader will gain a substantive understanding of the basic “emergent” process at work in first-century Christian discourse. Below is a display of the opening of John 17 with Lord’s Prayer *topoi* in bold capitals, and with additional “precreation” *topoi* in the progressive texture in the headings in italic bold capitals and regular bold italics in the text itself.

<i>Opening Texture in John 17</i>
HEAVEN; FATHER; <i>the hour</i> ; COME
1 After Jesus had spoken these words, he looked up to HEAVEN and said, 'FATHER, <i>the hour</i> has COME;
<i>Glorify/Glory</i> ; GIVE; <i>Know</i>
<i>glorify</i> your Son so that the Son may <i>glorify</i> you, ² since you have GIVEN him authority over all people, to GIVE eternal life to all whom you have GIVEN him. ³ And this is eternal life, that they may <i>know</i> you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent. ⁴ I <i>glorified</i> you on EARTH by finishing the work that you GAVE me to do. ⁵ So now, FATHER, <i>glorify</i> me in your own presence with <i>the glory that I had in your presence before the world existed</i> .
YOUR NAME; <i>Your Word(s)</i>
6 'I have made YOUR NAME known to those whom you GAVE me from the world. They were yours, and you GAVE them to me, and they have kept your word. ⁷ Now they <i>know</i> that everything you have GIVEN me is from you; ⁸ for <i>the words</i> that you GAVE to me I have GIVEN to them, and they have received them and <i>know</i> in truth that I CAME from you; and they have believed that you sent me.

"Father" occurs six times in the Son's Prayer in John 17: twice in the opening (vv.1, 5); twice in the middle (vv. 11, 21); and twice in the closing (vv. 24, 25). When Jesus looks up to heaven in the opening verse and addresses God as "Father" (πάτερ), the words evoke the Matthean picture at the beginning of the Lord's Prayer: "Father of us, the one in the heavens" (Matt 6:9). Instead of focusing next on hallowing the name "Father" or requesting the Father to let the kingdom come, however, the Son focuses immediately on "what has already come."

"The hour" has come, and this creates the context for the "precreation Son's" first petition: "glorify your Son that the Son may glorify you." Reciprocal "glorification" between the Father and the Son is a central *topos* in Johannine precreation rhetorolect, occurring more than twenty-five times in John.⁵⁶ The Son glorifies the Father "in the

56. John 1:14[2]; 2:11; 5:41, 44[2]; 7:18[2], 39; 8:50, 54[3]; 9:24; 11:4[2], 40; 12:16, 23, 28[3], 41, 43; 13:31[2], 32[3]; 14:13; 15:8; 16:14; 17:1[2], 4, 5[2], 10, 22, 24; 21:19.

world" and the Father glorifies the Son from "the invisible place of the Father." "Glorify" occurs three times in the opening as the Son asks the Father to glorify him so he himself may glorify the Father (17:1), and then he says he has already glorified the Father on earth (17:4). This leads to a restatement of the Son's opening petition in 17:5 as a conclusion to the Son's reasoning in John 17:1-4: "So now, Father, glorify me in your presence with the glory that I had in your presence before the world existed." Here we have a statement that openly and explicitly evokes precreation conceptuality for the Son's Prayer. Instead of opening with a blend of priestly, wisdom, and prophetic-apocalyptic conceptuality, which focuses on "the end" when the "kingdom" will come and bring in a new age, the Son's Prayer focuses on the coming of "the hour" when the Father will glorify the Son with the glory he had in the presence of the Father "before the world existed." The Son's Prayer focuses on the arrival of "the hour" when the Son will "return" to that "timeless" precreation sphere when the Son existed in the presence of the eternal, invisible Father.

After the elaboration of the Son's petition that the Father glorify him (17:1-5), the Son turns to the Lord's Prayer *topos* of God's divine name "Father" (17:6). The special emphasis in the Son's Prayer is not on "hallowing" the name but on reciprocal "giving" between the Father and the Son. One of the things the Father "gave" to the Son was God's "name," with the understanding that the Son should give the name to those whom the Father "gave" to the Son, so the name would be "known" to them. Later in the prayer it becomes clear that an additional goal of the reciprocal "giving" is to nurture imitation of the "Father/Son giving" by "those whom the Father gave to the Son." In other words, the purpose of the "giving" by the Father to the Son is to start a chain reaction: as the Father gives to the Son, so the Son gives to those whom the Father gave to him, so that those whom the Father gave to him will "give the name" to others so others also will "know the name."

The "chain-reaction reasoning" in precreation rhetorolect is a reconfiguration of "imitative learning" in wisdom rhetorolect, of which we saw a glimpse in Luke's elaboration of the Lord's Prayer. Instead of Jesus simply becoming an example of one who "prays," "heals those who are sick," and "cares for the poor," the "example" in precreation rhetorolect begins with the Father and starts a chain reaction from the Father to the Son to those whom the Father gives to the Son and from them to others who "seeing will believe." In essence, therefore, in precreation rhetorolect the Father is the "example." The Son is an extension of the Father's activity out into the world so "people" can see

the Father and, as we will observe at the end of the Son's Prayer, imitate "the love of the Father" both for the Son and for the world.

The Son opens with a statement of what he "has already done" with the name, which is reminiscent of the assertion by humans praying the Lord's Prayer that "they have already forgiven" their debtors (Matt 6:12; cf. Luke 11:4). The Son asserts: "I have made your name known to those whom you gave me from the world." The result, the Son says, is that they not only know the name, but they also know that everything the Father has given the Son is from the Father (17:7). This introduces the *topos* of God's "word." Those whom the Father gave to the Son have "kept" the "word" (λόγος) of the Father, because the Son gave the words (τὰ ῥήματα) to them that the Father had given to him. As a result of this, those whom the Father gave to the Son have "received" the words, know in truth that the Son came from the Father, and believe that the Father sent the Son (17:6-8). The reciprocal Father/Son "giving," therefore, includes not only the name but also the words the Father gave to the Son. The combination of the name and the words has led to both "knowing" and "believing" by those whom the Father gave to the Son. What they primarily know and believe is the "precreation storyline." They know that the Son came from the Father and the Father sent the Son into the world; they know that everything the Son has been given has been given to him by the Father; and they have received and know the words the Father gave to the Son to give to them. As a result, those the Father gave to the Son "believe" that the Father sent the Son, they "know in truth" that the Son came from the Father, and they have kept the Father's "word."

The opening of the Son's Prayer, therefore, has reconfigured the Lord's Prayer *topoi* of Father, heaven, come, give, and name, which are framed by a blend of wisdom, priestly, and prophetic-apocalyptic rhetorolect into a prayer framed by precreation rhetorolect that evokes an explicit storyline about how the Son came from the Father into the world full of "words" of the Father, which include the name of the Father. The Son gave both the name and the words to those whom the Father gave to him, and the result is that they know, believe, and have kept the Father's word.

This sets the stage for the middle of the Son's Prayer:

<i>Middle Texture in John 17</i>
<i>Asking</i>
9I am <i>asking</i> on their behalf; I am not <i>asking</i> on behalf of the world, but on behalf of those whom you <i>GAVE</i> me, because they are yours. 10All mine are yours, and yours are mine; and I have been <i>glorified</i> in them. 11And now <i>I am no longer in the world</i> , but they are in the world, and I am <i>COMING</i> to you. <i>HOLY FATHER</i> , protect them in <i>YOUR NAME</i> that you have <i>GIVEN</i> me, so that they may be one, as we are one. 12While I was with them, I protected them in <i>YOUR NAME</i> that you have <i>GIVEN</i> me. I guarded them, and not one of them was lost except the one destined to be lost, so that the scripture might be fulfilled.
<i>Coming to THE FATHER</i>
13But now I am <i>COMING</i> to you, and I speak these things in the world so that they may have my joy made complete in themselves. 14I have <i>GIVEN</i> them <i>your word</i> , and the world has hated them because they do not belong to the world, just as <i>I do not belong to the world</i> .
THE EVIL ONE
15I am not <i>asking</i> you to take them out of the world, but I <i>ask</i> you to protect them from <i>THE EVIL ONE</i> . 16They do not belong to the world, just as <i>I do not belong to the world</i> .
SANCTIFIED <i>in Truth</i>
17SANCTIFY them in the truth; <i>your word</i> is truth. 18As you have sent me into the world, so I have sent them into the world. 19And for their sakes I SANCTIFY myself, so that they also may be SANCTIFIED in truth. 20 'I <i>ask</i> not only on behalf of these, but also on behalf of those who will believe in me through <i>their word</i> , 21that they may all be one. As you, <i>FATHER</i> , are in me and I am in you, may they also be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me.

While the opening of the Son's Prayer contains petitions by the Son to the Father, the middle features the Son "asking" specifically on behalf of those whom the Father has given to him. The focus on asking is a reconfiguration of the Lukan elaboration of asking after Jesus taught the disciples the Lord's Prayer. In contrast to asking for bread, or even for forgiveness as in the Matthean closing, the Son asks "Holy Father" to "keep" those whom the Father has given to him "in" the Father's

“name.” The NRSV translates this “keeping” as “protecting”: God is to protect them so they will not be destroyed or lost (17:12: ἀπόλλυμι). The meaning seems to be that they may become lost “again” in “the world.” In other words, without knowing the Father, people are simply “lost in the world.” This means they have no light that enables them to “know” the Father, and without this knowing they live in darkness. As the Son continues, it becomes clear that a major goal of “keeping them in the name” is for the Son’s joy to “be filled” (πεπληρωμένην) in them (17:13; cf. 15:11; 16:20-24). Here again appears to be a chain reaction: as the Father has filled the Son with joy, so the Son’s goal is to fill those who believe with joy. In the Son’s Prayer, the Son asks the Father to “keep in the name” those whom the Father has given him, with the goal that they be filled with joy. In the chapter before the prayer, the Son tells those who have been given to him that they should “ask in the Son’s name,” and they will receive it so that their joy will be filled (16:24). The Son uses the experience of a woman in labor to explain how the process works. As the Son tells them farewell, those who have been given to him are in pain, because “the hour” has come. When the child is born, they will no longer remember the anguish “because of the joy of having brought a human being into the world” (16:21). Then he says: “So you have pain now; but I will see you again, and your hearts will rejoice, and no one will take your joy from you” (16:22).

Instead of asking for God’s kingdom to come on earth, for daily bread, and for forgiveness, therefore, the Son’s Prayer asks for the Father to keep people in the Father’s name, so the Son’s joy will fill them. In the midst of this, the Son says that those whom the Father has given him are “not of the world,” just as the Son is “not of the world” (17:14, 16). The Son also says that the world has “hated” the ones the Father has given to the Son. Then the Son tells the Father he is not asking that the Father “take them out of the world” but that the Father “keep them from the evil one” (17:15). Here again we see a dramatic reconfiguration of a Lord’s Prayer *topos*. In the Matthean version, the disciples are to pray that they not be “led into testing/temptation” but “delivered from the evil one.” In contrast, the precreation Son asks the Father to “keep them from the evil one.”

The middle ends with the Son asking the Father to “sanctify” (ἁγιάσον) those he has given to the Son “in the truth,” which is the Father’s “word” (17:17). Instead of sanctifying the name of the Father as in the Lord’s Prayer, then, the Son’s Prayer focuses on becoming sanctified in the Father’s word, which is “the truth.” The sanctification of the Father by the Son is made clear in 17:11, where the Son refers to

God as “Holy (ἅγιε) Father.” John 10:36 explicitly states that the Father has sanctified (ἡγίασεν) the Son and sent him into the world. The Son also says in 17:19 that he has sanctified himself so that they also may be sanctified in truth. Also, in 6:69 Peter says that they know that Jesus is the holy one of God. The goal of the sanctification is that all may “be one in us” (17:21). In the Son’s Prayer, the Son’s concern is the sanctifying of those who believe. Once again, then, we see the chain-reaction process in the precreation rhetorolect in the Son’s Prayer. The sanctification/hallowedness of the Father, which is evident in the Son’s reference to the Father as “holy,” is to be transmitted from the Father through the Son to those who believe.

Closing Texture in John 17

Love

22The *glory* that you have GIVEN me I have GIVEN them, so that they may be one, as we are one, 23I in them and you in me, that they may become completely one, so that the world may *know* that you have sent me and have *loved* them even as you have *loved* me.

24FATHER, I desire that those also, whom you have GIVEN me, may be with me where I am, to see my *glory*, which you have GIVEN me because you *loved* me before the foundation of the world.

25 ‘Righteous FATHER, the world does not *know* you, but I *know* you; and these *know* that you have sent me. 26I made YOUR NAME *known* to them, and I will make it *known*, so that the *love* with which you have *loved* me may be in them, and I in them.’

The closing reaches a very different place than the Lord’s Prayer as a result of the precreation reconfiguration of the conceptualization and reasoning, which means a reconfiguration of the meanings and meaning-effects of the *topoi*. The relation of the Son’s Prayer to the Lord’s Prayer is fully evident in the closing, however, with its focus on what the Father “has given.” Instead of asking the Father to give daily bread in the context of the coming of the kingdom, the Son’s Prayer focuses on what the Father has already given both to the Son and to those whom the Father has given to him. The Son starts with “the glory” the Father has given to the Son, and the Son says he has now given this glory to those the Father gave to him. Here we see the chain reaction from the glory of the Father through the Son to those who believe, as we saw above with

the name, the word(s), and the sanctification. The closing uses the Son's giving of "the glory" to the believers as the stepping-stone for giving them "the Father's love," which the Father has for the Son, and the Son wants to see in those whom the Father has given to the Son.

The key to the possibility that those who believe the Son may have the love of the Father in them is that they be able "to be with" the Son once the Son returns to the Father, where he was, where the Father loved him "before the foundation of the world" (17:24). This is possible through the transmission of "the glory" from the Father to the Son to those who believe, so that "they are one" even as the Father and the Son are one, which means that the Son will be "in" them as the Father is "in" the Son. At this point, the Son presents "his will" (θέλω) to the Father. Throughout the Son's Prayer the Son has stated that he has fulfilled what the Father sent him to do. In other words, the Son has done the will of the Father in the world. Thus, in relation to the Lord's Prayer, where the Father's will is to be done in the present and the future, in the Son's Prayer the Father's will already "has been done" by the Son while he has been on earth. But the Son's Prayer takes an additional step. In the context of the Son's doing the Father's will on earth, the Son asks the Father to do the Son's will, which is to have those whom the Father gave to him be with him, so they may see his glory which the Father gave to him before the foundation of the world (17:24).

The context for this final step is the Father's "love." While the Son prays for those the Father has given to him, he does not pray for those of the world (17:9). Rather, the Father's love "for the world" reaches beyond the Son's specific prayer to those who may still come to believe after the Son returns to the Father. The Father's love was given to the Son "before the foundation of the world" (17:24). The Father's love for the Son, which created the context for the Father to give certain ones in the world to him, initiated not only the Son's love for the Father but also the Son's love for those whom the Father gave him. In this context, the Son asks the Father to fulfill the Son's will about those whom the Father gave to him.

The goal of the Son's request is for those whom the Father gave to him to become completely one, which means the Son will be "in" them as the Father is "in" the Son. This means that the love with which the Father loves the Son will also be in those whom the Father has given to the Son. In this context the Son refers to those in the world, who do not know the Father. The Son makes known the Father's name to those in the world, and if they know "the love of the Father," then the love of the Father for the Son might also be in them, and the Son in them. Here

we see how the precreation reconfiguration of the Father's will on earth, which invites the additional *topoi* of the hour, the glory, knowing the name and the words of the Father, and being sanctified in truth, creates emergent discourse regarding the Father's love for the Son potentially to be in those who know the Father's name. The Son himself was not able to fulfill the Father's "love" for the world. Rather, the Son did the Father's will for the Son, which focused on those the Father gave to the Son. The further fulfillment of the Father's love for the world is the responsibility of those who "come to believe" after the Son returns to the Father.

Conclusion

This essay began with a comparison between Inductive Bible Study (IBS) and Sociorhetorical Interpretation (SRI). In the context of the many strategies the two approaches have in common, the proposal was that some noticeably different conceptual strategies exist between them. While IBS appears to be strongly driven by a blend of philosophical and canonical interests, SRI is driven by a blend of conceptualities in the social and cognitive sciences, linked with substantive interest in extracanonical literature and diverse religious discourses.

The differences in conceptualities and strategies was applied first to outlines of the Gospel of Mark, with a proposal that SRI is probably more inviting to different divisions of units and overall writings than IBS. For practitioners of SRI, different divisions of writings, including different divisions of opening-middle-closing texture, may be quite informative for readers in order to see multiple webs of meaning within the highly complexly-textured biblical and extracanonical texts that we regularly interpret. This leads to analysis and interpretation of the two versions of the Lord's Prayer in Luke and Matthew.

An opening-middle-closing approach to the Lord's Prayer first exhibits expansion and abbreviation in the Lord's Prayer itself. Then it broadens to analysis and interpretation of expansion and abbreviation in the openings that set the context for the Lord's Prayer and the conclusions that build upon specific *topoi* in the Lord's Prayer. While Luke elaborates the *topos* of "giving" in an argumentative conclusion exhibiting the foregrounding of wisdom rhetorolect, Matthew elaborates the *topos* of "doing" and "not doing" in the opening and expands the *topos* of "forgiving" in the closing, both of which foreground priestly rhetorolect.

From analysis and interpretation of *topoi* in the Synoptic versions of the Lord's Prayer, the essay turns to analysis and interpretation of

reconfiguration of Lord's Prayer *topoi* in the Son's Prayer in John 17. A key for this interpretation is a perception that the Lord's Prayer evokes a blend of priestly, wisdom, and prophetic-apocalyptic rhetorolect, while the Son's Prayer evokes a precreation storyline. Instead of the emphasis in the Lord's Prayer on prophetic-apocalyptic time associated with the coming of God's kingdom, the Son's Prayer focuses on "the hour" when the precreation Son will be glorified and will return to the Father. As the Son's Prayer unfolds, eight major Lord's Prayer *topoi* are reconfigured into a drama of petitions by the Son to the Father, intermingled with assertions by the Son that evoke the precreation storyline. The storyline includes the Father's sending of the Son to the world to give the name and the words of the Father to those whom the Father gives to the Son.

As the analysis and interpretation of the Son's Prayer unfolds, it is noticeable how the reciprocal "forgiving" in the Synoptic Lord's Prayer is reconfigured into reciprocal "giving" in the Son's Prayer. Rather than an emphasis on the Father's forgiving of humans in a context where they forgive other humans, the emphasis in the Son's Prayer is on what the Father "has already given" to the Son and how this "giving" introduces chain-reaction imitation: what the Father gives to the Son, the Son gives to those whom the Father has given to him, with the presupposition that those who were given to him will give what they have received to other people in the world.

In the broader context of the Fourth Gospel, one of the things the Son gives is "taking away" of "the sin" of the world.⁵⁷ In relation to no mention of forgiving in the Son's Prayer, the concept of "forgiving" in the Synoptic Lord's Prayer is dramatically reconfigured in terms of "precreation giving" in the Son's Prayer. The focus is on giving in the "chain-reaction environment" from the Father through the Son to those who believe. The Father gave "the Son" to the world. The Son completed an "intermediate task" of the Father's will that believers are to carry further through a process of what has been given to them. This evokes the overall goal of the Father that is articulated in John 3:16, that God so loved the world that he gave his Son to the world so that "the world" could be saved.

The Son's task was simply to save those whom the Father gave to him. As a result, the Son does not pray for "the world" in his prayer, only for those whom the Father gave to him, so that they may all be one in the Father and the Son. Those in the world who believe, rather than the Son himself, are responsible for giving "of the Father's love" to those "in

the world who do not believe." This "giving" occurs in a context where the Son "takes away" the sin of the world rather than "forgives" sins in the world. However, as humans on earth give to others the name Father, which the Father gave to the Son, as well as the words the Father gave to the Son, humans are to forgive other humans (20:23).⁵⁸ In this context, one of the overall goals is that the joy which came from the Father to the Son will also fill those whom the Father gave to the Son, and it has the potential also to fill other humans to whom those who now believe give the gifts that come to the Father and the Son to them.

On the basis of what we have been able to see in the relation among the Synoptic versions of the Lord's Prayer and the Son's Prayer in John 17, perhaps it is appropriate to conclude that SRI contrasts with IBS by inviting interpreters to look more deeply into the emergence of inner reasoning among early Christian communities. The deeper look is enacted especially by the perception of words and phrases—and clusters of words and phrases—as *topoi* that prompt the retrieval of social-cultural-ideological-religious "frames" that SRI calls rhetorolects. These frames evoke clusters or constellations of images, rationales, and arguments that prompt networks of meanings and meaning-effects that are valued culturally within certain geographical areas. As people encounter new issues through regular activities in their daily lives, which may include significant crises, they blend aspects of multiple frames together conceptually to think and reason about them. This blending prompts emergent structures in alternative networks of meanings and meaning-effects that enable them to "think further into" the issues they face.

SRI, then, contains strategies, concepts, and terminology that can help interpreters see emergent blends prompted by the discourse of various early communities and begin to explore what exigencies may have led to certain "solutions" provided by the emergent blends. Overall, then, we may see how SRI is designed to analyze and interpret "meaning in action" within emergent Christianity itself. In this way, SRI presents a challenge to people who may think Christianity always means, and always has meant, the same thing at all times in all places. Underlying SRI is a presupposition that Christianity is a mode of reasoning, believing, and acting that has always been changing, and still changes today. The reason for the ongoing change is its existence among humans, who are always changing and adapting as they respond to the challenges that

57. John 1:29.

58. 1 John 2:12 blends the logic of the chain-reaction imitation of the Father's giving in the Fourth Gospel with God's forgiving of humans in the Synoptics when it says: "I am writing to you, little children, because your sins are forgiven on account of his name" (cf. 1 John 1:9).

arise not only in the communities, nations, and continents where they live but also in the communities, nations, and continents they hear about, and may even see through modern media, on a daily basis.

MARK'S INCLUSION OF 'FOR ALL NATIONS' IN 11:17D AND THE INTERNATIONAL VISION OF ISAIAH

Mark A. Awabdy and Fredrick J. Long

Abstract: Despite recent scholarly recognition of the Isaian backdrop to Mark's Gospel, Jesus' citation of Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11 in Mark 11:17 has not been sufficiently interpreted; specifically, the phrase "for all nations" (from Isa 56:7) is considered redactional or is simply deemed relatively unimportant. Yet, the authenticity of Jesus' citation has been recently affirmed. Moreover, 11:17 is structurally focal in a chiasmatic arrangement within the narrative, with "for all nations" being central. Isaiah 56 was issuing critique of religious leaders for failing to include foreign worshippers. It seems plausible that Jesus as a Jewish teacher understood this and combined Isa 56:7 with Jer 7:11 to speak a prophetic word, even a divine word, that valued foreigners while indicting the religious leaders. This article is a text-based demonstration of the correlation of ISB with Vernon K. Robbins' socio-rhetorical interpretive heuristic, in order to explore the significance of Jesus' use of Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11 in Mark 11:17.

INTRODUCTION

There is no paucity of scholarly interest in Mark's so-called "temple cleansing" episode (11:15-19), framed by the withered fig tree scenes (11:12-14, 19-25).¹ Scholars have offered several interpretations of Mark's account, which include a "protest against commercial activity, creation of historical or eschatological space for the Gentiles,

1. For a bibliography of the history of twentieth century interpretation of Mark 11:15-17, consult Hans Dieter Betz, "Jesus and the Purity of the Temple (Mark 11:15-18): A Comparative Approach," *JBL* 116 (1997), 455 n.1. For a bibliography of studies on this pericope conducted in the 1980s and 1990s, consult David Seeley, "Jesus' Temple Act," *CBQ* 55 (1993): 263 n.1. Important studies exploring new contexts since the turn of the millennium include Scott G. Brown, "Mark 11:1-12:12: A Triple Intercalation?" *CBQ* 64 (2002): 78-89; Richard B. Hays, "Can the Gospels Teach Us How to Read the Old Testament?"

eschatological purification, [and] revolutionary putsch."² Unclear is whether the account reflects only Markan redaction or contains authentic teaching of Jesus. In either case, interpreters tend to focus upon Jer 7:11 and Jesus' confrontation of the commercialization of the temple, predicting its doom.³ Jesus' use of Isa 56:7, and particularly the phrase "for all nations" (which is omitted in Matthew and Luke) is either considered a Markan redaction⁴ or not representative of Jesus'

ProEcll 11 (2002): 402-18; J. Bradley Chance, "The Cursing of the Temple and the Tearing of the Veil in the Gospel of Mark," *BibInt* 15 (2007): 268-91; H. N. Roskam, *The Purpose of the Gospel of Mark in its Historical and Social Context* (NovTSup 114; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004); and Brian J. Incigneri, *The Gospel to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel* (NovTSup 65; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2003), see esp. 141.

2. Marcus J. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 1984), 182. See also the review of positions and ensuing discussion by N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 2; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 413-28.

3. Joel Marcus, *Mark 8-16* (ABD; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 783-84; Stein, *Mark* (Baker Exegetical Commentary of the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 518. A more nuanced portrait of Jesus' symbolic intentions with his own self-sacrifice is envisioned by Jostein Ådna who argues: "For Jesus as the Messiah the renewal of the Temple is a crucial task with regard to the imminent realization of God's *basileia* (cf. Mark 14:58). But there will not be any legitimized place for the traditional atoning, sacrificial cult – nor any need – in the realized *basileia*, and Jesus effectively demonstrates this by his symbolic act. On the other hand, by the time Jesus arrived in Jerusalem the controversy had already reached such a level that the foreseeable effect of a provocation of this kind will not be a final mass conversion but, on the contrary, the final doing away with the unpleasant figure from Nazareth. In case of this outcome, Jesus was willing to offer himself (cf. above) and, consequently, take over and replace the sacrificial cult in the Temple as the basis for atonement" ("Jesus' Symbolic Act in the Temple [Mark 11:15-17]: The Replacement of the Sacrificial Cult by his Atoning Death," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel* [WUNT 118; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1999], 472).

4. Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), 15 n.13, 117, 123; *idem*, "The Jewish War and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark," *JBL* 111 (1992): 441-462 at 448-49 n.38; Pheme Perkins, "Mark" in *NIB* 8:661; France, *The Gospel of Mark* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 2002), 445.

primary concern.⁵ Such conclusions are problematic, because the same interpreters have observed that the phrase “for all nations” is central to Isaiah’s concern,⁶ and/or that the combination of Isa 56:7 with Jer 7:11 is central to the Markan account,⁷ which is certainly true (see our structural presentation below).

Recently, Steven Moyise and Nicholas Perrin have provided good reasons for the authenticity of Jesus’ use of Isa 56:7 with Jer 7:11.⁸ Indeed,

5. France concludes, “it would be going too far to suggest that the primary object of Jesus’ protest was the interests of Gentile worshippers as such,...” (*Gospel of Mark*, 445). Wright too quickly moves from Isa 56 and its critique of leadership to Jer 7 and the destruction of the temple (*Jesus*, 418-22). William R. Telford, *The Barren Tree and the Withered Tree* (JSNTSS 1; Sheffield: University of Sheffield Press, 1980) makes only two passing references to Isa 56:7 always conjoined with Jer 7:11.

6. France argues, “In Isaiah it is this phrase which is the point of the sentence....Mark’s inclusion of the phrase as part of a quotation defending Jesus’ reform of the use of the Court of the Gentiles is likely to be deliberate....But it does not seem to be here, as in Isaiah, the main point of the quotation” (*Gospel of Mark*, 445). France is followed by Stein (*Mark*, 517).

7. Perkins, *Mark*, 661. Stein observes, “In the Markan context the emphasis of the Isaiah quotation falls upon ‘for all the nations’” but agrees with France “that this may not have been the main emphasis of Jesus in cleansing the temple” (*Mark*, 517). Puzzling, too, is France’s interpreting the intentions of Jesus’ actions, not in light of Isa 56:7, but Zech 14:21 (“There shall no longer be traders in the house of the Lord”), which is not cited or alluded to in any of the Gospels: “it would not be inappropriate to describe Jesus’ action as deliberately re-enacting Zc. 14:21” (*Gospel of Mark*, 438).

8. Steve Moyise, “Jesus and Isaiah,” *Neot* 43 (2009): 249-70; Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Temple* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011), 83-113. Perrin has traced a reasonable historical context within which to understand Jesus’ thought and action at the temple, but fails to take seriously the Isaian vision as expected by Jesus to have been enacted already, just as Isaiah had expected it to have been; both Isaiah and Jesus were indicting the religious leaders for failing to include all the nations in their worship of Yahweh. Instead, for Perrin, Isaiah’s is an eschatological vision that Jesus is inaugurating: “As Jesus understood perfectly well, Isaiah’s text pointed to a future, glorious reality, and in quoting the text he is intimating that the future is now present: the promised pilgrimage of the Gentiles and the eschatological re-gathering of exiled Israel had begun” (85; cf. 99, 109, 111, 176 n.65). So, for Perrin, Jesus’ critique of the temple establishment was simply “the ineradicable greed of Israel’s religious leaders” and concomitant abuse of the poor (110). However, Jesus’ pairing of Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11 in Mark 11:17 condemns the temple establishment for the failure to include all nations

as a Jewish teacher one would expect Jesus to provide some rationale for his symbolic temple actions.⁹ Joel Marcus is right to observe the possible exegetical technique of *gizērâ šāwâ* on the basis of the common words “called” and “house.”¹⁰ But what clues might Jesus’ use of Isa 56:7 combined with Jer 7:11 provide for recovering his intentions as presented in Mark’s narrative?

Important evidence is found in Mark’s retention of the dative modifying phrase in the Isaian quotation at 11:17d: “My house will be called a house of prayer *for all nations* [NT and LXX: $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\zeta\ \xi\theta\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$; MT: לְכָל־הָעַמִּים].” This phrase Matthew and Luke curiously omit (Matt 21:13//Luke 19:46). An investigation of the Third Isaian context, as will be further enumerated below, uncovers the intent of 56:7, namely, that covenant-keeping *foreigners* (בְּנֵי הַנֹּכַר ; 56:6) are invited to worship in the Jerusalem temple, but also that religious authorities are critiqued for failing to realize this invitation.¹¹ Thus, Matthew and Luke, by excluding $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\zeta\ \xi\theta\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$, have under-represented the Third Isaian context, whereas the Markan Jesus, conversely, has preserved that prophetic, confrontative context.

Assuming Markan priority, one wonders why Matthew and Luke

within the worship of Yahweh. The reason is not “either/or” but “both/and”; both greed with abuse of the poor and failure to welcome all nations are points of Jesus’ prophetic critique. Indeed, Perrin (86) provides evidence from 1 Macc 7:34-38 that shows how Isa 56:7 had been cited (nearly quoted) in reference to Maccabean temple practices. Instructive is how this citation replaces the phrase “for all nations” with another: when weeping about Nicanor’s threat to burn down the temple, the high priests pray at the altar: “You chose this house to be called by your name, and to be for your people a house of prayer and supplication” (1 Macc 7:34, NRSV, underlining ours).

9. Stein rightly asks, “What religious teacher in Israel would not seek to justify his actions by means of the OT?” (*Mark*, 517).

10. Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 784. For Marcus, however, this exegetical technique is a result of Markan redaction (see note 4 above). For a description of midrashic principles, see Craig Evans, “Midrash” *DJG*, 544-47.

11. See Raymond De Hoop, “The Interpretation of Isa 56:1-9: Comfort or Criticism,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 671-95.

omit this phrase against Mark;¹² this is especially so, since Matthew and Luke are concerned with the global scope of the Gospel. Did the oral tradition of the first century Roman church influence Mark's preservation of modifying phrase "for all nations" since the phrase captured Jesus' vision for Gentiles to be incorporated into God's saving purposes? This is possible, though unverifiable, and yet does not explain why the oral tradition underlying Matthew's and Luke's accounts would have omitted this phrase. Assuming Markan priority and Matthew's and Luke's use of the Q materials, have Matthew and Luke, against Mark, preferred the Q materials which omitted the phrase? Such a theory is difficult to maintain as Matthew and Luke, even more expressly than Mark, emphasize the international scope of the gospel and Christianity. Could Matthew and Luke's omission be explained as a Markan gloss, that is, a later scribal addition to Mark's account?¹³ There is no manuscript support for such a conjecture. Hans Deiter Betz argues instead that Matthew excludes the phrase because it "does not fit into his scheme of development, according to which Jesus turns to the Gentiles only in Matt 21:43."¹⁴ If correct, the same rationale would not explain Luke's omission. Might Matthew and Luke be abridging Mark's more detailed account (a common redactional pattern)? If Luke has deliberately abridged Mark here, the same cannot be said of Matthew since he follows Mark's longer edition in the first verse (Mark 11:19) and seems to have inserted into this pericope his own content (Matt 21:15-16). Are Matthew and Luke attempting to eliminate Markan redundancy or improve Markan grammar, as they do elsewhere?¹⁵ There is no obvious redundancy here, and although Mark's syntax and word order replicates the Septuagint (which has translated a *Vorlage* identical to the MT), Matthew and Luke may be attempting to improve Mark's syntactical construction (see comments further below). The implication of these considerations is that Mark's inclusion of "for all nations" likely preserves Jesus's original teaching or intention. It

12. Perhaps the least dissatisfying explanation for Matthew's and Luke's omission is that they each attempted to improve Mark's syntax by paring down the Isaian quotation to parallelize the syntax of the contrasting quotations from Isaiah and Jeremiah. For a comparative alignment of these texts, see further below.

13. R. H. Hiers, "Purification of the Temple: Preparation for the Kingdom of God," *JBL* 90 (1971): 89.

14. "Purity of the Temple," 458 n.15.

15. Robert Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 128

appears, then, that Mark retains the phrase intentionally to contribute to an Isaian theme in his Gospel.

Joel Marcus and Rikki Watts have sufficiently identified Isaiah as contributing substantially to Mark's portrayal of Jesus' ministry.¹⁶ Thorsten Moritz describes Isaian themes that include Jesus' prophetic confrontation and critique of Israel's leadership, his divine visitation to and judgment of the Jerusalem temple, and the favorable implications of both for the nations.¹⁷ However, oddly the contribution of the phrase $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \xi\theta\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ "for all nations" in 11:17 in context has not been sufficiently addressed by these interpreters.¹⁸ Moreover, commentators

16. Joel Marcus, *Way of the Lord*; Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark* (WUNT 88; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1997).

17. Moritz utilizes Watts (1997) and others for a stupendous theological interpretation of Mark's Gospel, yet ("Mark," in *Theological Interpretation of the New Testament: A Book-by-Book Survey* [ed. K. Vanhoozer; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008], 39-49).

18. For instance, Marcus offers extensive comments on Mark 11:15-19, but provides only one parenthetical reference to Isa 56:7, despite otherwise excellent research citing extra-biblical sources. This is likely due to his understanding that Isa 56:7 represents Markan redaction (*Mark 8-16*, 790-93). Watts concludes that "for all the nations" in 11:17 indicated that the temple space for the Gentiles was to be considered "an equally sacred space" (*Isaiah's New Exodus*, 324). Otherwise, Watts argues, "there is no further comment in the larger context about Gentiles *per se*. Thus, although the statement is certainly consonant with an INE [Isaian New Exodus] perspective on the nations, consistent with the Markan Jesus' hesitancy to actually inaugurate a 'mission to the Gentiles' (Mk 7:27), nothing more is done to elucidate this brief but pregnant declaration." Yet, Watts remains only tentative on the importance of 11:17 saying that "Israel's NE [new Exodus] and the nations' salvation (cf. Isa 56:7 in Mk 11:17) is predicated on the scandal of Χριστὸς ἔσταυρωμένος (1 Cor 1:23)..." (238) and that the ambiguous "many" of 10:45, includes the nations "not only given the immediate context in which the rulers of these nations are being discussed (Mark 10:42f) but also perhaps in light of Isaiah 56:7 in Mark 11:17" (282, underlining ours). Moritz ("Mark" 46) understandably (due to space constraints) does not comment specifically on 11:15-19. However, correctly he understands the broader meaning of Jesus' triumphal entry (Mark 11:1-19) as Isaianic and "nothing less than God's return to his people to sacrificially complete Israel's failed mission on her behalf (10:45)" ("Mark," 45) and then discusses Jesus' judgment of the temple in 11:12-26 as will be enacted by him as the Son of Man (cf. Mark 13).

fail to consider the significance of Mark's retention of this phrase.¹⁹ Specifically, we will argue that Mark's Gospel affirms Jesus as one who seeks fulfillment of Yahweh's international mission for the nations as presented in Isaiah, but who simultaneously must prophetically enact the impending judgment upon the corrupted temple (Jer 7:11) because of the failure to realize the temple's function as "a house of prayer for all nations" (Isa 56:7) in continuity with Isaiah's initial prophetic critique.

Supporting evidence for our claim will be supplied through using an evidential approach informed by IBS and the multifaceted socio-rhetorical interpretive heuristic as described by Vernon K. Robbins.²⁰ Norman Perrin and later Stephen H. Smith, who commented particularly on the structure and theology of Mark 11-12, called for "synthesizing the methodologies" in order to discover Mark's theology.²¹ Robbins has

19. One notable exception is James R. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark* (Pillar NT Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 343-45, quoted at 343: "The temple is not the sole property of Israel but a witness to the nations, the place where anyone who 'loves the name of the Lord [may] worship him' (Isa 56:6), a place where God 'will gather still others' (Isa 56:8). That, at least, was the purpose of the temple, had it not been perverted into 'a den of robbers.'" We would agree, but would add importantly that the Isaian context of 56:7 was one of prophetic critique, and Jesus' teaching and actions suggest he understood that Isaian meaning.

20. Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996); *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1996). See also the "Dictionary of Socio-Rhetorical Terms" (DSRT) website defining these terms based upon these books <http://www.religion.emory.edu/faculty/robbins/SRI/defns/index.cfm>.

21. N. Perrin, "The Evangelist as Author: Reflections on method in the Study and Interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts," *BR* 17 (1972): 5-18. Perrin is cited by Stephen H. Smith, "The Literary Structure of Mark 11:1-12:40," *NovT* 31 (1989): 104-24. Smith argues, "Too often scholars have drawn conclusions about Gospel theology from a purely redactional or linguistic analysis, or even by adopting a blanket approach in which the gospel is understood from a literary-critical perspective, regardless of other methodologies. Surely it is time to take stock of current critical scholarship on Mark, and to heed the advice issued some 16 years ago by the late Norman Perrin that our understanding of Mark's theology –or that of the other synoptists, for that matter—can be enhanced only by synthesizing the methodologies at our disposal" (104). Cf. Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), xiii-xiv.

envisioned interpreting a pericope by analysis of its inner texture,²² intertexture,²³ social-cultural texture,²⁴ ideological texture,²⁵ and sacred texture.²⁶ In actual occurrence, these textural dimensions co-exist simultaneously in a pericope informing one another, but there is benefit to investigate them distinctly.

This paper will, first, summarize how Mark intertexturally portrays Jesus as agent of Yahweh's international mission in Isaiah; second, investigate the inner textural dimensions of 11:15-19 that orient

22. "The inner texture of a text refers to the various ways the text employs language to communicate" (from DSRT website). Robbins describes strategies (or sub-textures) for studying inner texture that includes progressive and repetitive textures, narrational and opening-middle-closing textures, argumentative texture, and sensory-aesthetic texture (i.e. the feelings, emotions, and senses related to the human body in the text).

23. "Intertexture is a 'text's representation of, reference to, and use of phenomena in the 'world' outside the text being interpreted.' This world includes other texts (oral-scribal intertexture) other cultures (cultural intertexture) social roles institutions, codes and relationships (social intertexture) and historical events or places (historical intertexture)" (from DSRT website).

24. "The social and cultural texture of a text refers to the social and cultural nature of a text as a text. A text is part of society and culture by the way it views the world (specific social topics), by sharing in the general social and cultural attitudes, norms, and modes of interaction which are known by everyone in a society (common social and cultural topics) and by establishing itself vis-à-vis the dominant cultural system (final cultural categories) as either sharing in its attitudes, values, and dispositions at some level (dominant and subcultural rhetoric) or by rejecting these attitudes, values, and dispositions (counterculture, contraculture, and liminal culture rhetoric)" (from DSRT website).

25. "Ideological texture is concerned with the particular alliances and conflicts nurtured and evoked by the language of the text and the language of the interpretation as well as the way the text itself and interpreters of the text position themselves in relation to other individuals and groups" (from DSRT website).

26. "Sacred texture is a texture that is intertwined with each of the other four textures (inner, inter, social/cultural, and ideological), and refers to the manner which a text communicates insights into the relationship between the human and the divine. This texture includes aspects concerning deity, holy persons, spirit beings, divine history, human redemption, human commitment, religious community (e.g. ecclesiology), and ethics" (from DSRT website). Sacred texture is not described in Robbins, *Tapestry*, but only in *Exploring*, 130-32.

readers toward the centrality of Jesus' teaching and the phrase $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ "for all nations" (11:17d); third, probe the ideological texture of Isaiah 56 as the plausible foundation for Jesus' temple teaching; fourth, consider the social-cultural texture of honor-shame dynamics in Jesus' temple teaching; and, finally, conclude by considering the implications of textual interpretation for understanding the sacred textural dimensions of 11:15-19.

1. INTERTEXTURE: JESUS AS AGENT OF ISAIAIAN INTERNATIONAL MISSION IN MARK

Oral-scribal intertexture involving recitation, recontextualization, and reconfiguration of Isaiah is found throughout Mark's Gospel.²⁷ Instances of recitation (direct quotation of an authoritative source, often by name) include Mark 1:3 (Isa 40:3), probably Mark 4:12 (Isa 6:9-10), Mark 7:6-7 (Isa 29:13), and our passage in Mark 11:17 (Isa

27. Recontextualization, in which no explicit reference is made to a previous Isaian context, is found in several places. In Mark 2:7 (Isa 43:25), some scribes were adjudging that Jesus was claiming God's prerogative of forgiving sin. Jesus in 3:27-28 very possibly recontextualizes the return from exile motif of "binding the strong man" to bring release to that which was bound (Isa 49:23-25). Then Jesus' exhortation to resist sin is supported with a view of hell "where their worm does not die and the fire is not put out" (Isa 66:24). Jesus' last passion prediction in 10:34 recontextualizes motifs of spitting, striking, and humiliation from Isa 50:6 (cf. Mark 9:12 with Isa 53:3) and the Son of Man's ransom for many is from Isa 53:10-12 (cf. Mark 14:24; 15:27). Then, Jesus critiques the religious leaders (and they knew it; 12:12) in 12:1 recollecting Isaiah's vineyard allegory (Isa 5:1-2). The final instances of recontextualization involve numerous allusions to Isaiah's scenes of judgment while Jesus described the events of and prior to the fall of Jerusalem: Mark 13:8 (Isa 19:2; cf. Isa 13:13), 13:24 (cf. Isa 13:10), 13:25 (Isa 34:4), and 13:31 (Isa 51:6).

Reconfiguration involves recounting key themes of an authoritative text (without quotation) which are updated in the new context. Examples of this are found when Isa 35:5b, 6b ("And the ears of the deaf will be unstopped... and the tongue of the mute will shout for joy") essentially is found in Mark 7:37 with the acclamation of the crowds in amazement of Jesus' healing when they say, "He has done all things well; he both makes the deaf to hear and the mute to speak." In relation to this, likewise Isa 35:5a ("Then the eyes of the blind will be opened") is pivotal because Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and passion predictions are framed by two healing of the blind episodes of Mark 8:22-26 and 10:46-52. These instances of quotations or allusions were found using the *Loci Citati vel Allegati* of NA27.

56:7). Only in Mark 1:2-3 and Mark 7:6-7 is Isaiah quoted by name. The middle two instances of recitation are significant, since they involve indictments, first, against the people "on the outside" in Mark 4:12 who "are seeing, but not perceiving" and, second, against their leadership consisting of scribes and Pharisees in 7:5-7 who "honor with lips, but are far from God." The final recitation of Isa 56:7 combined with Jer 7:11 in Mark 11:17 continues this theme of judgment while affirming international mission to the Gentiles.

However, the first recitation sets the stage for the entire Gospel. Mark 1:2-3 reads: "As it is written in Isaiah the prophet, 'Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way [=Mal 3:1a or Exod 23:20];³ the voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight' [=Isa 40:3]" (RSV). Along with Isa 40:3, what scripture text is quoted here? Exod 23:20 or Mal 3:1a? Watts has surveyed the evidence and concludes that Mal 3:1a is used, although Malachi has drawn upon both Exod 23:20 and Isaiah for his prophecy.²⁸ This suggests that Malachi's prophecy was a restatement and elaboration of Isaiah's in light of Exod 23:20, such that it is "understood within an Isaianic framework."²⁹ This likely explains why Mark quotes first Mal 3:1a followed by Isa 40:3 under the rubric of "Isaiah's speech."

Unquoted in Mark's Gospel, however, is Mal 3:1b which continues the thought: "and the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his temple; the messenger of the covenant in whom you delight, behold, he is coming, says the LORD of hosts" (RSV). According to Malachi, there will follow *a sudden appearance of the Lord to his temple* bringing a covenant in order to fulfill Isaiah's vision. Why is this portion not provided? Might Mal 3:1b be understood as fulfilled by the Markan Jesus? Importantly, the Synoptic Gospels present Jesus as only visiting Jerusalem one time; the start of this momentous journey is starkly demarcated in Matt 16:21 and Luke 9:51, but not in Mark (cf. 10:32-33). In contrast, scholars acknowledge that John's Gospel account is more complete with Jesus going to Jerusalem three or four times. So, why did Mark (presumably followed by Matthew and Luke) present only one momentous journey of Jesus to Jerusalem? It is possible that Mark did so, in order to show how that final journey of Jesus to the temple is a fulfillment of Mal 3:1, which restates part of Isaiah's vision in Isa 40:3. Such a view is supported by the structural priority and Isaian intertexture of Mark 11:17.

Most interpreters argue that Mark redacts the Isaian context

28. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus*, 61-84.

29. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus*, 57.

at the temple- cleansing episode (Isa 56:7 at Mark 11:17) to advance a pro-Gentile theme: Jesus is portrayed as intending to create space for the Gentiles *historically, eschatologically, or covenantally*.³⁰ According to the most popular view, Jesus cleared out the congestion in the temple expressly to (re)establish a locale for Gentiles *historically* to pray undisrupted in the temple's outer courtyard.³¹ J. Bradley Chance has observed that Isa 56 calls for more than foreigners praying in the "outer precincts" of the temple since in 56:7, "Their burnt offerings and sacrifices will be acceptable on my alter...." Therefore "The temple, God's house, was to be a place of prayer *and* sacrificial worship for all nations. Full inclusion is the vision of Isaiah."³² Such is consonant with the Markan Jesus who extends the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom to the nations (4:30-32; 13:9), as exemplified even in Jesus' own ministry which reaches to the "Gentile" Syro-Phoenician woman (7:25-30), the Gerasenes Demoniac (5:1-20), and the Roman Centurion who is the first human to recognize Jesus as "son of God" (15:39).³³

Other interpreters believe creating *eschatological* space is Jesus' optimal concern in Mark's account. Endorsing this view, Richard Hays points explicitly toward the Third Isaian eschatological vision of the redemption of Jerusalem which provides a context for the gentiles to "come to Mount Zion worship alongside God's people" at the Jerusalem temple.³⁴ After Hays enumerates Isa 56:7-8, he elucidates his claim:

By citing this passage, Mark portrays Jesus' protest action as an indictment of the Temple authorities for

30. However, Casey contends that $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \xi\theta\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ in Mark's gospel is optimally concerned only about Jewish people, and not an international mission ("Culture and Historicity," 312). During Passover the Jews were not a minority of the nations present in the temple, but the vast majority. Thus, cleansing the temple of the buyers and sellers "would be to permit the throngs of Jewish people present for Passover to pray anywhere in the temple area. There was not room for all of them in the inner courts." Yet this suggestion is, for Mark's gospel, counterintuitive to $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \xi\theta\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$, especially when read in its Third Isaian setting, which points expressly beyond Jewish people to international mission.

31. Incigneri, *Gospel to the Romans*, 141.

32. "Cursing of the Temple," 274.

33. Although for evidence that the Gerasenes demoniac was Jewish, see Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus*, 164-66.

34. "How To Read the Old Testament?" 406-7.

turning the Temple into a bazaar, cluttering the outer "court of the Gentiles" and making it unsuitable as a place of worship for the Gentile "others" who might want to gather there to pray. By driving out the merchants, Mark's Jesus clears the way, figuratively, for the restored worship of the kingdom of God, in which all nations will participate along with the returning exiles of Israel. Thus, Jesus' action looks forward to the eschatological redemption of Jerusalem.

Closely related to this view is that Mark's Jesus intended to create *covenantal* space for the Gentiles, that is, "to adumbrate the entry of Gentiles into the new covenant."³⁵ David Seeley roots this understanding squarely in Jesus' mission to the gentiles in Mark's gospel:

In Mark 13:10, Jesus says that the gospel must be preached to all nations. In Mark 15:39, the Gentile centurion becomes the first person after Jesus' death to confess him as the Son of God. These passages suggest that Mark was looking toward Gentiles as fertile ground for Christian preaching. The notion that Jesus attacked the temple because it was somehow taking insufficient account of Gentiles would have fit very well into this schema.³⁶

Similarly, Paula Fontana Qualls sees covenant as central to the Isaian and Jeremian quotations which Mark employs strategically.³⁷ She notes that the beginning of Isaiah 56 is a summons to justice (56:1-2) and covenant fidelity (56:3-8), then an indictment against wicked rulers (56:9-12). Therefore, she asserts: "The purpose of the temple is here defined; it is for *covenant* relationship.... The heart of worship and faithfulness to Yahweh is covenant. And this is a covenant that is 'for all peoples.' This

35. "Jesus' Temple Act," 280.

36. "Jesus' Temple Act," 280. Donald Juel suggests, "The absence of the phrase $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \xi\theta\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ in Matthew and Luke [Matt 21:13; Luke 19:46] does not necessarily indicate anything about Mark's emphasis, but in fact, there does seem to be some concern for Gentiles present in the gospel" (*italics ours*) (*Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* [SBLDS 31; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1977], 131).

37. "Mark 11:15-18: A Prophetic Challenge," *RevExp* 93 (1996): 395-402.

is why Yahweh says that he is not limited to the temple (Is. 66:1-2), but resides with the humble and contrite in spirit. True and empty worship are being contrasted.” So Jesus in Mark’s account is centrally concerned with removing impediments so that covenantally faithful Gentiles – or as Scott Brown identifies them, “Gentile God-fearers and proselytes”³⁸ – can worship Yahweh as Isaiah envisions.

It is very likely that Mark’s Jesus in 11:15-19 intended to create space for Gentiles historically, eschatologically, or covenantally, if not all three, implementing the intent of Isaiah’s grand, pan-ethnic vision. Does this reading, however, place too much weight on Mark’s retaining of the phrase *πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* “for all nations” in 11:17d? We don’t think so. Arguably, Mark not only deliberately retained the original phrase in Jesus’ teaching, but through chiasmic arrangement centralized the phrase in the account, depicting Jesus as one who perceived and enacted Isaiah’s international mission within the setting of the Jerusalem temple.

2. INNER TEXTURE: MARK 11:15-19 AND THE CENTRALITY OF ΠΑΣΙΝ ΤΟΙΣ ἜΘΝΕΣΙΝ (11:17D)

There are several contextually limiting factors, particularly structural and syntactical, that centralize the phrase *πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* “for all nations” (11:17d) in Mark’s temple cleansing episode (11:15-19) within the cursing of the fig tree scene (11:12-14, 20-25).³⁹ The colons of Mark’s temple cleansing paragraph reflect a progressive and repetitive structure that supports a chiasmic presentation (ABC-D-CBA) centering on Jesus’ teaching in 11:17 (itself presented chiasmically—see further below):⁴⁰

- A Curse of fig tree spoken (vv.12-14)
- B Jesus and the disciples *enter Jerusalem* and enter the temple (v.15a)
- C Jesus *acts* adversatively toward the buyers-sellers (vv.15b-16)
- D Jesus *teaches* adversatively concerning the buyers-sellers (v.17)
- C’ The chief priests and scribes *act* adversatively toward Jesus (v.18)
- B’ Jesus and the disciples *leave the city* (v.19)
- A’ Curse of fig tree realized (vv.20-25).

The entire scene is framed by the cursing of the fig tree (A and A’). Next, Jesus and his disciples entering (11:15) and exiting (11:19) the city of Jerusalem (B and B’).⁴¹ The exit of Jesus and his disciples out of the city

40. This chiasmic arrangement is essentially affirmed by Watts, *Isaiah’s New Exodus*, 304. His presentation extends it into 11:1-11 and 11:26-12:12, affirming 11:15-19 as central.

“Jesus’ identity and authority: ‘triumphal’ entry (Ps 118:25f)	(11:1-11)
Cursing of the fig-tree	(11:12-14)
Incident (‘cleansing?’) in the Temple (Isa 56:7/ Jer 7:11)	(11:15-19)
Withered fig-tree, and mountain moving	(11:20-25)
Jesus’ identity and authority: authority questioned, response in the vineyard parable and stone saying (Ps 118:22f)	(11:26-12:12)”

On the other hand, Smith rejects any basis to observe a chiasm in this passage and the notion that one exists (“Mark 11:1-12:40,” 172). France offers only an alternating five-part structure: A (v.11)-B vv.12-14)-A (vv.15-19)-B (vv.20-25)-A (27) (*Gospel of Mark*, 436). However, the chiasm is established both on lexical and thematic/theological grounds.

41. There is a textual variant in 11:19 that leaves open the possibility that Jesus left the city (*ἔξεπορεύετο*) without his disciples. The external evidence for the 3rd singular reading *ἔξεπορεύετο* “he went out” (ⲛ C [D ἔκ τῆς] Θ ^f3 33 157 180 579 892 1006 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 Byz [E G H N Σ] *Lect*: it^{a, b, f, ff2, i, k, l, q} vg syr^{s, h, pal} cop^{sa, bo} eth geo² slav) is slightly superior to the 3rd plural reading *ἔξεπορεύοντο* “they went out” (A B Δ Ψ 0233 565 700 1071 2427 it^{aur, c, d, r1} syr^{p, h-mg} [arm] geo¹), but both readings have manuscript support that trumps the minor readings. Both readings are geographically widely distributed

38. Scott Brown, “Mark 11:1-12:12: A Triple Intercalation?” *CBQ* 64 (2002): 80.

39. It is standard to treat Jesus’ temple cleansing surrounded by the cursing of the fig tree as an intercalation. See, e.g., Brown (“Mark 11:1-12:12”) and Smith (“Literary Structure”), who propose multiple layers of intercalation. However, it is more important to understand how the fig tree is involved in the formation of a chiasm that focuses readers on Jesus’ most important speech of Scripture citation/interpretation at the temple in 11:17.

in 11:19 functions furthermore in conjunction with the surrounding withered fig tree episodes (11:12-14, 20-25). Together Jesus' cursing of the fig tree and his entering and exiting the temple serve as Jesus' symbolic indictment of the corrupt Jerusalem temple, not unlike when Yahweh's presence left the Solomonic temple in Ezek 10:18-19. This will point will be discussed below.

The 11:15-19 episode, moreover, moves rapidly due to Mark's repetitive use of *καί*, many active verbs, and Mark's apparent précis of Jesus' scriptural teaching, which is the grounds for his action (11:17). In 11:15b-16 Jesus is the sole agent of the active main verbs. The spotlight is on him as actor (11:15b-16) and teacher (11:17), but his teaching is the crux of the episode. Jesus is depicted as engaged in "purposeful action." Contra to Matt 21:13 and Luke 19:46, Mark retains the imperfect verb *ἐδίδασκεν*, likely ingressive ("he began to teach"), in conjunction with the imperfect retained in indirect discourse, *ἔλεγε* ("and he was saying"). Ostensibly, the buyer-sellers (11:15-16) are the object of Jesus' teaching, since there is a double reference to them in 11:17 (*αὐτοῖς* by the narrator; *ὁμοῖς* by Jesus). However, when the chief priests and the scribes "heard" (*ἤκουσαν*) Jesus' teaching, they "began seeking" (*ἐζήτουν*; imperfect tense) how to destroy him (11:18). The social-cultural texture of honor and shame associated with this confrontation will be explored further below.

The inner textural importance of the phrase *πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*, moreover, is seen since it is chiastically central to Jesus' teaching in 11:17,

and share a relatively equal amount of Alexandrian text type support, but *ἐξεπορεύετο* has broader text type distribution (Alexandrian, Alexandrian with Byzantine influence, Byzantine, Independent witnesses, other witnesses) than the *ἐξεπορεύοντο* reading (primarily Alexandrian and Independent text types). With regard to the internal evidence, within the Markan context *ἐξεπορεύετο* is the *lectio difficilior* since it is narratively disjunctive for Jesus *and* his disciples to enter Jerusalem (11:15), but Jesus alone to leave the city (11:19), and then in the next verse Jesus *and* his disciples are the agents of the plural verbs (11:20). On the other hand, one may say the 3mp *ἐξεπορεύοντο* is the *lectio difficilior* since Mark uses the singular form of the verb or participle 7 times (1:5; 7:19; 7:20; 7:23; 10:17; 10:46; 13:1), but the plural form only thrice (6:11; 7:15; 7:21). There is the possibility that the 3ms *ἐξεπορεύετο* reading was a harmonization with the number of Matthew's singular verb "he went out of the city" (*ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως*) in Mt 21:17. Although the external evidence slightly favors *ἐξεπορεύετο*, this reading is perhaps too disjunctive and may be explained as a harmonization in number with Matthew. Most likely, then, the *inclusio* of Mark's Temple cleansing saga is enforced by Jesus *and* his disciples entering (11:15) and leaving (*ἐξεπορεύοντο*) the city.

which itself is central to the chiasm of 11:12-30.

A	ὁ οἶκός μου
B	οἶκος προσευχῆς
C	κληθήσεται
D	πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν;
D'	ὁμοῖς δὲ
C'	πεποιήκατε
B'	αὐτὸν
A'	σπήλαιον ληστῶν

That Mark has shaped 11:17 by *chiasmus* is corroborated by Mark's word order against Matthew and Luke. Mark follows the LXX, MT, or plausibly Aramaic,⁴² but notably differs in his placement of the added pronoun *αὐτόν* from Matthew and Luke to support the chiasm:⁴³

LXX (Isa 56:7d)	ὁ γὰρ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν
MT	כי ביתי בית־תפלה יקרא לכל־העמים
Aramaic (Targums)	בית מקדשי בית צלו יתקרי לכל עממא
LXX (Jer 7:11a)	σπήλαιον ληστῶν
MT	המערת פרצים
Aramaic (Targums)	הכבית־כנישת רשיעין

42. P. M. Casey notes the possibility that Mark's source could have had an Aramaic version, in which case the translation would still be very similar to the LXX and MT ("Culture and Historicity: The Cleansing of the Temple," *CBQ* 59 [1997]: 318).

43. John's account in 2:16 can hardly be called parallel, and thus is not compared here with the triple tradition.

Mark 11:17	ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; ὑμεῖς δὲ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον ληστῶν.
Matt 21:13	ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ποιεῖτε σπήλαιον ληστῶν.
Luke 19:46	καὶ ἔσται ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον ληστῶν.

Assuming Markan priority, Matthew follows Mark generally, but places αὐτὸν before the verb in the second colon, omits πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, and replaces Mark's perfect tense verb πεποιήκατε (possibly corresponding to a circa AD 70 date) with the present form ποιεῖτε (possibly corresponding to a pre-AD 70 date).⁴⁴ Luke diverges from Mark by replacing the future passive κληθήσεται with the future ἔσται (from εἰμί) in the first colon, omitting πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, and replacing πεποιήκατε with the aorist form ἐποιήσατε (possibly corresponding to a post-AD 70 date). The significance for this paper is that Mark located αὐτὸν before the second colon's verb in order to shape his *chiasmus*. Finally, it should be said that the chiastic arrangement parallels the D-D' elements with genitive modifiers, "house of mine" (ὁ οἶκός μου) with "den of robbers" (σπήλαιον ληστῶν). If Jesus speaks as first person referent to refer to "my house," then he is further identifying himself with Yahweh. But, ironically, in contrast to him are robbers (λησταί), among whom Jesus will be eventually be crucified (15:27; cf. Matt 26:55; 27:38, 44 and not paralleled in Luke).

At the core of this *chiasmus*, πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν "for all nations" is antithetically paired with ὑμεῖς δὲ "but you."⁴⁵ This center stresses, consequently on the one hand, the purported and potential beneficiaries

44. If one assumes Markan priority and Matthew's and Luke's use of Q materials, the popular theory that Matthew and Luke replace Mark's historical presents with superior verbal forms (i.e., aorists) breaks down here as Matthew converts Mark's aorist into a historical present. Likewise, one may note that Matthew and Luke remove the recitative ὅτι "that" (untranslated). None of the Evangelists include the explanatory "for" (LXX: γάρ; MT: כִּי). There are other differences, but space considerations do not allow us to detail these here.

45. *Contra* Gundry, *Mark*, 639, who does not adequately treat "for the nations." His chiasm is stated as "My house [a] a house of prayer [b] will be called..., but you [b'] have made it [a'] a den of bandits." Oddly omitted is "for all the nations" (designated by "...").

with inclusive scope ("ALL nations"), but on the other hand, the human agency that has undermined this potential: "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations [πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν], but you [ὑμεῖς δὲ] have made it a den of robbers." The dative of advantage "for all nations" (πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν) expresses the temple's intended reputation (κληθήσεται as predictive future, "will be called/known as") as a place full of, or characterized by, prayer for the benefit of all nations. Antithetically paired with πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν as the potential beneficiaries is the emphatic personal pronoun subject ὑμεῖς ("you"). Within a contrastive context as exists here, the conjunction δὲ brings distinctive focus to what follows ("but you").⁴⁶ The δὲ introduces a statement that denounces the agents for having made (note the perfect tense verb form) the temple (αὐτὸν "it" as double accusative internal object) into a den (σπήλαιον as double accusative external complement) full of robbers (genitive of content), which by implication, disadvantaged "all nations." The temple should have been a place conducive "for all nations" to pray and receive God's blessing, and ideally a place for Jews to pray for the benefit of all nations, a la, Gen 12:1-3; but as Jesus found it in Mark 11, the temple was not this kind of a place. So, prophetically and didactically Jesus confronted the temple establishment's failure on the basis of Isaiah's vision "for all nations."

3. IDEOLOGICAL TEXTURE: TORAH PREROGATIVES AND REBUKE IN ISAIAH 56

If one affirms that Mark's Gospel portrays Jesus as agent of Isaiah's international mission (via intertexture) and that 11:15-19 orients readers toward the centrality of Jesus' teaching from Isa 56:7 and particularly πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν "for all nations" (via inner texture), then there remains to consider whether Jesus' actions and teaching on Isa 56:7 in Mark 11:15-19 reflect the ideological impulse of Isa 56:7 in its

46. Most essentially δὲ marks new development within narrative, but in a contrastive context δὲ marks distinctive focus (Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek* [2nd ed.; Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 2000], 113-18). Levinsohn helpfully explains the significance of δὲ in these contrastive contexts: "the characteristic or proposition associated with δὲ is more in focus: the negative proposition is usually discarded or replaced by the positive one" (114). However, in Mark 11:17 the positive vision is replaced by the negative outcome of what the temple has become.

Isaian context. We believe it does.⁴⁷

Most scholars believe Isa 56:1-8(9) envisages a cultic ideal for the postexilic province of Yehud, and while the unit is multidimensional, its ideology revolves around faithfulness to Yahweh's covenant expressed through Torah obedience by even "eunuchs" (סְרִיסִים) and "foreigners" (בְּנֵי הַנֹּכַר) who keep covenant. Although the term "Torah" (תּוֹרָה) is not used, the unit is full of allusions to Torah, some of which we identify below. Isaiah's conception of Torah is polyvalent, such that in its various contexts the term, with its associated language, may mean: "law," "instruction," "the Law (of Moses)," "rebuke," "moral instruction," "official record," "teaching," *et al.* However, there is also continuity in the term's Isaian usage: Torah is instructive revelation from Yahweh that carries covenantal overtones. Subordinate to this basic component of meaning are at least three ascriptions to Torah in Isaiah that find expression in 56:1-12. First, Yahweh's Torah is extended to the nations, announced as a gift to Israelites and non-Israelites alike. Second, Yahweh's Torah prescribes cultic and ethical prerogatives that are rooted in abiding traditions. Third, the distorted use Yahweh's Torah necessitates rebuke, that is, Torah's divine intent must be enforced in praxis. We discuss these three ideological ascriptions to Torah in Isaiah 56 within its literary context, and then note how Mark's Jesus reflects these Torah ascriptions through his actions and teaching in 11:15-19.

Yahweh's Torah is Extended to the Nations

Marvin Sweeney's argument is quite convincing that "the book of Isaiah as a whole portrays the revelation of YHWH's Torah to the nations and Israel in analogy to the revelation of Torah to Israel and the nations in the Mosaic tradition."⁴⁸ Indeed, in the Isa 56:1-8 unit Yahweh's Torah is explicitly, if emphatically, extended to foreigners and eunuchs who keep covenant with Yahweh:

³ Let not the foreigner say, Who has attached himself to the LORD, "The LORD will keep me apart from His people"; And let not the eunuch say, "I am a withered

47. For a comprehensive treatment of the related theme of the integration of non-Israelites into Yahweh worship in Deuteronomy, see Mark A. Awabdy, *Immigrants and Innovative Law: Deuteronomy's Theological and Social Vision for the גֵר* (FAT II 67; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

48. Marvin Sweeney, "The Book of Isaiah as Prophetic Torah," pages 13-27 in *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature* (FAT 45; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 27.

tree." ⁴ For thus said the LORD: "As for the eunuchs who keep My sabbaths, Who have chosen what I desire And hold fast to My covenant -- ⁵ I will give them, in My House And within My walls, A monument and a name Better than sons or daughters. I will give them an everlasting name Which shall not perish. ⁶ As for the foreigners Who attach themselves to the LORD, To minister to Him, And to love the name of the LORD, To be His servants -- All who keep the sabbath and do not profane it, And who hold fast to My covenant -- ⁷ I will bring them to My sacred mount And let them rejoice in My house of prayer. Their burnt offerings and sacrifices Shall be welcome on My altar; For My House shall be called A house of prayer for all peoples (Isa 56:3-7 JPS Tanak).

An intertextual relationship exists between Isa 56:1-8 and Isa 2:2-4 (cf. Mic 4:1-5) which affirms (2:3): "And many peoples will go and say: 'Come, let us go up to the mountain of Yahweh, to the house of the God of Jacob; that he may instruct us in his ways, and that we may walk in his paths.' For instruction [תּוֹרָה] will go out from Zion, the word of Yahweh from Jerusalem" (translation ours).⁴⁹ Brevard Childs suggests "The promise of universal acceptance into the worshipping community is set by God's bringing them to his 'holy mountain' (v.7), which is an intertextual play on the promise of the assembly of the nations in Isa. 2:1ff."⁵⁰ Claus Westermann further connects the "foreigners," or "aliens," of 56:3-7 with those in 14:1: "'aliens will join to them', a verse which may have roughly the same date as Trito-Isaiah."⁵¹

Isaiah 56:1-8 should also be read in relation to Isaiah 40-55. A number of scholars have demonstrated the linguistic interconnection between Second Isaiah (chs.40-55) and Third Isaiah (chs.56-66), and their findings are beneficial regardless of one's stance on Isaiah authorship

49. Cf. H. G. M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 148.

50. Brevard Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 458.

51. Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66* (OTL; Trans. by David M. G. Stalker; Great Britain: SCM, 1969), 312. However, against Westermann's view, Isa 14:1 uses the term גֵר "immigrant," whereas Isa 56:3-7 uses the term כְּיִהְיֶה "foreigner."

and composition.⁵² Rolf Rendtorff's conclusion remains attractive: "Denn Kap. 56-66 sind so stark von den Beziehungen zu den beiden anderen Teilen bestimmt, daß eine selbständige Existenz dieses dritten Teils m.E. kaum vorstellbar ist."⁵³ The formula "thus says Yahweh" (יהוה יאמר), which some regard as a superscription to chs.56-66, is used repeatedly in Second Isaiah and "functions above all in a formal sense in 56:1 to establish a continuity with Second Isaiah rather than to signal a new beginning."⁵⁴ Isaiah 56 arguably continues, if not culminates with ch. 66, Yahweh's international mission in Second Isaiah advanced through the servant(s) of Yahweh. Yahweh's servant in Second Isaiah fulfills his mission as "a light to the nations" (לְאֹרֶת גּוֹיִם; 42:6; 49:6) by extending Yahweh's "deliverance to the remote regions of the earth" (יְשׁוּעַתִּי עַד לְגוֹיִם יוֹצִיא) and bringing "forth justice for the nations" (נִתְתִּי רוּחִי עֲלֵי מִשְׁפַּט; Isa 42:1; see also 9:7). Whether the preposition ל is adversative, "justice *against* the nations," or advantageous, "justice *for the benefit of* the nations," is an interpretive decision. Given the servant's role as "light to the nations" within the so-called second servant song, the nations should be understood here as the beneficiaries of the servant's execution of justice.⁵⁵ The nations who benefit, however, are not passive recipients of this blessing since "the coastlands will wait expectantly for his Torah" (וּלְתוֹרַתוֹ אֵיִים יִחִלּוּ); 42:4).

52. K. Elliger, *Die Einheit des Tritojesaja (Jesaja 56-66)* (BWANT 45; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1928); *ibid.*, *Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja* (BWANT 63; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933); H. Odeberg, *Trito-Isaiah (Isaiah 56-66): A Literary and Linguistic Analysis* (UUÅ 1; Uppsala; Lundequvist, 1931); A. Zillessen, "Tritojesaja' und Deuterojesaja: Eine literarkritische Untersuchung zu Jes 56-66," *ZAW* 26 (1906): 231-76; O.H. Steck, "Beobachtungen zu Jesaja 56-59," *BZ* 31 (1987): 228-46.

53. "For chs. 56-66 are so robustly determined by their relationships to the two other parts that it is hardly imaginable, in my opinion, that this third part ever had an independent existence" (translation ours): *Kanon und Theologie: Vorarbeiten zu einer Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 161.

54. Childs, *Isaiah*, 453.

55. Shawn W. Flynn, contends, "As we have noted, most scholars see this text as supporting the nations; yet it seems that we do not have enough clarification as to the degree of support, and whether those nations are equal to Israel. Thus, it is acceptable to conclude that this one servant song is ambiguous, but likely supports the nations in some way" ("A House of Prayer for All Peoples': The Unique Place of the Foreigner in the Temple Theology of Trito-Isaiah," *Theoforum* 37 [2006]: 5-24 at 20).

These international beneficiaries, these expectant ones, according to a synchronic reading of Isa 56:1-8 (especially v.6), are the new "servants of Yahweh," related to, or engendered by, Yahweh's servant in chs. 40-55. "The 'servants' can include foreigners and outcasts who line themselves with the *law of God* over against the rebels and sinners within and without Israel who continue to resist his will" (italics ours).⁵⁶ It should be mentioned that the nations, including the "foreigner" (יְהוֹנָכָר) class, in the book of Isaiah are portrayed as co-worshippers of Yahweh with Israel, but also as Israel's enemies, Yahweh's servants (e.g., Cyrus), and Israel's servants.⁵⁷ John Oswalt has argued that the framing of Isaiah 56-66 with 56:1-7 and 66:18-24 orients readers to view "the statements about submission of the nations to Zion (not only in chs. 60-62 but also in 45:14-17 and 49:22-26) as partial and not final. God wants the nations to come into his house (56:7) to worship him (66:23)..."⁵⁸ We conclude that the red thread that runs through Isa 2:2-4, 14:1-2, chs. 40-55, 56:1-8, and ch. 66, among other passages, is the conceptualization of the instruction and blessings of Torah, and its associated covenantal relationship between Yahweh and his people, a relationship now expressly extended to non-Israelites who keep Yahweh's covenant.⁵⁹

56. Childs, *Isaiah*, 458. So also Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 454.

57. See John N. Oswalt, "The Nations in Isaiah: Friend or Foe; Servant or Partner," *BBR* 16 (2006): 41-51.

58. Oswalt, "Nations in Isaiah," 50-51.

59. It is debatable whether the inclusion of covenant-keeping "foreigners" (יְהוֹנָכָר) and "eunuchs" (הַסְרִיסִים) in Isa 56:1-8 supplants Deut 23:2-9's prohibition of three classes of individuals from entering "the assembly of Yahweh" (קְהַל יְהוָה): one with crushed or severed genitals (דִּכָּא וּכְרוּת שִׁפְכָה; Deut 23:2), illegitimately born (מִמְזֵר; 23:3), and first through tenth generation Ammonites and Moabites (עַמּוֹנִי וּמוֹאָבִי; 23:4-7). Third generation Edomites (אֲדָמִי) and Egyptians (מִצְרִי) are curiously permitted to enter (23:8-9). Herbert Donner argues that Isa 56:1-7 intra-canonically abrogates Deut 23:2-9, and he suggests theological implications and post-exilic consequences ("Jesaja LVI 1-7: Ein Abrogationsfall Innerhalb Des Kanons – Implikationen und Konsequenzen," *Congress Volume: Salamanca* [ed. J. Emerton; VTSup 36; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985], 81-95).

Yahweh's Torah Prescribes Cultic Prerogatives

Yahweh's Torah in Isa 56, however, is not merely to be understood abstractly as a gift to the nations, but in relation to particular cultic and ethical prerogatives granted to Israelites and non-Israelites together.⁶⁰ These prerogatives were received or performed in the temple (vv.5-7), were to promote Torah ethics, doing "justice" (משפט) and "righteousness" (צדקה) (v.1), and were to be motivated by Yahweh's imminent salvation and revealed righteousness (כִּי-קְרוּבָה יְשׁוּעָתִי לְבוֹא וְצִדְקָתִי לְהַגְלוֹת). The term "Torah" (תורה) is absent from 56:1-12, but its lucidly alluded to in 56:2, "Happy is the one who does this, the one who holds fast to it: who keeps the Sabbath and does not profane it, and keeps his hand from doing any evil" (translation ours). Particularly, the two halves of the Decalogue appear to be in view: "keeps Sabbath and does not profane it" (שָׁמַר שַׁבָּת מִחֲלָלוֹ) is shorthand for words (commandments) one through four, relating to the divine-human relationship, and "keeps his hand from doing any evil" (שָׁמַר יָדוֹ מֵעֲשׂוֹת כְּלִי-רָע) is shorthand for words five through ten, relating to human-human relationships.

Additionally, Isa 56:2-7 reflects the influence of available and abiding Torah traditions that included non-Israelite in worship privileges.⁶¹ For instance, "joining" oneself to Yahweh as the foreigner may do (Isa 56:3), with its "separating" counterpart terminology, is not innovative language, but is rooted in "separation/distinction between clean and unclean" in Lev 20:22-26.⁶² In one sense, then, the formerly unclean foreigners have been transfigured into "the clean" if they "join themselves to Yahweh" (cf. unclean foreigners in Deut 14:21). Language of rejoicing while sacrificing (Isa 56:7) is likely rooted in Israelite cultic gatherings, as for example in Deut 12:5-7. The repetition of Sabbath observance in Isa 56:2, 4, 6 is the strongest link to enduring Torah traditions, reiterating the command to "keep Sabbath" (e.g., Exod 31:12-17; Lev 26:34-35, 42-46). If keeping Sabbath is the optimal concern of

60. Cf. Christopher Begg, "The Peoples and the Worship of Yahweh in the Book of Isaiah," in *Worship and the Hebrew Bible* (ed. M. Graham et al.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 54-55.

61. Roy D. Wells, Jr., "'Isaiah' as an Exponent of Torah: Isaiah 56.1-8" in *New Visions of Isaiah* (JSOTsup 214; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic), 140-55. Westermann believes Isa 56 and Second Isaiah are rooted in the prophetic tradition, not the exclusivist Priestly and legal tradition (*Isaiah 40-66*, 316). Wells, by showing Isaiah 56's dependence upon Israelite legal traditions, has, in our view, discredited Westermann's position.

62. Wells, Jr., "Exponent of Torah," 147.

Isa 56:1-8, then plausibly "The hallowing power of Sabbath observance breaks down proposed limitations of the worshipping community on mount Zion."⁶³

That Isa 56 granted non-Israelites cultic prerogatives in the Jerusalem temple, substantiated by these abiding Torah traditions, was unique among the post-exilic canonical literature.⁶⁴ Jeremiah and Ezekiel portray the foreigner as the one who defiles the Jerusalem temple with cultic distortions and syncretistic activities (cf. Jer 57:5-8; Ezek 44:7-9). Ezra and Nehemiah, moreover, are afraid "that the foreigner's presence in the community will lead to a dissolution of the community's heritage."⁶⁵ In contrast, the unique ideology of Isa 56:1-8 both reinforced the most important Torah traditions – which enforced just and right living and integrated non-Israelites and eunuchs in temple worship – and, as we contend in the next section, criticized Jewish leaders who neglected these Torah traditions in favor of other traditions that justified their preclusion and subjugation of the disadvantaged.

Distorted Use of Yahweh's Torah Necessitates Rebuke

Yahweh's Torah, now extended to non-Israelites to carry out its abiding ethical and cultic traditions, must be appropriated by members in the community without adulteration. Here we are indebted to Raymond De Hoop's persuasive argumentation that Isa 56:1-9 functions not merely as a comfort to ostracized members in the postexilic worshipping community, such as foreigners and eunuchs, but as a criticism to the religious authorities who failed in their responsibility to shepherd outcast worshippers by abandoning seminal Torah traditions and defining themselves as "holy" according to their preferred Torah traditions (56:8-12).⁶⁶ We enumerate here De Hoop's key premises.

It is difficult to reconcile a solely "comfort" reading of Isa 56:1-8(9) with its subsequent section, Isa 56:9–59:21, which is governed by "prophetic announcement of impending judgment."⁶⁷ This ostensible disjunction between Isa 56:1-8(9) and 56:9–59:21 has led literary critics to view 58:1-8 as a later addition that, by contrast, pronounces God's

63. Wells, Jr., "Exponent of Torah," 152.

64. Flynn, "House of Prayer," 5-24.

65. Flynn, "House of Prayer," 17.

66. "The Interpretation of Isa 56:1-9: Comfort or Criticism?" *JBL* (2008): 671-95.

67. De Hoop, "Comfort or Criticism," 672.

salvation and coming righteousness. De Hoop argues, contrarily, that Isa 56:1-8(9) is not an anomaly in its present literary context. He proposes that vv.8-9, traditionally broken down into 56:1-8 and 56:9-12, should be read as a Janus-text that closes vv.1-9 positively, and opens the negative toned unit of vv.10-12 which reads:

The watchmen are blind, all of them, they perceive nothing. They are all dumb dogs that cannot bark; They lie sprawling, they love to drowse. Moreover, the dogs are greedy; they never know satiety. As for the shepherds, they know not what it is to give heed. Everyone has turned his own way, every last one seeks his own advantage. "Come, I'll get some wine; let us swill liquor. And tomorrow will be just the same, or even much grander!" (Isa 56:10-12; JPS Tanak)

In v.8, then, Yahweh gathers the dispersed, and the animals in v.9 are welcomed to eat. Like the docile animals in Isaiah 11, their presence on the "mountain of Yahweh" is not threatening, but an eschatological picture of peace. However, it is precisely in Yahweh's shepherding activities that serves as a rebuke to Jewish leaders: "The function of good רעים ('shepherds') is to gather the dispersed, but now YHWH will do it himself, because the shepherds 'have turned their own way' (56:11; cf. 53:6). So it appears that Isa 56:8-9, on the one hand, forms the closure of the preceding verses but, on the other hand, opens the rebuke of the leaders in the following verses."⁶⁸ It is also likely that the imperatives to do justice and righteousness (vv.2, 4, 6), to observe Sabbath (vv.2, 4, 6), refrain from evil (v.2), choose what pleases God (v.4), and hold fast to Yahweh's covenant (vv.4, 6), may imply that some eunuchs and foreigners were observing these important ethical practices, but the Jewish leaders were not, such that "The answer to the complaints of the eunuch and the foreigner in this text is an implicit criticism of leaders who apparently follow certain laws of the Torah but neglect more important ones."⁶⁹

De Hoop further shows that the language and concepts of Isa 56:1-9 recur, often by contrast, in the subsequent sections, 56:10-57:13, 58:1-59:8, and 59:15-21. Those castigated in Isa 56:10-12 were syncretistic (56:11) leaders (רעים "shepherds" [56:11]), probably among the self-centered (57:10), wealthy Jerusalem upper class who exploited the

lower socio-economical classes (58:7, 10) and arrogantly abused their power (57:14; 58:6, 9). These Jerusalem leaders, apparently connected to the temple cult, self-righteously separated themselves, announcing, "Keep to yourself, do not approach me, for I am holier than you!..." (Isa 65:5, translation ours). But these cultic personnel were neither holy, nor righteous, by God's standards: "In 66:3 a clear juxtaposition of legitimate cultic behavior and sinful conduct is found, describing the behavior of those bringing offerings but simultaneously בחרו לא באשר, 'choosing what does not please me' (66:4; 65:12), which might be contrasted with the formulation in 56:4, באשר הפצתי בחרו 'who choose the things that please me.'"⁷⁰ The Jerusalem leaders precluded members of the cultic community on the basis of "those elements in the Torah that suited themselves,"⁷¹ elements which were authentic, but not core exhibitions of God's justice and righteousness.

Mark's temple cleansing account aligns ideologically with the socio-religious dynamics in Isaiah 56 in context. Mark portrays Jesus as definitive teacher of Torah with power (e.g. 1:21-22; 2:13; 4:1-2; 6:2, 6, 34; 8:31; 9:31; 10:1; 11:17; 12:35; 14:49), not unlike Matthew's portrait. But more specifically, Mark's Jesus understood Yahweh's Torah expressly in Isaian terms. By retaining the integral phrase πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, against Matthew and Luke, Mark's Jesus understood that Torah grants to Jews and non-Jews alike cultic prerogatives sanctioned by binding traditions rooted in just and right living. Conversely, those who endorse certain Torah traditions in order to secure their own cultic authority, while neglecting the very Torah traditions that promote God's core ethical values, teach instead the "commandments of humans" and breed "vain worshippers" (Isa 29:13; 46:12; 57:8). In the spirit of Isaiah, Jesus citing Isa 29:13 confronts such corrupt leadership in Mark 7:5-9 and by citing Isa 56:7 with Jer 7:11 confronts this again in Mark 11:17. Abiding cultic prerogatives foundational to Torah, including Sabbath observance, joyful sacrificing, living justly and righteously, and devoted prayer, were granted to "all nations," to covenant-keeping foreigners and eunuchs. But the decadent temple buyers-sellers and Jewish hierarchs behave as a "den of robbers" in the truest sense because they deny "the nations" these core Torah prerogatives that God had bestowed. Indeed, Jesus' temple teaching confronted the temple establishment as is clearly depicted through investigating honor-shame cultural codes.

68. De Hoop, "Comfort or Criticism," 678.

69. De Hoop, "Comfort or Criticism," 681-82.

70. De Hoop, "Comfort or Criticism," 686.

71. De Hoop, "Comfort or Criticism," 695.

4. SOCIAL-CULTURAL TEXTURE: HONOR AND SHAME IN JESUS' CONFRONTATION IN MARK

Jesus' radical actions in 11:15-16, his supplanting role as teacher in 11:17-18, and the abridged content of his teaching in 11:17, collaboratively function to shame the Jewish temple authorities. Mark's narrative description reflects honor-shame values in the first century Palestinian context.⁷² Jesus by his adverse actions in this pericope persistently challenges the acquired honor of the buyers and sellers (11:15-16). The episode, however, does not conclude with Jesus' actions in 11:16, but focuses upon Jesus' teachings in 11:17. Mark here uses the imperfect tense with a progressive, iterative sense "and he was teaching" (καὶ ἐδίδασκεν), and in so doing envisions Jesus' "didactic authority" over the temple audience, particularly the buyers and sellers (11:15-16), but also the chief priests and experts in the law (11:18).⁷³ The latter group immediately plotted to destroy Jesus on the basis of his actions and teaching, which suggests that Jesus' acquired honor with the crowds jeopardized their ascribed honor. It is curious that the chief priests and scribes, not explicitly the buyers and sellers, are the ones who offer such a riposte to Jesus' challenge. We must assume that the chief priests and scribes in some way authorized the actions of the buyers and sellers. The subsequent extended scenes of challenge and riposte in Mark 11-12 between Jesus and the temple authorities suggests the latter viewed themselves as "equal or almost equal in honor" to Jesus.⁷⁴

By assuming the role of authoritative teacher with power, Jesus challenges the acquired honor of the buyers and sellers and the chief priests and scribes.⁷⁵ The Greek constructions are highly rhetorical. Mark is the only Evangelist to retain the negative οὐ (cf. Matt 21:13; Luke 19:36) with the intensive perfect (also in Matt 21:13 and Luke 19:36) to express

72. See Halvor Moxnes, "Honor and Shame," *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (ed. R. Rohrbaugh; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 19-40.

73. Gundry describes the compiling of imperfective tense verbs describing Jesus' acting (not permitting) and teaching and saying (οὐκ ἤφιεν... ἐδίδασκεν...ἔλεγεν) as a "didactic authority" which Mark is stressing (*Mark*, 640).

74. Moxnes, "Honor and Shame," 20.

75. Gundry, *Mark*, 640-41. Gundry concludes that the main point of Mark is "the awe-inspiring power of Jesus' teaching, backed up as it is by his strong actions.... the power for which he will be crucified is a power that he exerts for the benefit of all the nations, Gentiles as well as Jews" (641).

the rhetorical question "Is it not written...?" (οὐ γέγραπται) which stressed the binding nature of Scripture. Since this rhetorical question expects a positive answer with οὐ, why would the Markan Jesus even ask it? It is forceful. To the audiences of Mark's Gospel, such a rhetorical question would have been seen as insulting to the buyers-sellers, chief priests and scribes. Whereas in 11:15-16 Jesus challenged them by his actions, now in 11:17 he challenged the integrity of the temple system of buying and selling as a misaligned from, or even a distortion of, Scripture, especially Isa 56:7. Similarly, earlier in Mark 7:6-7 Jesus had cited Isa 29:13 when confronting the Pharisees and the scribes because they adhered to "the commandments of humans" and their traditions rather than to "the commandment of God" (7:8-9). So, too in 11:17 while Jesus orally recited Jer 7:11 and Isa 56:7 to his auraliterate audience, he was also acting scriba-literately by authoritatively interpreting religious texts for the community; in this act he supplanted the chief priests and scribes in one of their defining socio-religious functions.⁷⁶ Jesus thus shames and supplants the chief priests and scribes not merely to win in a challenge-riposte situation, but in alignment with the Isaian vision, in order to symbolically clear out the "commercial activity and traffic" from the outer courtyard to create a space "for those for whom it had been intended."⁷⁷

In addition to Jesus' actions and manner of teaching, the very content of Jesus' temple discourse as summarized in 11:17 should also be understood within this honor-shame value system. He reaffirms that the temple, Yahweh's (or Jesus') house, was to be characterized as a place for all nationalities to come and pray (οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν) or where Jews, not least Jewish leadership, would pray for the benefit of non-Jews (cf. Gen 12:1-3). The buyers-sellers and the chief priests and scribes not only neglected this Isaian "pan-

76. Lucretia B. Yaghjian explains that scriba-literate reading was intended "for technical, professional, or religious purposes on behalf of a particular interpretive community or 'school'" ("Ancient Reading," *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* [ed. R. Rohrbaugh; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996], 209).

77. Incigneri corroborates his view by referencing two passages in Josephus' *Jewish War* (2.409-10; 6.124-26) that depict the Roman contempt for the Jewish practice, by rebels and customs, of excluding Gentiles from sacrificing and worshipping at the Jerusalem Temple. Mark, then, sides with the Roman disdain for these practices as God decrees through Jesus' Temple cleansing the Temple's destruction in AD 70 (*Gospel to the Romans*, 140-41). Against Incigneri's view, see, David Seeley, "Jesus' Temple Act," *CBQ* 55 (1993): 269.

ethnic” redemptive vision, but inverted the vision altogether by having made (πεποιήκατε) the temple into a “den full of robbers” (σπήλαιον ληστῶν). The intensive use of the perfect tense (“you have made”) conveys the ongoing adverse affects of the temple authorities’ actions, while the emphatic subject pronoun ὑμεῖς “you” and contrastive δέ underscore Jesus’ denunciation. Jesus’ verbal challenge was met with no verbal response, but only with plotting to destroy him due to the amazement from the crowds “at his teaching” (ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκίᾳ αὐτοῦ). Jesus won this contest in a show of no contest, gaining honor, whereas the defeated opponents experienced shame and damage to their standing in the community;⁷⁸ consequently, they resolved to destroy Jesus (11:18).

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS WITH SACRED TEXTURE

We have argued that Mark deliberately retained the modifying phrase πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν “for all nations” (11:17d) in Jesus’ teaching to identify him as the one who fulfills Yahweh’s international mission by confronting corrupt leadership and establishing justice for the nations. By *chiasmus* in 11:15-19, Jesus’ teaching in 11:17 is centralized, and by *chiasmus* within 11:17, πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν is centralized and contrasted with ὑμεῖς δὲ “But you....” In so doing, Mark’s account represents the buyers-sellers, chief priests, and scribes as hindering the God-fearing Gentiles from enjoying the very cultic prerogatives that Isaiah uniquely advocated (*contra* Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Ezra-Nehemiah). The buyers-sellers, chief priests, and scribes were acting collectively as a “people who honors me [Yahweh] with their lips, but their heart is far away from me,” that is, far from Yahweh’s original intention (Mark 7:6-7; cf. Isa 29:13; 46:12; 57:8). The cultic prerogatives that Yahweh intended “for all nations” included praying to Yahweh in the outer court of the temple and offering joyful sacrifices in the inner precincts as described in Isa 56:7.

Jesus symbolically acted and was teaching to affirm these prerogatives not because the Gentile God-fearers were superior to their Jewish counterparts, but because these Gentiles from among all nations belonged to those who had resolved “to join themselves to Yahweh, to minister to him, and to love the name of Yahweh, to be his servants” (Isa 56:6). And yet, Jesus’ teaching interwove Isa 56:7 with Jer 7:11, in order to restate Isaiah’s critique alongside Jeremiah’s indictment and prediction of the first temple’s destruction. In so doing, Jesus forecasts the impending and tragic divine judgment upon the second temple,

which Jesus explicitly describes in Mark 13. This judgment would occur because of the failure to carry forth Yahweh’s mission to the nations.

In reciting Isa 56:7, Jesus refers to the Temple (τὸ ἱερόν) metonymically as “my house” (ὁ οἶκος μου), which in Third Isaiah’s context referred to Yahweh’s house. Was Jesus intending more than a prophetic critique by teaching on Isa 56:7 and Jer 7:11? Why did religious authorities respond with plotting to destroy him (11:18)? What is Mark representing in his narrative about Jesus’ sacred identity? Throughout Mark’s narrative, Jesus’ statements and actions which assume divine prerogative were often recognized as such and resulted either in charges of blasphemy for claiming God’s status or immediate plotting to destroy Jesus, the punishment for such blasphemy. For example, Jesus forgives sins (2:5-7), but the scribes charge in 2:7: “He blasphemes! Who can forgive sins, except One, namely, God?!” (βλασφημεῖ τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός;). Jesus is “Lord of the Sabbath” (2:23-3:6) and “the Pharisees straightaway with the Herodians were giving counsel against him, how they would destroy him” (3:6). In Mark 14:61-64, when Jesus is asked by the high priest if he was the Messiah, Jesus indicated so (ἐγώ εἰμι “I am”) followed by a statement that combined Dan 7:13 and Ps 110:1. The response of the high priest was to tear his clothes and exclaim: “You have heard the blasphemy! What is clear to you?” Well, all of them condemned him to be worthy of death” (14:64).⁷⁹ Thus, in 11:17-18 Jesus’ claim over the temple (v.17) followed immediately by a response to destroy him (v.18) aligns well with the Markan portrayal of Jesus: Jesus not simply speaks on behalf of Yahweh, but provocatively assumes divine prerogative over temple functions in such a way that the “my” refers to himself. Indeed, Jesus’ actions at the temple “constitutes the most obvious act of messianic praxis within the gospel narratives.”⁸⁰ Moritz rightly understands Jesus’ triumphal entry in Mark 11:1-19 as Isaianic and “nothing less than God’s return to his people to sacrificially complete Israel’s failed mission on her behalf (10:45).”⁸¹ The implication of such a view is described by Stephen H. Smith:

79. We might also place 12:9-12 in this list, in which Jesus presumes himself to be the rejected stone that becomes the basis of a new temple; the religious authorities respond with wanting to arrest him.

80. Wright, *Jesus*, 490-93 at 490.

81. Moritz, “Mark,” 45.

78. cf. Moxnes, “Honor and Shame,” 21.

For Jesus to act as judge of his people would be to claim the divine prerogative more openly and more boldly than ever before, and of course, this is precisely what Mark intends to assert: for him Jesus is God, no less.... In all this, we can appreciate that the structure of Mark 11,12 [chs.11-12] reveals an image of a Jesus who assumes the rôle of God as both plaintiff and judge of his people—a symbolism which is ultimately deutero-Isaianic.⁸²

If Jesus was speaking self-referentially that the temple is “his” house, then Jesus is God in person, “the Lord suddenly come to His temple.”⁸³ Such a view reflects Mal 3:1b, implied by the quotation of Mal 3:1a in Mark 1:2 that frames the entire Gospel account. Jesus’ travel to the Jerusalem temple, then, fulfills how Mark began his gospel, in which Mal 3:1a is conjoined with Isa 40:3 and named together as a quotation from Isaiah. So, Mark 11:1-19 is a high point within Mark’s Gospel that affirms Jesus as the Lord coming to the temple to fulfill the Isaian vision to allow all nations to worship Yahweh, while simultaneously warning of judgment. As Mark’s Gospel continues, Jesus will present himself as a temple space erected after judgment occurs: “the stone rejected has become the capstone” (Mark 12:10; Ps 118:22). In this way, Mark’s Gospel shows how all nations will worship Yahweh in the sacred space that is Jesus the Messiah.

82. “Mark 11:1–12:40,” 122. He cites in support Isa 41:1-5, 21-29, 43:8-13, 44:6-8, and 45:18-25.

83. Perrin is correct to summarize two essential questions concerning Jesus’ temple actions and teaching: “Who legitimately speaks for the temple? What does it mean to be the temple? Jesus did as much to *show* his answers to both these questions as he did to speak them. In fact, it is no overstatement to say that both these questions drove all that he did” (*Jesus the Temple*, 112). But Perrin here leaves unexplained that Jesus’ showing entailed his divine prerogative concerning the temple’s purpose and practices.

DOI: 10.7252/JOURNAL.02.2014F.10

MY JOURNEY WITH INDUCTIVE BIBLE STUDY

David R. Bauer

It is both a pleasure and a privilege to contribute this autobiographical account of my experience with inductive Bible study. I hope this short description will illumine some of the facets of the history of the inductive Bible study movement and will provide insight into certain aspects of the inductive study of the Bible.

I consider myself fortunate to have been born into a devout Christian home. My mother's family had been active in the Free Methodist Church for several generations. And the local Free Methodist Church in which I was raised was a nurturing, caring congregation that sought to embody the gospel. The Scriptures played a central role in every aspect of the church's life and ministry, from children's Sunday School classes to midweek prayer meeting, to Sunday morning and evening services, to Bible quizzing where young people memorized whole books of the Bible. All preaching and teaching was centered on the Bible. I witnessed firsthand the power of God's Word to transform lives, to shape individuals into the kinds of people I respected and wished to emulate, and to create a community that had a kind of transcendent attractiveness. Of course the church was far from perfect. But quite early I discerned that these people had something special, that they exhibited a difference from most other people and groups I encountered. I had to think that this distinction was due to the influence of the Word of God.

I was especially enthralled by the power of the preached Word. One of my earliest memories is that of sitting in church, with my head resting on my father's chest, listening to the preaching of S. B. Sams and caught up in the sensation that what I was hearing were not just words, but rather that something was *happening*, that people were being changed deep within. I knew this powerful activity was occurring, because I recognized that it was occurring within me.

My early experience within the church taught me not only the power of the Bible and its message, but also the proper way to read the Bible, in other words, method. Now I remember no explicit instruction in Bible study method. But method was taught implicitly through practice.

In both preaching and teaching an attempt was made to treat individual books and passages, and to deal with them by careful attention to the wording and development of individual passages within the context of biblical books. Sunday School classes and midweek Bible study lessons were typically not topical, but focused upon biblical books. Even as a child I reflected on these practices and thereby came to develop a hermeneutic, although at that early stage of my life I would not have been able to articulate it.

I pause here just long enough to point out the tremendous, but often neglected, power of early experiences in the development of a love for the Bible, a sense of its power, and an internalization of the principles of its interpretation. Children are more observant and perceptive than we often realize. And at least in my experience I find that my childhood has profoundly affected the direction of my life and thought.

I realize now the indirect role of the inductive Bible study movement in my experience with the Bible in the local church. The Biblical Seminary in New York, which was the center of the inductive Bible study movement, had as early as the 1930s become the institution of preference for Free Methodist ministers who sought theological seminary education.¹ Although my pastors had not attended The Biblical Seminary, they did receive their training at Free Methodist colleges where graduates from The Biblical Seminary served.

When at the age of sixteen I came to believe that God was calling me to Christian ministry, I was convinced that my primary responsibility was to prepare as best as possible for competent and effective pastoral ministry. My theology of ministry, which was still developing and was certainly unarticulated, was bibliocentric; by that I mean that it seemed obvious and inarguable that the Bible must be at the center of all ministry, that ministry, and particularly pastoral ministry, was a ministry of the Word. It occurred to me, even at that young age, that the only thing that set the ministry apart from all other professions is the Word of God.

Therefore, as I thoroughly and prayerfully considered which Christian college to enter, I gave primary attention to the shape of biblical instruction as was presented in the various college catalogues. I was unimpressed with those programs that seemed to deal with the

1. This preference for The Biblical Seminary in New York for ministerial preparation within the Free Methodist Church continued until 1946, when the Free Methodist Church established the John Wesley Seminary Foundation at Asbury Theological Seminary. From that point many Free Methodists attended Asbury Seminary, where they had exposure to the inductive approach from professors such as George Allen Turner and Robert Traina, as discussed below.

Bible topically, offering such courses as “Love in the New Testament” (a course title I still remember after more than 40 years). I had come to believe that the Bible was not a flat book that existed to present broad ideas, but was rather a collection of originally independent books, each of which having its own message to present, bound together into a canonical whole.

Thus, I was drawn to the biblical curriculum at Spring Arbor College (now Spring Arbor University), which offered a book-oriented approach. The catalogue presented courses centered on individual biblical books, or collections of books (e.g., the Pauline epistles), and described these courses as focusing upon the study of the biblical text itself so as to grasp the message of these books.

When I matriculated at Spring Arbor, I realized that its biblical curriculum was the brainchild of Dr. W. Ralph Thompson, the primary professor in biblical studies. Dr. Thompson was a graduate of The Biblical Seminary in New York, where he had studied under Professor Robert Traina, among others. He had also taken classes under Dr. Howard Tillman Kuist at Winona Lake School of Theology, in Winona Lake, Indiana, where Kuist had sometimes taught summer-school classes during his tenure at Princeton Theological Seminary. Thompson revered Kuist as a Christian gentleman and a teacher. Thompson loved to tell the story of his experience in Kuist’s class on Jeremiah. It seems that at the end of one day of instruction, the students were so overwhelmed by the power of the message of Jeremiah that all of them were unable to move from their seats for a half hour after the class ended.

But Thompson was clearly more influenced by Traina, especially in terms of method. Thompson would describe Traina’s rigorous academic standards. Thompson, who was himself a highly accomplished scholar who held several graduate degrees, confessed that he was never so stretched academically as he had been in Traina’s classes. Indeed, I was first introduced to Traina’s *Methodical Bible Study* in Thompson’s upper-level classes.²

Yet, Thompson understood that he was teaching undergraduate students. His classes were challenging, but did not approach the level of rigor that I was to experience when I myself studied under Traina at Asbury Seminary. Although Thompson would present his understanding of the breakdown and dynamic movements of the biblical book we were studying, to the best of my memory he never required us to do anything

like a structural analysis of a biblical book for ourselves. Indeed, I believe we were never assigned the structural analysis of a passage. Assignments consisted of our answering questions posed by Thompson (he would write them on the board at the beginning of a class session), with the firm insistence that we were to answer these questions of the basis of our own study of the text, without consulting commentaries, although he would occasionally direct us to articles in Bible dictionaries or the like for historical background. I can still recall how difficult it was for me as an eighteen-year old college freshman to derive interpretation from the direct study of the text, without the help of commentaries. I remember at times being sorely tempted as I studied late into the night at the library to pull down a commentary just to get me started or to provide some guidance or confidence. I am happy to report that I never succumbed to such temptations.

To be fair, Thompson would often give us some direction in answering these interpretive questions. For example, sometimes the questions would include references to other passages in the book that might be especially helpful for the interpretation of our paragraph or verse. But for the most part, Thompson taught by modeling. In an interactive fashion constantly engaging the students, Thompson would demonstrate how the use of structure, immediate and broader-book context, as well as relevant scriptural and historical background, would provide the answers to the assigned questions. Thompson was a low-key, soft-spoken man; but his classes were electrifying in creating excitement over what we were discovering in the Bible.

Although Thompson never asked us to break down a passage into its units and sub-units or to identify “structural relationships” such as contrast or causation, by the time I was a senior, having taken several classes under Thompson, I was thinking structurally. I was using contrasts and causal connections and movements from general to particulars to interpret passages. Thompson employed a largely indirect method for teaching method. And in my case at least it succeeded.

I later came to realize that in employing his own interpretive questions as the substance of assignments, Thompson was following the typical practice of most professors at The Biblical Seminary. Robert Traina was unusual, and indeed unique, among the faculty at that institution in requiring students to analyze the text for themselves with a view toward generating their own questions. Thompson’s questions arose out of his own study of the text and thus represented his own observations and interpretations. I later realized that this process necessarily involved an implicit deductive element: Our conclusions were influenced and

2. Robert A. Traina, *Methodical Bible Study: A New Approach to Hermeneutics* (New York: Ganis & Harris, 1952).

perhaps sometimes directed by the questions that were assigned or by the way in which those questions were framed. Yet I still consider this approach—I'll call it the "indirect" approach—to teaching the inductive interpretive method highly effective at the undergraduate level.

I arrived as a student at Asbury Theological Seminary fully anticipating a vocation in pastoral ministry. But being all the more confident in the centrality of the Bible for ministry, and now enthusiastic for its interpretation thanks to the stimulation of W. Ralph Thompson, I decided to focus on biblical studies. I had taken essentially a minor in New Testament Greek at Spring Arbor (taught also by W. Ralph Thompson) and was anxious to make use of the biblical languages to a degree that was not expected in most Bible classes at Spring Arbor. I was thus inclined toward "exegesis" classes; and in fact, I did find the exegesis classes at Asbury to be engaging and instructive.

But W. Ralph Thompson had made me excited about sitting under Dr. Traina; and I anticipated doing so, even though as an undergraduate I had found *Methodical Bible Study* to be a bit dry and pedantic. My enthusiasm was also somewhat dampened by the fact that the inductive Bible study classes Dr. Traina taught were named "English Bible" courses; I wanted to work seriously with the original languages.

My first class with Dr. Traina was the Pentateuch. (Because of my extensive work with W. Ralph Thompson Dr. Traina allowed me to waive the class on Mark's Gospel, which was the first-level inductive Bible study class, and to take a course that was considered upper-level; I later took Mark with Dr. Traina.) I was utterly amazed. I had never experienced such exceptional teaching. Every aspect of the course—both inside and outside the classroom—was meticulously planned, one might say almost choreographed. And yet the class felt free and fresh; Dr. Traina had built spontaneity into it. Dr. Traina's classroom presence was daunting; and yet he exuded a humility before the biblical text and a reverence for the Bible and a profound love of God. His demands were very high; and yet he was sensitive to the level at which most students were working.

Dr. Traina's insights into the biblical text were nothing short of brilliant (and I use that word intentionally and advisedly); but he was careful to demonstrate exactly how he had reached his conclusions so that over time we would begin to think in the same way. I was mesmerized by just how articulate he was, choosing just the most precise, helpful, and clear terms, and explaining difficult concepts with a breathless simplicity. He was a master of the chalkboard (overhead projectors were just coming into use), working with it almost as an artist, but always in the service of communicating to visual learners. It became clear to me

the very first day that "English Bible" did not mean "dumbed down." Far from it. Indeed, Dr. Traina used Hebrew, and in New Testament courses Greek, with great facility; and he made it clear that he expected those of us with knowledge of the original languages to make use of them. And, incidentally, by connecting his classroom presentations with *Methodical Bible Study*, Dr. Traina demonstrated the helpfulness of that classic volume in inductive Bible study.

Four things especially stand out to me as significant "takeaways" from Dr. Traina's classes. First, Dr. Traina developed the connections between traditional inductive Bible study emphases, e.g., literary/structural analysis of whole books and individual passages, and mainstream exegesis, including critical methods such as form criticism and redaction criticism. He actually presented a holistic approach, according to which various standard exegetical practices and critical methods were included within a broad framework of inductive Bible study. Second, Dr. Traina emphasized the use of the Bible for theology. He was insightful in drawing out the theological message of individual passages and exploring how the theology of a passage or book contributed to the theology of the entire Bible. And in the process he related these biblical insights to the theological tradition of the Church. Dr. Traina knew the theologies of Barth or Brunner as well as those who taught systematic or historical theology. Third, Dr. Traina emphasized that the "supreme authority of the Bible," as he liked to call it, was not reducible to certain creedal statements, but must necessarily be expressed in practice. More specifically, he insisted that the chief challenge to the Bible's authority in the Church is our constant tendency to read our own ideas into the text, a practice made all the more insidious because we are typically unaware that we are doing so. Thus, a corollary of the authority of the Bible is an "inductive attitude," i.e., a commitment to identify our presuppositions and submit them to the evidence in and surrounding the biblical text, so that the message of the text itself, construed according to relevant evidence, becomes the final determination of our thinking, and especially of our theology. Traina insisted, too, that the inductive attitude must be expressed through an inductive process that is careful to identify evidence and draw conclusions from evidence in a fair, impartial, and accurate manner. And fourth, I learned from Dr. Traina the importance of inferential reasoning in the inductive process. Often he would lay out his own inductive logic: "Whereas..., and whereas..., therefore..." And he loved to involve students in the same process within class interaction and thereby to lead students to see that some of their interpretations derived from unexamined and questionable assumptions or from poor

logic in moving from evidence to inferences.

While a student at Asbury had the privilege of taking English Bible/inductive Bible study classes also from Dr. David Thompson. And I found that he brought his own impressive background and gifts, which complemented the teaching of Dr. Traina.

As I proceeded through the coursework of my Master of Divinity program at Asbury, I gained two clarifications regarding my ministerial calling. For one thing, I increasingly sensed that God was calling me to theological education rather than to pastoral ministry. I actually began to develop this sense as I was completing my undergraduate program at Spring Arbor. But the issue came to a head during my first year at Asbury Seminary. This shift of ministerial focus was difficult for me; for I loathed the prospect of forsaking pastoral ministry. In order to come to grips with this possible vocational shift, I took a year out of seminary to serve under pastoral appointment. During that year I made peace with the idea of serving as a professor in theological education.

Related to this sense of calling to theological education was a profound commitment to promote inductive Bible study in both the academy and in the Church. I actually considered this focus on the inductive approach to biblical study to be my more specific calling. I was impressed with its potential. At the same time, I was aware that it was not taught broadly, at least in the effective ways in which I had encountered it. Thus, I was convinced that the Church needed this type of instruction. And I believed that the Lord had placed this passion within my heart.

In my final year as a student at Asbury Seminary, I served as a grading assistant for Dr. Traina, while also being a half-time teaching fellow in New Testament Greek. I was responsible for grading approximately half of all assignments in Dr. Traina's Mark classes. This experience increased my understanding of inductive Bible study and provided significant insight into the teaching of this subject.

At about this time the seminary was attempting to find a successor to Dr. George Allen Turner, who had taught English Bible/inductive Bible study at Asbury since 1945. Dr. Turner was a graduate of The Biblical Seminary in New York, where he had studied under Wilbert Webster White and Howard Tillman Kuist, and had earned his Ph.D. in biblical studies from Harvard University.³ He had played a critical role in establishing inductive Bible study as central to the

3. Dr. Turner related to me that he heard Dr. W. W. White deliver a series of lectures at Greenville College while Turner was a student at Greenville, and White encouraged him to apply to The Biblical Seminary in New York.

biblical curriculum at Asbury Seminary. Because he had the reputation of being less methodologically rigorous than Dr. Traina, or at least less methodologically explicit, I never registered for one of his courses.⁴ Nevertheless, when the seminary was searching for a successor to Dr. Turner, I was told that, if I pursued my doctoral studies immediately, the seminary would not look aggressively for someone else. No promises were made, of course. But these conversations confirmed my sense of calling to theological education and specifically to the teaching of inductive biblical study.

After teaching part-time for a year at Ashland Theological Seminary, including an inductive biblical studies class on the Gospel of John, I matriculated as a Ph.D. student at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. I was attracted to Union Seminary in part because of its historic connection to inductive Bible study. Howard Tillman Kuist had been called to Union Seminary from the faculty of The Biblical Seminary in New York in 1938 (because of his broad reputation as a stellar teacher), and taught there until he accepted a professorship at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1943. And Donald G. Miller came from The Biblical Seminary to Union in 1943 in order to assume the position vacated by Dr. Kuist.⁵ So inductive Bible study had been taught at Union from 1938 until 1963, when Miller departed to become president of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary. Although inductive Bible study was no longer part of Union's curriculum, the seminary continued to bear the imprint of Kuist and Miller. Dr. James Luther Mays and Dr. Patrick D. Miller, both world-recognized professors of Old Testament, had been students of Donald G. Miller and were very much influenced by Miller's inductive approach.⁶ I could discern this influence through their emphasis upon the theological meaning of the final form of the text and their concern to interpret passages with special attention to the role these passages played within the biblical book and to the structural dynamics of the passages themselves.

I was also attracted to Union because of the work of Dr. Jack Dean Kingsbury, a New Testament professor at Union with a global reputation

4. An example of Dr. Turner's instruction can be found in his book, *Portals to Books of the Bible* (Wilmore, KY: Asbury Seminary Press, 1972).

5. I count myself fortunate to have known Dr. Donald Miller, since I have gained much insight from him about exegesis, hermeneutics, and theology, as well as the history of the inductive Bible study movement.

6. I know this is the case, because I have had extended conversations with both of them regarding the inductive Bible study movement.

as an authority on the synoptic Gospels. I became interested in studying under Kingsbury while studying at Asbury, when I had encountered Kingsbury's writings and found an immediate methodological affinity with him. Although not a product of the inductive Bible study movement, Dr. Kingsbury had, through a process of reflecting deeply on the interpretive demands of New Testament texts, arrived at a hermeneutic that was remarkably similar to the inductive approach. Later, after reading *Methodical Bible Study*, Kingsbury would describe Traina as one of the most brilliant exegetical thinkers he had encountered.

Dr. Kingsbury had written briefly on the structure of Matthew's Gospel,⁷ and persuaded me to center my dissertation on the structure of the Gospel of Matthew. In a truly inductive fashion, I tried to identify structural programs and categories other than those I had learned at Asbury for my examination of the structure of Matthew. I did not want simply and uncritically to adopt an understanding of structure that I had inherited. But I found no other treatment of structure that approached the hermeneutical integrity or the exegetical effectiveness of the structural analysis that belonged to inductive biblical study as I had learned it. I thus applied the structural insights of inductive Bible study to Matthew's Gospel. The dissertation was accepted with no substantial revisions required; and I later published a slightly modified version with Sheffield Academic Press under the title: *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: a Study in Literary Design*.⁸

As I was about to begin writing my dissertation, I was hired as Assistant Professor of Inductive Biblical Studies at Asbury Theological Seminary, over a year before I actually started to teach. I have served on the faculty of Asbury Seminary since 1984, teaching across the canon in both Old Testament and New Testament inductive Bible study classes. I have no words to describe the thrill of teaching the Scriptures by employing an approach that allows the Bible to speak on its own terms; nor are there words to express the pleasure of witnessing the enthusiasm of students who have discovered how this inductive approach can open up the Scriptures in new and tremendously exciting ways.

But beyond classroom instruction part of my sense of calling to inductive Bible study has been to help make the inductive approach known

7. Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975).

8. David R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplemental Series* 31, *Bible and Literature Series* 15 (Sheffield: Almond, 1988).

within the academic biblical guild. I hope that my dissertation and my other academic publications have assisted in the accomplishment of this goal. People often, and perhaps even typically, associate inductive Bible study with non-specialist lay reading of the Bible. They fail to realize that inductive Bible study emerged from the work of William Rainey Harper, a Yale Professor of Old Testament and the founding president of the University of Chicago and his associate and student Wilbert Webster White, a Yale-trained Semitist and Old Testament scholar, and the founder of a significant theological seminary, The Biblical Seminary in New York.⁹ Nor do they realize that inductive Bible study has been taught at such prestigious institutions as Princeton Theological Seminary, Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, and Fuller Theological Seminary. Inductive Bible study continues to have a significant contribution to make to the academy. And generations of students, both from Asbury and elsewhere, testify to its value in professional ministry, pointing to its importance in seminary curricula.

It was from a desire to promote inductive Bible study in the academy and the seminary classroom that I collaborated with Dr. Traina in the book, *Inductive Bible Study: A Comprehensive Guide to the Practice of Hermeneutics*.¹⁰ Dr. Traina had actually planned for years to produce a sequel to *Methodical Bible Study*, and graciously asked me to share the effort. In this book we related inductive Bible study to major current hermeneutical issues, which we presented especially in the first section, entitled "Theoretical Foundations." The remainder of the book develops these theoretical commitments through a recommended process of study, ranging from observation through interpretation to evaluation/appropriation and correlation. Dr. Traina and I incorporated insights into methodology that we gained from a combined sixty years of seminary classroom instruction and reflection on matters pertaining to hermeneutics.

The inauguration of this very publication, the *Journal of Inductive Biblical Study*, represents an additional attempt to demonstrate the

9. For the work of Wilbert Webster White (and William Rainey Harper) and the founding of The Biblical Seminary in New York see Charles R. Eberhardt, *The Bible in the Making of Ministers: The Scriptural Basis of Theological Education; The Lifework of Wilbert Webster White* (New York: Association Press, 1949); and David R. Bauer, "Inductive Bible Study: History, Character, and Prospects in a Global Environment," *The Asbury Journal* 68/1: 6-35.

10. David R. Bauer and Robert A. Traina, *Inductive Bible Study: A Comprehensive Guide to the Practice of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011).

contribution of the inductive approach to biblical scholarship. This journal was actually the brainchild of my colleague (and one of my most gifted former students), Dr. Fredrick Long, who graciously allowed me to serve as a founding co-editor.

In order to make inductive Bible study available to the broader Church, Dr. Traina and I developed a website that deals with various aspects of inductive Bible study. This website offers historical description, archival material, video and audio presentations from Dr. Traina (including complete class presentations, together with overheads, of every course Dr. Traina taught at Asbury), along with expository sermons. Plans exist to regularly upload inductive studies of biblical books, passages, and themes. This website has been adopted by the Seedbed Ministries of Asbury Theological Seminary and is available at www.inductivebiblestudy.seedbed.com.

It is my conviction that inductive Bible study has a most vital role to play in the Church, in ministerial preparation, and in the academy. It is therefore critically important for the practitioners of inductive Bible study to continue to think rigorously about the instruction, methodology, and hermeneutics that have been associated with the inductive approach and to do all necessary to ensure that the inductive approach has a significant place at the table of biblical scholarship. It is to fulfil this vision that I have given my professional life.

BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS IN AN AFRICAN CONTEXT

Alan John Meenan

If the key elements of biblical interpretation in general include the biblical text, the cultural context, and the act of appropriation through which they are linked, the interaction between them must be clearly defined. In a consideration of the African academy, as in many parts of the world, the setting is incredibly diverse and affected by numerous components. How an African reader moves between text and context is determined by a range of factors, including tribal biases, ideo-theological orientation, ecclesio-theological missionary heritage, engagement with territorial communities, accepted community mores and a wide variety of issues unique to Africa. In becoming cognizant of the complexity of approaches on the continent, I am convinced it is dubious at best to even speak of “an African context.” However, in this discussion, I want to explore African biblical hermeneutics within these particular parameters to which we have alluded.

If we are to define biblical hermeneutics as ‘methods of interpretation’ in the sense of devising ‘rules’ for a viable understanding of the biblical text there appears to be scant regard for a sound methodological approach in general. The term “hermeneutics,” particularly since Schleiermacher, seems to suggest a much broader sense of understanding as the fundamental philosophical and theological assumptions ‘behind’ different methods of interpretation. Taking such an approach to the discipline, it becomes possible to discern the complex elements that make up the African consciousness.

The biblical text ever remains the one constant factor in the discipline of hermeneutics. Yet the text does not exist in a vacuum, it speaks to a particular audience within a specific cultural context. In Africa, the problem arises in the dialogical approach between text and reader “where a comparative methodology facilitates a parallel interpretation” of certain biblical texts or motifs and supposed African parallels, “letting the two illuminate one another.” Knut Holter has rightly suggested that in African biblical hermeneutics the biblical text “is approached from a perspective where African comparative material

is the major dialogue partner and traditional exegetical methodology is subordinated to this perspective.”¹

Justin Ukpong, a Nigerian scholar, takes us a step further in his comments on the comparative approach. He indicates that the goal of comparative interpretation is “the actualisation of the theological meaning of the text in today’s context so as to forge integration between faith and life, and engender commitment to personal and societal transformation.”²

Because engagement between biblical text and African context is fundamental to African biblical scholarship, it is important to view the cultural landscape that is Africa. Gerald West has pointed out: “Interpreting the biblical text is never, in African biblical hermeneutics, an end in itself. Biblical interpretation is always about changing the African context. This is what links ordinary African biblical interpretation and African biblical scholarship, a common commitment to ‘read’ the Bible for personal and societal transformation.”³

The ideo-theological orientation of any particular interpreter has been radically affected by such factors as Africa’s socio-cultural context unheeded by the global West. As a result, biblical hermeneutics is understood within the African life experience invariably in contrast and even opposition to those forms of biblical interpretation inherited from the Christian missionary movement and Western academic biblical studies. As Ukpong states, “[t]he focus of [African] interpretation is on the theological meaning of the text within a contemporary context.”⁴

A similar emphasis can be perceived in the work of the South African biblical scholar Itumeleng Mosala, who suggests the starting point for biblical hermeneutics in Africa can only be seen in “the black

1. Knut Holter, *Old Testament Research for Africa: A Critical Analysis and Annotated Bibliography of African Old Testament Dissertations* (New York: Peter Lang, 2002), 88.

2. Justin S. Ukpong, “Developments in Biblical Interpretation in Africa: Historical and Hermeneutical Directions” in *The Bible in Africa: Transactions, Trends, and Trajectories* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000), 24.

3. Gerald O. West, “Biblical Hermeneutics in Africa,” a paper presented at the Ujamaa Centre (University of KwaZulu-Natal, 2008), 1-14 at 2; to be published in John Parratt, ed., *John: A Reader in African Theology* (rev. ed.; London: SPCK, forthcoming).

4. Justin S. Ukpong, “Rereading the Bible with African Eyes: Inculturation and Hermeneutics,” *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 19 (1995): 3-14 at 6.

struggle for liberation”⁵ with its emphasis on the economic and the political dimensions of African life. In this scenario, the Bible is a source of oppression and domination resulting in an intertwining of suspicion and trust in the ideo-theological orientation of liberation hermeneutics.

Within African scholarship, one sees a commitment to relate biblical scholarship to the realities of Africa, an oppositional stance towards the missionary-colonial enterprise which brought the Bible to Africa, a recognition that the Bible is an important text in the African context which must be engaged with and by critical scholarship, and a preference for socio-historical modes of analysis for both the biblical text and the African context. This reaction of the African academy to missionary-colonial imperialism does not appear to be particularly widespread beyond the academy and, for the most part, appears antithetical to the ordinary African believer and pastor who are gratefully cognizant of the work of European missionaries, in particular, who introduced them to Christianity’s book and taught them to read it.

While for some the Bible “will always be linked to and remembered for its role in facilitating European imperialism,”⁶ hopefully the recognition that the Bible is not a western book will ultimately provide grounds for opposing the present institutional need of reading the Bible for decolonization. Musa Dube has posed the question of “why the biblical text, its readers, and its institutions are instruments of imperialism”⁷ as the first part of the task of postcolonial hermeneutics. However, if that becomes the first question to ask in the task of the understanding the text, then engagement with this very inquiry will surely lead to the excesses of a hermeneutic bereft of objectivity – an essential objectivity that lies at the heart of the inductive methodological approach to biblical study.

It is necessary to point out that “the African context” is complicated further by the parceling up of territory by denominations often in conjunction with the colonial enterprise. The result has been lasting missionary ecclesio-theological memories that continue to affect African biblical hermeneutics to the present time. In his detailed study of the role of religion in the making of the Yoruba people of West Africa, J.D.Y. Peel reminds us of the enduring impact of the missionary endeavor

5. Itumeleng J. Mosala, *Biblical Hermeneutics and Black Theology in South Africa* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 67.

6. Musa W. Dube, *Postcolonial Feminism Interpretation of the Bible* (St. Louis: Chalice, 2000), 3.

7. *Ibid*, 6,

in African biblical interpretation, the clearest cases being those of the Catholic and the Evangelical missionary ecclesio-theological legacies and the more recent impact of the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements.⁸

The problem facing the church in Africa today is a distinct lack of ability to hear the text, first in its original Sitz im Leben, its own socio-historical context, and then second, in its consideration of the writer’s intent, and third, in its unbiased approach to the African context and, in a larger sphere, to the world. African scholars are often eclectic in their approach and the ideo-theological orientation of a particular biblical interpreter tends to define the focal point of analysis.

The idea that African interpreters often blur the original and present meaning of the text - what was meant with what is meant - may be indicative of a holistic worldview intrinsic to African thinking and symptomatic of Max Wertheimer’s understanding of Gestaltian theory: the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.⁹ As best I understand philosophical and psychological holism, there appears to be two divergent views: that of Wertheimer, on the one hand, and that of Kurt Koffka on the other. The latter insists that the Gestaltian approach might be better summed up in the statement the whole is *different* from the sum of its parts as opposed to the *summation* of the parts.¹⁰

When I speak of African holism, I want to make clear that I am taking my lead from Maurice Leenhardt, the French Protestant missionary who coined the term “cosmomorphism” to indicate the state of perfect symbiosis with the surrounding environment that he observed in the culture of the Melanesians of New Caledonia.¹¹ In a similar fashion Africans, when not infected by western ideas, have an innate propensity of seeing the world as an interactive whole with the parts contributing meaning to the greater entity. I would postulate that it is precisely this

8. J. D. Y. Peel, *Religious Encounter and the Making of the Yoruba* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000).

9. D. Brett King and Michael Wertheimer, *Max Wertheimer and Gestalt Theory* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2005).

10. Kurt Koffka, *Principles of Gestalt Psychology* (Fort Worth, Tex.: Harcourt Brace, 1935), 176.

11. Maurice Leenhardt, *Do Kamo. La Personne et Le Mythe Dans Le Monde Mélanésien* (La Montagne Sainte-Geneviève 6; Paris: Gallimard, 1947). Translated by Basia Miller Gulati, *Do Kamo: Person and Myth in the Melanesian World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979). For a helpful summary in broader anthropological context, see Malcomb R. Crick, “Anthropology of Knowledge,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 11 (1982): 287–313 at 302.

that awakes the African mind to the discipline of inductive biblical study (IBS).

Holism may be disadvantageous to the African biblical scholar who insists on biblical comprehension within an ideo-theological orientation. But within the methodological approach of IBS, the holistic philosophy intrinsic to the African mind can have distinct advantages. Holism asserts that systems should be viewed as wholes not collection of parts. Indeed one could reasonably argue philosophically that any doctrine that emphasizes the priority of a whole over its parts is holism. This holistic emphasis ought not to be mistaken for reductionism (that a system is nothing more than the sum of its parts) nor deny the usefulness of divisions between the function of separate parts and the workings of the 'whole.'

Understood in this way, one can recognize the ready grasp of IBS methodology by the African mind. As such, it is imperative that the discipline of inductive study be vigorously promoted in Africa to combat the ideo-theological tendencies of the African academy, but also the uncritical embrace of the populist western preacher-propagandist all too easily accessed through the medium of television and internet – a topic for another paper.

The African church is humbly aware that the center of Christendom is moving to the global south and perceives its role in twenty-first Christianity to be of immense leadership significance. It is incumbent, therefore, that we in the global West make a huge investment in the future of the global church that latent apostasy be avoided and that God's Word will be more fully understood and communicated effectively.