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ABSTRACT

In talking about the relation between the OT and the NT, Catholic interpreters have in this century seen the OT in three basic ways:

a) as preparation for the NT

b) as a mine of evidence to prove the veracity of theological claims about Jesus

c) as the historical record of Israel's relationship with Yahweh, but with no attempt to show any relation to the NT

For the past two centuries, OT theology has been a predominantly Christian attempt to synthesize the accumulated insights of the OT; it may therefore form a mirror through which attitudes toward the relation of the Testaments can be seen. This is especially true within Catholicism, in which historical-critical methodology has been officially authorized for little more than 50 years.

Three 20th century Catholic OT theologians have been selected for study: one (Paul Heinisch) from the “pre-critical” period; the second (Paul van Imschoot) who wrote a decade before Vatican II; and the third (John L. McKenzie) from the post-Vatican II era. As well as mirroring attitudes, this study attempts to trace any development in thinking within these authors upon this issue.

It will be argued that Heinisch combined approaches (a) and (b) in his book; that van Imschoot used approach (b); and McKenzie is an example of approach (c).
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The starting point for this project was a simple one. Upon reading about the history of the “discipline” of OT theology within works of reference, OT theologies, and “histories of the discipline” themselves, the writer found one major tradition (Catholicism) to be rather under-represented in the discussion. This raised the question: if Catholic scholars had indeed been contributors to the tradition and some of the literature is clear in affirming this point, then why is the Catholic tradition comparatively neglected, when compared with other traditions in Europe and the USA? It seems that Catholic contributions to the OT theology debate are under-represented and deserve more attention. The reasons for this are legion, but here are those that appear to be the most important for the task at hand.

First, in this century, Catholicism as a tradition has entered not just the OT theology debate, but the world of biblical scholarship, which had begun in Catholic France in the late seventeenth century. The works of Richard Simon (1638-1712) and Jean Astruc (1684-1766) had been groundbreaking, but the biblical critical enterprise within Catholicism had been stymied in the late nineteenth century by a fear of rationalism. The development of biblical scholarship within Catholicism in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries is only now being studied, and much more needs to be done. To that end, examining the OT theology debate within Catholicism can form a window into a much larger phenomenon within biblical scholarship as a whole.

Second, the reactions of the scholarly guild toward Catholic attempts at OT theology have been mixed: some have been described as “scholastic” and too tied to the needs of dogmatics, while others have been characterised as “groundbreaking” and a “new departure” for the “discipline”. One question which may be asked is: how justified is this praise or criticism of Catholic attempts at writing OT theology? Another, more general, question is: how have Catholic biblical scholars seen the OT as Christian Scripture? The present work is an attempt to answer these questions.

To do so, a number of Catholic OT theologians have been selected, as representative of the changing tendencies. Our study will focus on Catholic writers,
for if the works of non-Catholics were to be held up as comparative material, the
task would be too big. The examination of these writers offers an intra-confessional
window into the phenomenon of Catholic biblical scholarship, and a series of
landmarks by which the development of Catholic biblical scholarship can be
determined. Our study will focus in particular upon the effect of church
pronouncements and instructions upon the Catholic scholarly community. Now that
more than two decades have passed since the last Catholic OT theology to be
considered here was written, we are now better able than before to evaluate their
place in the history of Catholic biblical scholarship, and to examine how each of
their works mirrored the development of biblical scholarship within Catholicism.

1.1 LITERATURE SURVEY

What follows in this section is a brief survey of the literature of the past forty years,
which focuses on the attention given to three Catholic authors: Paul Heinisch
(1878-1956), Paul van Imschoot (b. 1889), and John L. McKenzie (1910-1991).
The reason why these three scholars have been chosen are threefold.

First, while they are not the only Catholic OT theologies to be written,¹ they are
among the most accessible. Second, they mirror the hermeneutical shifts in this
century within Catholicism. Heinisch’s book was published (in German) in 1940:
three years before the historical-critical method was authorised for Catholic scholars
by Pius XII’s encyclical Divino Afflante Spiritu (30 September 1943). Van
Imschoot’s (incomplete) two-volume work was written (in French) in the fifties:
this was a period of caution and consolidation within Catholic biblical study, but a
time when suspicion of the historical-critical method was present in both Rome and
in the USA. John McKenzie’s work was published in 1974, by which time Vatican
II’s Constitution on Divine Revelation, Dei Verbum (18 November 1965), had
officially cleared the air of suspicion and encouraged Catholic biblical scholarship in
the methods that Pius XII had authorised. By that time (1974) a new generation of
Catholic scholars had been trained in the historical-critical method. Third, these
three scholars show enough diversity of method amongst themselves to show how
this discipline has grown and matured within Catholicism.

¹ These three scholars are not the only Catholics to attempt writing an OT theology this
century; others include Michael Hetzenauer (Theologia Biblica sive Scientia Historiae et Religionis
utriusque Testamenti Catholica. Tomus I, Vetus Testamentum, Fribourg im Briesgau: Herder
1908; Franciscus Ceuppens, Theologica Biblica, I, De Uno Deo, Rome: Marietti 1948. More
recent examples would include Maximiliano García Cordero, Teología de la Biblia. 1: Antiquo
Testamento, Madrid: Católica 1970; and finally, that of Alfons Deissler, Die Grundbotschaft des
In surveying the literature, the following approaches were adopted. First, articles within standard works of reference were consulted (e.g. ABD, DBSup, DTC, IDB, IDBSup). Next, OT theologians themselves were consulted, and this was done in two ways. First, they were scrutinised to see what, if any, history of the discipline that their works contained. This is because in inaugurating a new method, it is usual to point out the shortcomings of the old. Second, they were scanned to ascertain what, if any, use they made of the works of our three Catholic scholars. Finally, the enquiry was broadened to histories of the discipline (Dentan; Harrington; Hayes; Ollenburger). However, detailed analysis of scholarly reactions to the works of our three Catholic OT theologians will be left until their respective chapters: any comment here will be confined to a few chosen examples, and general statements about the conclusions of the types of book consulted.

1.1.1 REFERENCE WORKS

This survey of “standard” reference works covers a wide theological spectrum, for two reasons. First, this is to avoid any possible bias within the survey (whether it be confessional, national, or theological), and second, to provide a large enough sample to give some significance to any observations made. A summary of the survey follows in tabular form; an analysis of the data (in terms of authorial comment) will conclude this section.
Figure 1. The citation of Catholic OT theologians within standard biblical/theological reference works.2

Of course, not all of these works could have been expected to note the works of Heinisch, van Imschoot and McKenzie; for example, only the final six were published after McKenzie’s work had appeared. Of the twelve Catholic publications

---

listed, for example, not one lists all three theologians; this is despite the fact that one of them wrote the relevant article in NJBC. The listed works will be examined chronologically, to see if there are any commonalities in approach or critique.

Prior to 1960 (within Catholicism at least) was the era of the encyclopaedia, and many of these Catholic works were French productions. However, there seems to be little perceived need for a treatment of OT theology within these works. But the 1960s witnessed a boom in the number of biblical and/or theological reference materials being published; ironically the publication of the second volume of von Rad's OT theology brought the publication of further OT theologies to a halt for a decade. Since the publications of this period came from much wider geographical and theological bases than previously, one might expect that the increased dissemination of critical work through summary articles within these books would have led to both a wider knowledge and appreciation of the contribution of the works of Heinisch and van Imschoot.

Examination of these reference works produced a mixture of results. As can be seen from the table, five of the works consulted made no mention of either scholar's work. This could be due to the fact that these works were primarily concerned with the explanation of biblical concepts, places, and people, and not much interested, therefore, in any discussion of overarching theological reflections that connected them.

Despite the plethora of reference works published in this period, the consensus among those which dealt with biblical and/or OT theology seemed to be a narrowly negative one: that Heinisch and van Imschoot had imposed the scholastic categories

---

3 The Catholic publications in the list are these: DTC; DBSup; NCCHS; EDC; DicE; JBC; DBTh; SM; VTB; EBT; 2DBTh; and NJBC.


5 Examples include Fulcran Vigouroux et al., (eds.) Dictionnaire de la Bible, Paris: 1891-1912 (with its Supplément); and A. Vacant & E. Mangenot (eds.) Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, Paris: Letouzey et Ané 1899-1950. There were also equivalents for liturgy and the spiritual life.
of dogmatic theology upon the OT, and had written works that reflected the concerns of dogmatic theology rather than those of the biblical witness.

Among those who were of this opinion was Otto Betz. He was one of the first to characterise, in what had then become a consensus, the works of both Heinisch and van Imschoot as informed by;

[the systematic approach [which] prevails in the Roman Catholic treatments of recent times]

What is meant by "systematic" here is the imposition of scholastic categories upon the biblical material, both as a way of ordering the material, and of demonstrating the consonance of Church doctrine with the analysis of the material so ordered. This was also the opinion of Alexa Suelzer, for whom van Imschoot's work "suggests the influence of an outline of Catholic dogma." Underlying this methodology was what Suelzer called "a view of biblical theology as a systematic account of specific religious ideas found in the OT." She continued:

So conceived, biblical theology becomes a neat, well-documented system, forced into thought patterns foreign to it.

While it may be true that some of the categories used by both Heinisch and van Imschoot were to be found in the neo-scholastic theology current in their time: it may be overstating the case to suggest that they all were. This issue will be discussed in depth in the following chapters; it is now time to see how the works of the following decade evaluated these works.

Alone among the works published in the 1970s in mentioning any Catholic contribution to OT theology was George Ladd's article in the revised ISBE. Like

---

7 Betz, 435.
8 Suelzer, 602.
9 Suelzer, 602.
the 1960s and 1970s, the period after 1980 saw few examples of authors acknowledging Catholic contributions to the discipline of OT theology. When they are acknowledged, it was in piecemeal fashion: one Catholic author is cited without reference to any of the others. The one author who mentioned the contributions of all three scholars to OT theology was Werner Lemke, in his article upon OT theology for the *Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Lemke gave an analysis of McKenzie's book which noted its essential dissimilarity to the other two Catholic authors under discussion:

McKenzie's work (1974) is the first by a Roman Catholic scholar to break with the traditional schema of dogmatic theology. Lemke argued that, insofar as McKenzie's book is a descriptive one, describing the historical matrix of and in the divine revelation to Israel, it eschewed the traditional Catholic dogmatic patterns of yore. This approach was characterised by Lemke as being of a similar type to the works of Claus Westermann and Walther Zimmerli, and therefore furnishing some evidence of the death of confessional biblical theology within Catholic circles.

This survey of the past fifty years of reference works has yielded some evidence of trends within scholarship. Firstly, we have seen that Catholic OT theologies have not featured prominently within surveys of biblical and/or OT theology. Secondly, the scholarly response to and critique of Catholic OT theologies has generally been distinguishing between the theology of the OT and the religion of Israel. These issues will be taken up in the next chapter.

---


13 Lemke, 460.

14 This approach is characterised as "descriptive" by Gerhard Hasel (*Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate,* Grand Rapids, MI. : Eerdmans 1972: 9-15). Briefly, this approach is less interested in the "now-meaning" of the OT as it is with the "then-meaning." This would appear to be borne out in John L. McKenzie (*A Theology of the Old Testament,* New York: Doubleday, 1974: 319) who wrote "as if the New Testament did not exist."

15 In an earlier article within the same encyclopaedia, Henning Graf Reventlow ("Theology (Biblical), History of," in David Noel Freedman (gen. ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary,* [6 vols.], New York: Doubleday, 1992., 6: 483-505; 491) also noted the dogmatic nature of both Heinisch's and van Imschoot's works. In the case of McKenzie, however, Reventlow noted the author's confessional allegiance; "One cannot help noting that McKenzie is a Roman Catholic scholar, and that consequently the varying organisations of the OT theologies described here apparently derive from different worldviews." Reventlow noted the centrality of cult within McKenzie's theology; the cult being the most frequent example of Israel's personal experience of Yahweh. This distinguished McKenzie from his Catholic predecessors; and gives added weight to my earlier point about the death of confessional OT theology: at least within Catholicism.
negative (at least, in the cases of Heinisch and van Imschoot). This critique has generally taken the view that these two OT theologies are methodologically flawed, in that the perceived imposition of the categories of scholastic theology has distorted the biblical material unduly, and not let it speak for itself. More positively, though, the work of John McKenzie has been noted as a breakthrough in Catholic OT theology, eschewing the dogmatic approach in favour of a more descriptive, conceptual method.\(^\text{16}\)

A few final thoughts. It may very well be the case that this genre of literature (works of reference) is not the best place to begin an investigation upon Catholic OT theology, given the paucity of reference to it within the literature surveyed, and also the brevity of their treatments of the work of many OT theologians. Perhaps a better place to begin would be the OT theologies written over the same period (including those of Heinisch, van Imschoot, and McKenzie). In these we may note the responses of the practitioners of the discipline to their Catholic counterparts.

### 1.1.2 OT THEOLOGIES

The OT theologies written in the same time frame as those of the three Catholic scholars under consideration (and some afterward) have been noted in the table below. Their appearance in this table does not necessarily mean that the author advanced a detailed critique of the work of the writer cited (it may well be that the Catholic author is cited as agreeing/disagreeing with something the named author wrote). The purpose of the table, first and foremost, is to point out what cognisance those writing in the genre of OT theology had of the work of Heinisch, van Imschoot, and McKenzie.

---

\(^{16}\) "Nearly all OT theologies today combine conceptual and systematic with historical and tradition-historical approaches to the subject. Some, like Vriezen, McKenzie, Clements, Childs, and Terrien, favour the conceptual approach" (Lemke, 468).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Heinisch</th>
<th>van Imschoot</th>
<th>McKenzie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinisch [ET]</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Imschoot</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965 [ET]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Rad [ET]</td>
<td>1957-60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob [ET]</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eichrodt [ET]</td>
<td>1961-67</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Vriezen [ET]</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deissler</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clements</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrien</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerli</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyrness</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westermann</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preuss</td>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childs</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendtorff</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. The citation of Heinisch, McKenzie, and van Imschoot within the works of some 20th-century OT theologians: in chronological order of publication.

In some ways, the period before 1970 represented this century’s golden era for OT theology, given that the two most influential OT theologies of the century (Eichrodt and von Rad) were published in this period. To some extent what came later was in reaction to these two works. As many of these works are still in German; the works noted here are, for the most part, translations, or were originally published in English.17

---

George Ernest Wright characterised Heinisch as one who followed the time-honoured schema of "God, Man, and Salvation", but excepting him (and Edmond Jacob), no works from the 1950s or 1960s mentioned either Heinisch or van Inschoot, with the exception of the English translation of Eichrodt; who noted van Inschoot's treatment of human morality in the initial framing of his own discussion of the matter. It took until the 1970s for any new OT theologies to be written in the wake of von Rad's books, and it was not until the work of Walter Kaiser in 1978 that Catholic OT theologies were again cited within their pages.

According to Kaiser, four types of approach have been used by OT theologians in structuring their works: the structural, diachronic, lexicographic, and biblical. The structural approach can be loosely described as the method informed by the

---

18 G. Ernest Wright (God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital, [SBT 8] London: SCM Press 1952: 36 n. 1) also added that Heinisch added chapters upon "the Kingdom, death, and evil." Edmond Jacob (Theology of the Old Testament, tr. A. W. Heathcote & P. J. Allcock, London: Hodder & Stoughton 1958: 25) agreed with this, saying; "On the Roman Catholic side, the Theology of Paul Heinisch is a clear and well-documented statement following the classical plan borrowed from dogmatics." He also mentioned van Inschoot as well; but just as an entry within a bibliography of general works upon OT theology (Jacob, 33).


21 In a 1981 article ("A Decade of Old Testament Theology: Retrospect and Prospect," ZAW 93 (1981) 165-183: 166) Gerhard Hasel noted the extraordinary number of OT theologies published in the 1970s: eleven in total. This, he wrote, was unheard of in the history of the discipline.

22 Walter C. Kaiser (Toward an Old Testament Theology, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan 1978: 9-10) wrote that Gerhard von Rad is the exemplar for Kaiser of the diachronic approach; the lexicographic approach mapped the influence of groups (e.g the sages) and their theological import (G. Kittel's TWNT was an example of this); and finally, the biblical thematic approach is exemplified for Kaiser by John Bright, The Kingdom of God [New York: Abingdon Press, 1953].
dictates of systematic theology; this is the category in which Kaiser placed van Imschoot.\textsuperscript{23} McKenzie is merely noted by Kaiser as an example of an American Catholic contribution to the discipline.\textsuperscript{24} Despite his criticism of the dogmatic categories employed by Heinisch and van Imschoot (along with Köhler and Otto Procksch), Samuel Terrien made the point that a didactic pattern underlies this structure.\textsuperscript{25} To round off the 1970s, William Dyrness mentioned McKenzie’s book, but only in the course of writing about creation, providence, and ethics; he makes no comment upon his method.\textsuperscript{26}

Following the flood of OT theologies produced during the 1970s, the period after 1980 has been relatively quiet by comparison.\textsuperscript{27} Of the works surveyed, only the two-volume work of the late German scholar Horst Dietrich Preuss made any mention of the three scholars in question.\textsuperscript{28} Perhaps this is because none of them had initially set out to provide a history of past works as a preface to their own efforts. Childs attempted this in a limited way, but his project is not strictly an OT theology. It could also be that as some of these writers (Childs and Rendtorff) were attempting to do something completely new and different, they were reacting to

\textsuperscript{23} ibid.


\textsuperscript{25} “Although many essays on biblical theology are still written in the traditional framework of doctrinal ideas, they usually assign a prominent place to the soteriological complex of cultic obedience and faith, even if they present a didactic pattern. See, among others, the works of L. Köhler (1936), P. Heinisch (1940), A. Gelin (1949), P. van Imschoot (1945), [sic] and O. Procksch (posthumously published in 1956). McKenzie was only mentioned by Terrien in respect of some of his journal articles, not his OT theology (Samuel L. Terrien, \textit{The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology}, San Francisco: Harper & Row 1978; 58 n.173).


what had gone before, and had no wish to chronicle it.

Unlike those works surveyed in the previous section, those who have written OT theologies of their own have been somewhat reticent about Catholic contributions to the discipline. It seems that a comment made in the concluding paragraph of the previous section may well apply here too: it may be that those OT theologians who were seeking new approaches to the discipline were little concerned with chronicling the past. So what responses there were in these books to the works of Heinisch, van Imschoot, and McKenzie were necessarily terse, stereotypical, and infrequent. The final part of our literature survey concerns the "histories of the discipline."

1.1.3 **HISTORIES OF BIBLICAL / OT THEOLOGY**

Having seen that biblical and/or theological reference books (as well as OT theologies themselves) have represented Catholic OT theology in a piecemeal fashion, we might expect that volumes more narrowly focused upon the history of the discipline will give a more detailed appraisal of the matter at hand. Being devoted to the task that this study is attempting, these works should put Heinisch, van Imschoot, and McKenzie into context, and offer insights into how these scholars fit into any of the major discourses within the discipline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Heinisch</th>
<th>van Imschoot</th>
<th>McKenzie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowley</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentan</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurin</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraus</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childs</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clements</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snart</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldingay</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reventlow</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasel</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogenhaven</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasel</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ollenburger</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdue</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knierim</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. The incidence of the above mentioned Catholic OT theologians within works devoted to the discipline of biblical / OT theology.

Of the three works mentioned as belonging to the pre-1970 period, the book with the most to say upon the matter at hand is that of Robert Dentan; neither Rowley nor Wright mentioned Catholic OT theologies in their treatments.²⁹

In speaking of Heinisch’s work, Dentan described it as illustrating the profound changes within Catholic biblical scholarship since Pius XII had issued his encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* (30 September, 1943). This foundational document in the history of Catholic biblical scholarship will be discussed much more fully in Chapter Three. It will suffice for the present to say that dogmatic concerns were of secondary importance within this document, which officially endorsed the use of the historical-critical method within Catholic biblical studies.³⁰


³⁰ Dentan (*Preface to Old Testament Theology*, (rev. ed), New York: Seabury Press 1963: 69) had this to say: “The great progress made in Roman Catholic biblical studies in recent times becomes startlingly evident when critical and exegetical views represented by this book are compared with those of Hetzenauer, a generation earlier. Except in certain crucial instances, Heinisch’s interpretation of Old Testament religion does not differ greatly from that of modern Protestant scholarship, if only he had written after 1943, when the encyclical *Divino afflante*
But Dentan went further, in connecting the publication of Heinisch’s book with the liturgical renewal movement within Catholicism, which had begun in Europe in the 1920s. In this way, Dentan’s book saw the works of Heinisch and van Imschoot as part of a larger context, one in which the emphases in Catholic biblical scholarship were changing, and that this change was part of a wider renewal movement within the Catholic world.

Books written in the 1970s, generally speaking, dealt more thoroughly with Catholic OT theologians than did those published earlier. In two particular cases, there is extensive analysis of the works of Heinisch and van Imschoot (Harrington and Laurin), in one case, a slight reference to Heinisch (Kraus), and finally, two books that did not mention Catholic OT theology at all (Clements and Smart).

David Hubbard (in an article within Laurin’s book) noted the similarity of approach in van Imschoot’s work to Köhler and Sellin (and the earlier Catholic commentator, Ceuppens) in that a structure akin to that of systematic theology was followed. A major difference between van Imschoot and his Protestant contemporaries,

spiritu removed most of the restrictions under which Roman Catholic scholars had suffered since the beginning of the century, the rapprochement would have been even clearer. These facts are important as indicating the irenic function which can be served by the scientific study of biblical theology.”

31 The book was published by the Liturgical Press, run by the Benedictine Order; an Order active in the renascent liturgical revival (Dentan, 75). Turning to van Imschoot, Dentan characterised this book as following the dictates of dogmatic theology, as the authors of summary articles in the section upon reference works had noted.


33 The article upon van Imschoot within Laurin’s book covered more than twenty pages; and contained a detailed examination of Heinisch’s work as well. The relationship between the two books is neatly set out by David Hubbard; “All in all van Imschoot’s approach to critical, historical, and introductory problems reveals the caution and balance characteristic of all his work. He goes off on almost no tangents and admirably resists the temptation to build his theological superstructure on shaky critical hypotheses. Still he is considerably more open to critical theories than is his fellow Catholic, Heinisch, whose work pays only modest attention to the studies of other scholars. Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the unity of Isaiah are implied by Heinisch, who develops his theology independent of the main lines of critical scholarship” (Hubbard, 199). These themes will be further developed in the next two chapters.

34 In a short note (Die Biblische Theologie: ihre Geschichte und Problematik, Neukirchen-Vleyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1970: 130 n. 19) Hans-Joachim Kraus alluded to a tendency for the teaching of the OT to be reinforced and brought to completion in the NT; here he used Heinisch as an example.
however, rested in van Imschoot’s use of the deutero-canonical books.35 Hubbard, finally, suggested that Heinisch may have provided a model for van Imschoot to follow as their structures are extremely similar (as will be seen later).36

Brevard Childs, in his controversial book *Biblical Theology in Crisis*, suggested that the “Biblical Theology movement” did not leave Catholic scholarship unaffected. It was, according to Childs, that the influences upon Catholic scholars (*Divino Afflante Spiritu* and translations of French-speaking scholarship; e.g Giblet, Gelin, and Guillet) 37 were different to those of American Protestant scholarship, which tended to look to Germany and Britain as major centres of theological learning. Having said that, Childs named no-one as an example of this analysis, so his comments here were general. 38

Wilfrid Harrington (a Catholic biblical scholar himself) presented a critique of both Heinisch and van Imschoot; McKenzie was considered in terms of his earlier works because his OT theology had yet to be published.39 Whilst noting the effect of *die religionsgeschichtliche Schule* upon Heinisch’s work (in his use of non-biblical parallels), Harrington noted what he saw as the lack of a clear understanding of God’s salvific work within Israel’s history, this being the effect of what he described as dogmatic rather than biblical categories being used to structure the work.40 Van Imschoot had argued that the explication of OT religion is the heart of any OT theology and that doing this in a synthetic, systematic manner is what distinguishes OT theology from a history of Israelite religion. As such order is not inherent in the OT itself, this provided a warrant for the systematic method of presenting OT theology; without doing violence to the texts.41 Ultimately,

55 Within the confines of the systematic schema, van Imschoot opted for a topical approach; in that he subdivided the systematic categories further, and wrote small articles upon each one, so that “were the articles in alphabetical rather than logical order, they would come close to comprising a dictionary of Old Testament themes” (Hubbard, 196).

36 Hubbard, 209.

37 None of these authors, however, wrote an OT theology.

38 “In spite of these common elements, there remained characteristic differences in the doing of Biblical Theology by Catholics. Much of the difference lay in the focus and stress that was placed upon the various Biblical themes rather than in specific interpretations” (Childs, 30-31).


40 Harrington thus concluded: “One might find here, too, a demonstration of the fact that the imposition of the scheme of dogmatic theology on the Old Testament material is not really the way to a satisfactory presentation of Old Testament theology” (Harrington, 81).

41 Harrington, 82.
however, this was its downfall (according to Harrington); the traditional tripartite structure blurred historical horizons, making it difficult to see the development of Israel’s faith.\(^{(42)}\)

The period after 1980 saw a number of “histories of the discipline” written,\(^{(43)}\) but the focus of interest in Catholic OT theology seemed to have shifted: attention is now directed to the newer work of John L. McKenzie, published in 1974.\(^{(44)}\) Generally speaking, McKenzie’s work is considered to have marked a paradigm-shift; the concerns of dogmatics were replaced with a focus upon Israel’s experience of Yahweh, as represented in her literature.

In his analysis of McKenzie, Henning Graf Reventlow described the methodological difference between him and his predecessors:

J. L. McKenzie, \textit{A Theology of the Old Testament}, London, 1974, chooses the ways in which Israel encountered Yahweh as the principle for his thematic arrangement (cf. 32f.).\(^{(45)}\)

The dogmatic schema is not totally absent though in McKenzie’s book, according to Reventlow, who saw McKenzie’s final chapter (which was upon eschatology) as a vestigial reminder of the older method.

In the book by John Hayes and the late Frederick Prussner, all of the three Catholic OT theologians thus far studied were included.\(^{(46)}\) While Heinisch is characterised by his dogmatic approach, he is here also commended for his use of non-biblical parallels; his acknowledgment of the evolution of biblical ideas; and for his use of

\(^{(42)}\) Harrington, 85.


\(^{(45)}\) Reventlow, 55.

“historical perspectives.” Van Imschoot is seen as “more open to critical positions” than Heinisch; but was seen as being perhaps a little too confident of the record of early Israelite traditions. These authors also note that McKenzie struck out on a new path: his theology (and the topics that it covered) would be controlled by the amount of space they occupied in the OT literature, the record of Israel’s dealings with Yahweh.

The “histories of the discipline” have had much more to say about Catholic OT theologies than the reference books surveyed in the previous section, as a cursory glance at Figure 3 would illustrate. There is virtual unanimity, generally speaking, regarding the methodology of the first two Catholic biblical scholars, Heinisch and van Imschoot. It is claimed that the time-honoured tripartite division of "God, Man, and Salvation" sufficed for these two scholars; their critics have time and again argued that this distorted the texts and their message. It is also worth noting that several Protestant theologians (viz. Baab, Köhler, and Sellin) had also used the same methodology at about the same time, and were similarly criticised. In this respect, the publication of John McKenzie’s OT theology in 1974 proved a watershed in the history of Catholic OT theology, for this was a book that dispensed with dogmatic categories. McKenzie’s approach was to examine the record of Israel’s dealings with Yahweh, using the biblical categories that took up the most space in that record. Critics generally responded warmly to the book; although at least one critic (Hasel) expressed unease at McKenzie’s avowed intention to write as if the NT did not exist. On balance, however, the “histories of the discipline” have provided us with a richer source of recognition for Catholic OT theology; their authors have noted in greater detail the progress of the “discipline” in Catholic circles, and in biblical scholarship generally.

1.2 GENERAL SUMMARY

At the beginning of this chapter, it was alleged that there was an under-representation of Catholic scholarship within the chronicles of OT theology. Having surveyed the literature upon this subject, we can now be more precise in our assessment of this claim.

---

47 Hayes & Prussner, 191. He is here wrongly identified as a Dutchman (Hayes & Prussner, 189).

48 Hayes & Prussner, 228.

49 Hayes & Prussner, 253.
In considering reference materials, there was a paucity of reference to Catholic OT theology, but as noted in the conclusion of that section, this is not, perhaps, the best place to start. Volumes such as these are compendious by the very nature and scope of the genre, and are designed to be all things to all people. It follows that articles within them are unlikely to treat such a topic as biblical/OT theology in sufficient depth so as to sustain such an enquiry as this one. That there were sufficient counter-examples to give some clues as to the appraisal of Catholic OT theology is an indication of the more specialised nature of some of these works.

Next, an attempt was made to discern the visibility of the three scholars within other works of OT theology. The results of this survey were similar to that of the survey of reference works: the nature of the works surveyed was not necessarily conducive to finding the type of material with which we are concerned. While the remarks made by the OT theologians generally accorded with that gleaned from the other surveys, it appears that the OT theologians themselves were more concerned with pushing forward the boundaries of the discipline than chronicling its history, however much they were reacting against what had preceded them.

The most fruitful genre of literature for this purpose has been (unsurprisingly!) the “histories of the discipline.” These have provided, in the main, a standard critique of both Heinisch and van Imschoot, characterising them as attached to a tripartite dogmatic schema which distorts the text, and as primarily concerned with the dictates of dogmatic theology. It was noted by Childs, however, that Heinisch and van Imschoot drank from different wells than their contemporaries (looking to French scholarship as a model, as opposed to the British or German models of their contemporaries). The publication of McKenzie’s work is considered to have marked a watershed in Catholic OT theology, eschewing the dogmatic patterns of yore. Critics wrote of its focus upon the record of Israel’s dealings with Yahweh, its themes dealt with according to the space they occupied in the record, and the assertion that it was written as if the NT did not exist. The “histories of the discipline” have thus afforded a more detailed look at the work of these three scholars, which, whilst stereotypical in places, nonetheless provide valuable clues as the status of Catholic OT theology within the guild.

In sum, it is not the case that Catholic contributions to the discipline of OT theology have been completely ignored. That this contribution has often been described stereotypically within the literature does not point to ignorance. The level of “neglect” with regard to Catholic scholarship, it may be suggested, is dependent upon the type of literature consulted.
In sum, it is not the case that Catholic contributions to the discipline of OT theology have been completely ignored. That this contribution has been described stereotypically in many cases within the literature does not point to ignorance of it. The level of ‘neglect’ with regard to Catholic scholarship, it may be suggested, is dependent upon the type of literature consulted.

1.3 AIMS OF THIS STUDY

Since the purpose of this introductory chapter has been to ascertain the level of visibility that Catholic OT theology has had within the guild, and thus provide a warrant for the research as a whole, it will be the task of the next three chapters to analyse and discuss the OT theologies of Heinisch, van Imschoot, and McKenzie in much greater detail. In order to examine each work as carefully as possible, the procedure to be adopted will be as follows.

Firstly, a chapter will be devoted to each scholar, including a brief biographical note. Secondly, an overview of ecclesiastical politics, church pronouncements, and theological currents within Catholic biblical scholarship will be included; this is to establish both a context in which to view each book, and to posit some reasons why they are methodologically different. Thirdly, a brief summary of each book’s content will be provided, to illuminate questions of method and focus. Fourthly, each book will be examined in terms of issues arising from within itself; examples would include the use of Scripture (particularly the NT), and the use of contemporary scholarship as well. Fifthly, comparisons between these Catholic scholars will be made, based upon these criteria. Sixthly and finally, an effort will be made to dialogue with the critics of these scholars: are all of the criticisms valid?

Underlying this whole effort, however, is the major leitmotif or question of this research: how did each of these Catholic biblical scholars see the OT as Christian Scripture? Is all of the Bible of equal value in constructing an OT theology, or should a theology of the OT only draw upon the OT as source material? Is there any development in thinking from one Catholic biblical scholar to the next?
TWO

PAUL HEINISCH: THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH

2.0 INTRODUCTION

While the major focus of this chapter is the OT theology written by Paul Heinisch in 1940 (ET 1955), his book is best read in the light of the environment that spawned it. It will presently be argued that Heinisch (and the other two OT theologians to be considered: Paul van Imschoot, and John L. McKenzie) wrote their OT theologies within widely differing Catholic theological contexts. Briefly, Heinisch wrote his book in a climate of fear and suspicion; the tools of the historical-critical method were then not officially approved for use by Catholic scholars, and a thoroughgoing neo-scholasticism was the standard of theological orthodoxy.\(^1\)

This initial statement needs some elaboration. The first part of this chapter, therefore, will attempt to sketch the major theological trends within Catholicism concerning Scripture, and how these shaped the writing of OT theology in this period. For critical biblical study within the Catholic Church has historically been conditioned by its views upon the inspiration of Scripture. How has what had historically been the Catholic Church's traditional position upon biblical inspiration, namely that God is the author of an inerrant Bible, been applied to the writing of OT theology? How are apparent inconsistencies to be explained without imputing error to God?

It is my contention that the work and example of pioneering liberal Catholic critics, such as Marie-Joseph Lagrange (1855-1938), was instrumental in finding a way of

\(^1\) In the Foreword to the first volume of his own OT theology, Paul van Imschoot spoke of the dearth of biblical theologies within Catholicism; "especially of the Old Testament." The examples he noted were primarily small books or monographs in reference works by French (Joseph Touzard, Jacques Guillet, Albert Gelin, Roland de Vaux) or German-speaking authors (Paul Heinisch and Michael Hetzenauer). But in terms of major studies, van Imschoot lamented that in the mid 1950s: "one can refer only to the outdated works of P. Scholz, Handbuch der Theologie des Alten Testamentes, 2 vols., 1861; H. Zschokke, Theologie der Propheten, 1877, and Der dogmatischethische Lehrgehalt der alttestamentlichen Weisheitbucher, Vienna, 1869; M. Hetzenauer, Theologia biblica sive scientia historiae et religionis urbisque Testamenti catholica, I, Vetus Testamentum, 1908 ... (Paul van Imschoot, The Theology of the Old Testament I: God, tr. K. Sullivan & F. Buck, New York: Desclee 1965 xi. [the original French work was published in 1954])."
reconciling the previously irreconcilable: namely the traditional affirmations about biblical inspiration, and the methods of modern critical scholarship. An examination of documents, papal and otherwise will follow, chronicling the changes as they occurred. We will see that the work of Heinisch marks the start of a movement, a movement towards a thoroughly historical treatment of Scripture.

2.1 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Within the history of Catholic biblical scholarship in the final decades of last century (and in the first half of this one) the major theological issue at stake was the authority of Scripture, more specifically its inspiration.2 The Catholic Church appeared unwilling to grant credence to any hypothesis that appeared to compromise the authority of Scripture: this was usually expressed in terms of the absolute inerrancy and infallibility of Scripture. Such compromises were seen to question the activity, authority, and authorship of the Holy Spirit, and the omniscience of God. This was allied to a deep suspicion of the methods and results of the “rationalist” Protestant Tübingen School.3 Any change to the doctrine of

2 Anthony Cotter (“The Antecedents of Providentissimus Deus”, CBQ 5 (1943) 117-124 [hereafter noted as Cotter]) described a series of attempts to further refine the doctrine of inspiration following Vatican I. Some of these are now briefly summarised: August Rohling (1839-1931) advanced a theory that inspiration was granted to matters pertaining to faith and morals (and their historical basis) (Cotter, 118-119.) François Lenormant (1837-1883) wrote that all Scripture is inspired: but only that pertaining to faith and morals constitutes revelation; so myth and legend can be accommodated. (Cotter, 119-120). J. H. Newman (1801-1890) classed historical narratives as inspired, and obiter dicta are excluded (e.g the greetings at the end of Paul’s letters); because “the Bible was not written for the sake of such trifles.” (Cotter, 120-121.) Cotter characterized these opinions (and several others, viz. di Bartolo, Semeria, Didiot, d’Hulst, Savi, and Loisy) under three categories: 1) not all in Scripture is inspired: therefore error is possible; 2) there are degrees of inspiration in Scripture; 3) revelation and inspiration are to be distinguished from each other; inspiration “not guaranteeing inerrancy.” (Cotter, 124.) Keith Stephenson (“Roma Catholic Biblical Scholarship: Its Ecclesiastical Context in the Past Hundred Years,” Encounter 33: 4 [Autumn 1972] 303-328: 307 n.18) makes the point that Cotter did not distinguish the above mentioned scholars from such “radical progressives” as Lagrange and von Hummelauer; and that this may have been influenced by the conservatism of the time in which he wrote (just before Divino Afflante Spiritu). I would agree with the second point, but not the first. In the first place, Leo approved of Lagrange’s efforts at the École Biblique (1890-) and his other critical work; secondly, Cotter’s purpose (as I read him) was to delineate the theological ferment into which Leo issued his encyclical; and thirdly, since the purpose of the article is not to compare these two “wings” of the debate, the absence of Lagrange and his contemporaries from its pages is readily explicable. For a much more exhaustive treatment of the personalities involved and their theories of inspiration, see the excellent book of James T. Eurtchael (Catholic Theories of Biblical Inspiration since 1810: A Review and Critique, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1969: esp. 164-229).

3 A brief but encyclopaedic synopsis of the European intellectual climate (as it applies to the subject at hand - the biological debate, for example, is absent) is to be found in Roger Aubert et al., (The Church in a Secularised Society, [The Christian Centuries - Louis J. Rogier et al. (eds.)] New York/ London: Paulist/ Darton, Longman & Todd 1978 5: 164-185.[hereafter cited as Aubert]; see also Jean Levine, The Bible, Word of God in Words of Men, London: Geoffrey
inspiration was problematic for many, since it often seemed to be associated with a rationalist denial of the supernatural order.

2.1.1 Leo XIII and Providentissimus Deus

The pope reigning at the beginning of this period, Leo XIII (reigned 1878-1903) issued an encyclical Providentissimus Deus (18 November, 1893) on the promotion of Scripture study. In it, he addressed the problems of inspiration and inerrancy. Leo reaffirmed the teaching of the Councils of Florence-Ferrara (1439-1442), Trent (1546-1563), and Vatican I (1869-1870), that the writing of the Scriptures was undertaken under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Leo's understanding of inspiration had its roots in the Thomistic doctrine regarding principal efficient causes. A principal efficient cause acts "in virtue of its own

Chapman 1961 1-39., [hereafter cited as Levine]. For a brief assessment and analysis of this challenge, see Robert Bruce Robinson, (Roman Catholic Exegesis since Divino Afflante Spiritu: Hermeneutical Implications, [SBLDS 111] Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982; 9ff. [hereafter cited as Robinson]). Briefly, Robinson argues that the narrowness of the neo-scholastic interpretation of Scripture did not insulate it from outside influences. Catholic interpreters, (and, indeed, the laity) in lands with a Protestant majority could not fail to notice the advances in archaeology and philology, or the "higher criticism" of F. C. Baur and David Strauss, or ignore the popularity of such works as Renan's Vie de Jesus (1863). It will be salutary to remember, though, that Catholicism was not the only faith community to be convulsed by issues of biblical authority at about the same time. Raymond Brown ("Rome and the freedom of Catholic Biblical Studies," in Jacob M. Myers, Search the Scriptures, [Gettysburg Theological Studies, III] Leiden: E. J. Brill 1969 129-150: 143-144) reminds us of the "furor in defense of the Erasmian textus receptus against the Westcott-Hort New Testament," and the Church of Scotland's proceedings against the biblical critics William Robertson Smith, Alexander Bruce, Marcus Dods, and George Adam Smith. American Protestantism was also starting to become increasingly agitated at the spectre of evolution. Upon the Church of Scotland, see the book of A. C. Cheyne, (The Transforming of the Kirk: Victorian Scotland's Religious Revolution, Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press 1988: esp. 199-204).

Ironically, it was the same pope who gave great impetus to the "Biblical movement" [Leo XIII] who instigated the revival of Thomism and neo-scholastic theology in the Catholic Church. His intentions were made clear in one of his first encyclicals as pope (Aeterni Patris [4 August 1879]) which dealt with the utility of the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas in binding together; "as it were, in one body the many and various parts of the heavenly doctrines, that each being allotted to its own proper place and derived from its own proper principles, the whole may join together in a complete union; in order, in fine, that all and each part may be strengthened by its own and the others' invincible arguments." (Leo XIII, Aeterni Patris, New York: Paulist Press 1951 par. 6: [8]). From this it is not difficult to understand the tendency of later theologians to adopt and defend this position; given the status accorded it by Leo. The background to the issue of this encyclical (moreover its outcome) may be found in Aubert (171-178).

Richard T. Murphy ("The Teachings of the Encyclical Providentissimus Deus," CBQ 5 [1943] 125-140; 129 n. 6) gave this source: Thomas Aquinas (Quodlibet Quodlibetales, VII, 14 ad 5um). James Forestell ("The Limits of Inerrancy," CBQ 20 [1958] 9-18: 10) recounted the classical definition found in the Summa Theologiae (III q. 62 art. 1). As Thomas did not write a
form" producing an effect. An instrumental cause acts because it is acted upon by a principal efficient cause; therefore, the effect reflects the action of the principal efficient cause as well, since it is its instrument. By analogy, the action of God (principal efficient cause) combined with that of the human authors (instrumental cause) produced the inspired Scriptures; this is Leo's position here.

The encyclical gave a cautious assent to the critical (in the modern sense of the word) works of such Catholic exegetes as the Austrian Franz von Hummelauer (1842-1914), the Belgian Albin van Hoonacker (1857-1933) and more especially the Frenchman Marie-Joseph Lagrange. However, Leo also condemned the errors of unnamed rationalists (among others, Loisy is in the background here) in their seeming denial of the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture. Despite these treatise specifically upon inspiration, his treatment of the prophetic charism has been invoked in this discussion.

6 Murphy, (129 n.7) gave the source: Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* (III, q. 62 art. 1).

7 For an exemplary article discussing the state of biblical scholarship before and after the issue of the encyclical (in the U.S), see Gerald P. Fogarty, ("American Catholic Biblical Scholarship: A Review," *TS* 50: 2 (June 1989) 219-243).

8 It may suffice for the present to say that Leo expressed his approval of Père Lagrange's work in a letter to him dated 17 September, 1892. Luis Alonso Schökel (Understanding Biblical Research, tr. P. J. McCord New York: Sheed & Ward 1963: 31-32) cited the letter in part: "If your plans and their realisation have earned the justifiable praise of all those who have a scholarly interest in these studies, then surely you should not fail to receive praise from Us, Who consider these studies to be of the utmost importance, to be furthered and encouraged on every occasion. Take courage, beloved son, in this noble and useful enterprise, difficult though it may be, and may all those who have joined you under our authority and with our approval take courage."

9 "It was against these three opinions [see note 2] that the encyclical came out, stating emphatically that inspiration may not be restricted to certain parts of Scripture, and that inspiration makes error metaphysically impossible; it also answered the arguments, one by one, by which the writers mentioned had tried to make their solution of the problem plausible; finally it pointed out the correct method by which Catholic scholars may meet the objections of higher critics." (Cotter, 124). Having spoken of the motives for studying the Scriptures, and having given a brief resume of Catholic exegetical history, Leo went on the attack against the rationalists. He proposed a plan of action within Catholic seminaries and religious institutes that would prepare Catholic clergy to enter the lists against such "true children and inheritors of the older heretics." Leo in *Providentissimus Deus* ([18 November, 1893] [hereafter cited as PD] II.c., in Cyril Gaul (ed.) *Rome and the Study of Scripture*, (7th rev. & enlarged ed.), St. Meinrad, IN: Abbey Press 1964: 1-29; 10 [hereafter cited as RSS]; also James J. Megivem, *Bible Interpretation*, (Official Catholic Teachings), Wilmington, NC: McGrath Publishing, 1978: 193-220; 202 [hereafter cited as OCT]) did not mince his words; the rationalists denied the doctrine of inspiration, and, while keeping their own counsel on such matters, "have rejected even the scraps and remnants of Christian belief which have been handed down to them." (PD, ibid.; RSS, ibid.; OCT, ibid). Leo continued, "They deny that there is any such thing as revelation or inspiration or Holy Scriptures at all; they see, instead, only the forgeries and falsehoods of men; they set down the Scripture narratives as stupid fables and lying stories: the prophecies and the oracles of God are to them either predictions made up after the event or forecasts formed by the light of nature; the miracles and the
criticisms, the general tone of the encyclical was positive. It outlined a positive programme of training in biblical science, both for students in seminaries, and those who were to be their teachers. The purpose of these programmes was to answer the rationalists, and to promote the appreciation and proper interpretation of Scripture among clerics.

2.1.2 Pius X and the "Modernists"

Within a few short years of Leo’s death, the interpretive crisis that had been emerging in the Church for twenty years or so finally exploded into prominence. The tendencies known as “Modernism” were ruthlessly attacked and suppressed by Leo’s successor, Pius X (reigned 1903-1914) by means of two documents from 1907; one from the Holy Office, Lamentabili sane exitu (3 July, 1907) and Pius’s own encyclical Pascendi dominici gregis (8 September, 1907).

Wonders of God’s power are not what they are said to be, but the startling effects of natural law, or else mere tricks and myths; and the apostolic Gospels and writings are not the work of the Apostles at all." (RSS, 10-11.; OCT, 202). Under the pretence of inventing a new science, these rationalists had the presumption to consider themselves theologians; and thus their pride disguised their motives. They attracted a following, disseminated their ideas through the print media and by lecturing, and “they pervert the credulous and unformed minds of the young to the contempt of Holy Scripture.” (RSS, 11; OCT, 203).

For a considered report upon the execution of this plan within the U.S; and taking into account the teachings of Pius X and Pius XI and the Codex Iuris Canonici (1917), see the two-part article of Edward Byrne ("The Curriculum of Scriptural Studies in our Seminaries," CBQ. 1 [1939] 214-222; 333-341). The bulk of Byrne’s papers involve the interpretation of a survey of American seminaries and their biblical teachers upon the amount of time spent in the study of Scripture; how best to incorporate this study into the seminary curriculum; and how to obey the relevant papal and canonical legislation. It would be interesting to compare this with the report by Eugene Maly et al. ("Methods of Teaching Sacred Scripture," CBQ 16 [1954] 46-51).

This programme was succinctly summarised in an Apostolic Letter written by his successor, Pius X (Quoniam in re biblica, [27 March, 1906] in RSS, 36-39) on the programme of Scripture studies in seminaries.

Among the propositions condemned therein are these; “Those who believe that God is really the author of Scripture display excessive simplicity or ignorance.” [n.9]; “The exegete, if he wishes to apply himself usefully to Biblical studies, must first of all put aside all preconceived opinions concerning the supernatural origin of the Sacred Scripture, and interpret it not otherwise than other merely human documents.” [n.12]; “The narrations of John are not properly history, but the mystical contemplation of the Gospel; the discourses contained in his Gospel are theological meditations, devoid of historical truth concerning the mystery of salvation.” [n.16]; “The dogmas which the Church gives out as revealed, are not truths which have fallen down from heaven, but are an interpretation of religious facts, which the human mind has acquired by laborious effort.”[n. 22]; “Opposition may and actually does exist between the facts which are narrated in Scripture and the dogmas of the Church which rest on them; so that the critic may reject as false facts which the Church holds as most certain.” [n.23] (OCT., 258-260).

The English text of this encyclical can be found in Vincent A. Yzermans (ed.), All Things in Christ: Encyclicals and Selected Writings of Saint Pius X, Westminster, MD: Newman Press
Modernism, if indeed any such phenomenon existed (given that it was defined by its opponents) could perhaps be characterized as a multi-national, multi-lingual attempt to establish a rapprochement between the Church and modern philosophy. It was international in scope, drawing upon people from England, Ireland, France, and Italy.\textsuperscript{14} One of the most influential of the “Modernist” movement was the Frenchman, Loisy.\textsuperscript{15} In dealing with what he saw as the “Modernist” danger in his \textit{Pascendi dominici gregis} (8 September, 1907), Pius amalgamated the work of a number of thinkers; perhaps none of the so-called “Modernists” held all of the views expressed in the encyclical, and no one is specifically named in it.

What of Scripture? With regard to critical method, Pius was scathing. He wrote that the “Modernists” applied a principle of \textit{vital evolution} to the Scriptures, engendered by the need to explain additions and interpolations. The subject of Scripture, Pius said of the “Modernists”, was not science and history, but faith and morals; science and history are therefore the vehicles for the expression of faith and morals. In denying this, and averring Leo's teaching on inspiration, Pius cited Augustine as support:

\begin{quote}
In an authority so high, admit but one officious lie, and there will not remain a single passage of those apparently difficult to practise or believe, which on the same most pernicious rule may not be explained as a lie uttered by the author wilfully and to serve a purpose ... [and] thus it will come about that everybody will believe what he likes or dislikes in them [the Scriptures].\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{14} The “movement” drew in men from France: Loisy, Blondel, and Laberthonnière; Italians such as Bonaiuti; Englishmen such as von Hügel; and Irishmen, such as Tyrrell.

\textsuperscript{15} Alfred Loisy (1857-1940) wrote a book \textit{[L'Evangile et L'Eglise]} against what he saw as the essentialist historical reductionism of Adolf von Harnack (as represented in his book \textit{Das Wesen des Christentums}). For von Harnack, there was no need for a church, because the interior apprehension of God by the soul was the essence of Christianity; a church then becomes an obstacle to and a deformation of genuine Christianity. Loisy defended the existence of the Church; but said that its present form was not instituted by Christ, or foreseen by him in this form. His thesis was that von Harnack's reductionism assumed an immutable principle within history, a pure, unchanging essence. Evolution and development within history (and tradition), to Loisy, were an essential part of its nature. (Robinson, 13-14.). The threat to Rome from Loisy was obvious; because he represented a \textit{via media} between a liberal Protestantism looking back to a church that once was, and a conservative Catholicism insisting upon continuity between the apostolic church and itself. Cardinal Richard of Paris sent the book to Rome, where it was later condemned. The seeds of Loisy's later excommunication were sown here.

\textsuperscript{16} Augustine, \textit{Epistola 28.}, (cited in \textit{ATC}, 115).
Finally, Pius also alluded to the Modernist denial of the defence of doctrine using Scripture; they characterized it, he said, as homiletical artifice.

Pius was of a different mettle than his predecessor, seeing a mortal danger to the faithful and acting decisively: many of the "Modernists" were excommunicated, and clerics were forced to assent to the prescribed orthodoxy, through signing the document and oath *Sacrorum antistatuum* (1 September, 1910). As if to underline the point, the Pontifical Biblical Commission (founded by Leo XIII in 1902) issued what could be construed as a rigidly anti-rationalist set of decrees (although these were often qualified) regarding the validity of critical hermeneutical conclusions concerning both Testaments. The decisions of the Pontifical Biblical Commission were not something to be lightly dismissed; those who disobeyed them did so at the risk of the stigma of "grave guilt."

---

17 René Latourelle (*Theology of Revelation* [8th printing], Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1987: 286) described the document in this way: "It [also] offers the precious advantage of being not only, like the Syllabus [of Errors], a condemnation of errors, or, like *Pascendi*, the exposition of a series of doctrinal deviations, but a reaffirmation of the Church's positive teaching. It constitutes directly a profession of the Catholic doctrines to which the Modernist heresies are opposed."

18 This was established by an Apostolic Letter (*Vigilantiae* [30 October, 1902]; *RSS*, 30-35; *OCT*, 221-227). After favourably commenting upon progress since *Providentissimus Deus*, Leo spoke of the need for such a Commission; "As the task now before Us of explaining these divine books and maintaining them intact is too difficult for our Catholic interpreters to acquit themselves well of, if left to their individual efforts, and because the work is so necessary on account of the manifold development of science and the appearance of such multitudinous error, it is deemed proper that a federation of energies should be made, and that assistance should be afforded under the auspices and direction of the Apostolic See." Then Leo gave it its task; "Hence this Commission will have as its task to regulate in a legitimate and suitable manner the principal questions which are pending between Catholic doctors in order to arrive at a conclusion. To settle them the assembly will lend sometimes the light of its judgment, sometimes the weight of its authority. Their investigations will also have a result of the greatest advantage, namely, that of furnishing to the Holy See an opportune occasion to declare what ought to be inviolably maintained by Catholics, what ought to be reserved for more profound research, and what ought to be left to the free judgment of each." (*OCT*, 222, 225).

19 There are two collections of these decrees (and other documents pertaining to the Catholic Church and the interpretation of Scripture) that are readily available in English; that of Cyril Gaul (*RSS*) and the collection of James Megivern (*OCT*). To be precise, the Commission in these decrees was answering questions that had been put to it by prelates and Scripture professors. It is undeniable that, from this distance, that the questions to be answered were cast in a negative way; and most often they were answered in that way. Here is a brief summary of the matters dealt with by the Commission in the years 1905-15. It needs to be noted that the Commission still occasionally issues statements (the last one was in 1993). Tacit quotations in Scripture [13 February, 1905]; historical narratives [23 June, 1905]; Pentateuchal authorship [27 June, 1906]; John's Gospel [29 May, 1907]; the book of Isaiah [28 June, 1908]; Genesis 1-3 [30 June, 1909]; the Psalms [1 May, 1910]; Matthew's Gospel [19 June, 1911]; the Gospels of Mark and Luke [26 June, 1912]; the Synoptic Problem [26 June, 1912]; Acts [12 June, 1913]; the Pastoral Epistles [12 June, 1913]; the Letter to the Hebrews [24 June, 1914]; and the Parousia [18 June, 1915].

20 Pius (in the motu proprio *Praestantia Sacrae Scripturae*, (18 November, 1907) *RSS*, 40-41:
In order to train exegetes and teachers, Pius X established the Pontifical Biblical Institute in 1909. In spite of the suspicion surrounding critical method, much valuable critical work was accomplished during the period between the promulgation of Providentissimus Deus and the outbreak of the Second World War.

2.1.3 Benedict XV and *Spiritus Paraclitus*

During this period, on 15 September, 1920, Benedict XV (reigned 1914-1922) issued an encyclical entitled *Spiritus Paraclitus*, to "promote among the children of the Church, and especially the clergy, assiduous and reverent study of the Bible." In the midst of pastoral exhortations and a summary of the legacy of Jerome, Benedict attacked what he saw as errors that had surfaced since Providentissimus Deus. These errors were then compared with the teachings of both Jerome and Leo XIII. These errors were concentrated into five major areas, each of which is represented by a heading in Benedict's encyclical: a) "plenary inspiration"; b) "plenary truth"; c) "historical truth in the Bible"; d) "tacit

---

21 This was established by the Apostolic Letter *Vinea electa* (7 May, 1909).

22 This encyclical, issued as it was on the sesquimillennial anniversary of the death of Jerome, gave a brief summary of Jerome's life, opinions, and legacy. Interspersed with this material was a critique of various theories of inspiration and inerrancy that had emerged between the reign of Leo XIII and his own.

23 Benedict XV, *Spiritus Paraclitus*, (15 September, 1920) 1; RSS, 43-78: 43.

24 Benedict's attitude to what to him represented modern critical method is perhaps best expressed in his own words: "We warmly commend, of course, those who, with the assistance of critical methods, seek to discover new ways of explaining the difficulties in Holy Scripture, whether for their own guidance or to help others. But we remind them that they will only come to miserable grief if they neglect our predecessor's injunctions and overstep the limits set by the Fathers." (RSS, 51; OCT, 275).

25 The error of distinguishing sacred and profane elements in the Bible (so as to assign inspiration only to the first; and relegate the rest to packaging) is condemned - as Leo averred that the whole of Scripture is inspired. History, according to some, had the same basis as the natural order - it was narrated as it appeared to the writer, using unspecified sources or general opinion. Leo had apparently sanctioned this view, saying that as natural phenomena were narrated as they appeared to the writer, in the thought forms and language of the writer's time; that this was also
quotations"; 27 and e) "modern views incompatible with tradition and with Christ’s method." 28 With regard to these areas, Benedict condemned a number of views as contravening what Leo had written in Providentissimus Deus, and what Jerome had taught.

It seems that Benedict was a more cautious man than his predecessor, affirming more strongly the role of tradition in critical work, but not showing the confidence of Leo XIII in the results of critical scholarship. It appears that he closed a "loophole" that Leo had left open regarding the analogy of natural phenomena and history as narrated by Scripture’s human authors. 29 Whatever his opinion of critical method, though, Benedict formally censured what we might call a "European spy ring that was only too ready to delate to Rome the name of anyone it suspected of harbouring progressive tendencies. 30

2.1.4 Pius XI

Benedict’s successor, Pius XI (reigned 1922-1939) did not write about the issues that we are concerned with here, although he was supportive of the Pontifical
Biblical Institute and enjoined the religious Orders to send their best men there.  
Raymond Brown noted that biblical scholars were in this period under the eye of 
the Holy Office;  
in these years, several books of biblical introduction were 
condemned. In the years immediately following the Modernist crisis, even 
Lagrange was censured (albeit indirectly); he abandoned Old Testament study, then 
New Testament studies, and he ended his life as an Oriental specialist. In sum, the 
years between 1910 and the outbreak of the Second World War were indeed dim 
for biblical scholarship; the atmosphere of suspicion was such that the principle 
"Catholics are not worth reading" became axiomatic. Raymond Brown goes 
further, however, noting that,"a whole generation was deprived of the privilege of 
independent scholarship."  

2.2  PAUL HEINISCH - A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Paul Heinisch's *Theology of the Old Testament*, originally published in 1940, is 
often cited as the first modern attempt at an OT theology to be written by a Catholic 
scholar, and is of interest for that reason. It is also of interest because, in a sense, 
subsequent OT theologies in the Catholic tradition are in its debt. Whether this is 
because these later theologies (of whom van Imschoot and McKenzie are the two 
best-known) have, in their own way, reacted to Heinisch's method and conclusions 
remains to be seen; this will be explored as our study progresses. Heinisch 
represented a theological mindset within Catholic biblical studies that has largely 
disappeared, and so his work is illustrative of how much Catholic biblical studies 

---

31  Pius XII noted (in *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, [30 September, 1943] [hereafter cited as DAS] 
in *RSS*, 80-111; 84-85 *OCT*, 316-342: 320) that his predecessor had written (in his motu 
proprio *Bibliorum scientam* [27 April, 1924]) on the requirement that seminary professors of 
Scripture have canonical degrees in Scripture (licentiates and/or doctorates) and encourage religious 
Orders to send their brightest men to the Pontifical Biblical Institute. 

32  Brown, 134. 

33  Stephenson, 317. 

34  Brown, 134. 

35  ibid. 

36  The title in the original German reads *Theologie des Alten Testamentes*, Bonn: Bonner Bibel 
1940. 

37  See John H. Hayes & Frederick C. Prussner (*Old Testament Theology - its history and 
development*, Atlanta: John Knox Press 1985: 189 [hereafter cited as Hayes]; also Wilfrid 
have changed since his time. This is not to say that everything he wrote is now superseded or is of merely historical interest, but that it must be seen as a product of its time.38

It was in the climate of suspicion in the wake of the “Modernist” controversy that Paul Heinisch lived much of his life. Heinisch was born at Leobschütz in Silesia (now part of modern Poland) on 25 March, 1878.39 He was educated at the University of Breslau, obtaining his doctoral degree there in 1908.40 He was appointed to the faculty there for three years on the basis of a book on the Greek philosophy inherent in the Book of Wisdom; he also taught at the University of Strassburg (1911-1918), but most of his teaching life was spent at the Catholic University of Nijmegen, in the Netherlands (1928-1945).

As a writer Heinisch was prolific; his publications included another book upon the book of Wisdom,41 several volumes in the Bonner Bibel series,42 and two

38 Heinisch was not, however, the first Catholic scholar in this century to attempt to write an OT theology. An earlier notable example was that of the Austrian, Michael Hetzenauer (1860-1928). His book (Theologia Biblica sive Scientia Historiae et Religionis utriusque Testamenti Catholica Tomus I: Vetus Testamentum, Freibourg im Breisgau, 1908) in the eyes of Hayes and Prussner, was written in part to counter the influence of liberal Catholic scholarship; as epitomised by Marie-Joseph Lagrange (Hayes, 190). To this end, Hetzenauer wrote his book along the lines of dicta probantia; using the OT to buttress a predetermined theological agenda - neo-scholastic orthodoxy. Hetzenauer's book was largely taken up with a history of humankind from Adam to Jesus. Harrington noted the influence on Hetzenauer of die religiögeschichtliche Schule. It is generally accepted today that there were "borrowings" by the writers of the book of Genesis from the Mesopotamian and Babylonian flood epics: the Gilgamesh and Enuma Exlish traditions. For Hetzenauer, this borrowing was in reverse; Babylon and Mesopotamia had borrowed the substance of their epics from the original, monotheistic form preserved by Hebrew tradition. (Hetzenauer, 49., cited by Harrington, 78). Perhaps unsurprisingly, then, the rest of Hetzenauer's book was concerned with the religion of the OT: theoretical truths regarding the nature of God, God's works, and the creation, redemption, and consummation of the world. With regard to ethics (or practical truths) Hetzenauer presented a brief excursus on the Decalogue. Interestingly, while Hetzenauer observed that the ceremonial and civil laws in the OT were more properly the province of biblical archaeology, he then said that the moral law was best dealt with by moral theologians. What were not stated were the criteria for determining which was which. In conclusion, the best that can be said of Hetzenauer's work by today's standards is that it was a product of a different time from our own; one where reputations were easily besmirched by the prevailing climate in the Catholic Church.

39 Therefore Dentan and Hayes erred in stating that Heinisch was Dutch (Dentan, 68; Hayes, 189).

40 His dissertation was entitled Der Einfluss Philos von Alexandrien auf die älteste christliche Exegese, Münster, 1908.

41 P. Heinisch, Das Buch der Weisheit, [Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament], Münster, 1912.

42 These included Das Buch Exodus (Bonn, 1934); Das Buch Genesis (Bonn, 1930); Das Buch Jeremia (n.p. n.d.); Das Buch Leviticus (n.p. n.d.); Das Buch Numeri (n.p n.d.); Das Buch der Weisheit (Münster 1912); Das Wort im A. T. und im Alten Orient (Münster 1922); Die personliche Weisheit des A. T. in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung (Münster 1923); Die
supplementary volumes in that series, the first being the subject of this chapter, and
the second being a history of the Old Testament. He also edited and contributed to
the periodical Biblische Zeitfragen. He died in Salzburg, Austria on 11 March,
1956.

2.3 HEINISCH'S BOOK: AN OVERVIEW

The issue of genre is critical in determining the type of audience for whom the book
was intended, the style in which it is written, and the tradition(s) upon which it
draws. For example, the OT theology of John McKenzie, which was written a
generation after Heinisch’s book was translated into English, differs markedly in
style (by being quite conversational in tone, and also in eschewing many scholarly
conventions), methodology (a topical approach rather than a systematic one), and
audience (interested non-experts as well as scholars). Yet both of these books claim
to be within the genre of OT theology. Heinisch’s book presumed a knowledge of
scholastic philosophy and theology, which suggests an intended audience of
seminarians and clergy.

Heinisch’s book was subdivided into five parts; “God”, “Creation”, “Human
Acts”, “Life after Death”, and “Redemption”. The question that came to mind upon
seeing the above divisions (certainly among Heinisch's critics) is the extent to
which post-biblical theological categories (the term most often used by his critics is
“scholastic”) are employed in Heinisch’s book. It is certainly true that within
Catholic seminaries, neo-scholastic philosophy and theology were the norm in this
period, due to Leo XIII’s directives in Aeterni Patris (4 August 1879).

It could be argued that the use of these categories within an OT theology reflect
post-biblical theological tradition, with a corresponding neglect of the historical
context of biblical revelation. Wilfrid Harrington, for example, argued that such a
view implied that God had not acted within Israel’s history, and that Israel’s
historical situation at any given time had no relevance to God's revelation to her.

---

43 P. Heinisch, Geschichte des Alten Testamentes, (1950); ET History of the Old Testament,

44 Edward Byrne, "The Curriculum of Scriptural Studies in our Seminaries," CBQ 1 (1939)
214-222; 333-341.

45 Apart from the use of scholastic categories in constructing his OT theology, Heinisch's
major weakness, according to Harrington, was his lack of awareness that God's revelation to Israel
One might conclude that Heinisch was primarily interested in doctrine, and in finding textual support for this doctrine within the OT. However, this conclusion would be a little simplistic, for two reasons. 46

First, given the context in which he wrote, it would have been very difficult for Heinisch to have written this book in any other way. Reading the OT in a thoroughly historical-critical fashion was simply not possible then, although it will be argued presently that historical-critical method was not foreign to Heinisch. Second, that Heinisch used the categories of post-biblical theological tradition to structure this book does not necessarily mean that doctrine was his primary interest. It will be argued in this chapter that Heinisch regarded both Testaments as equivalent sources for the writing of an OT theology; further, that this was a reasonable (but greatly qualified) assumption for those writing texts intended for the use of priests and seminarians. We now turn to an overview of Heinisch's book.

Part One of Heinisch's book dealt with "God". 47 He began by asserting that the source of OT theology is divine revelation, and that this revelation was accessible to "primitive men" by virtue of their reason. Coming to the aid of such people were the messengers of God: Abraham, Moses, and the prophets. Part Two of Heinisch's book began with a discussion of the spirit-world, starting with angels and proceeding to demonology. Next, he moved on to the visible realm, discussing creation in terms of both Israelite and Babylonian cosmology, divine act and teleology. He discussed world government, then finally, the creation of humanity. 48

Part Three of Heinisch's book dealt with ethics and morality, and is where (as we shall see) this work is particularly inclined to subject the OT witness to dogmatic categories. 49 Beginning with descriptions of one's duty toward God, it then moved onto one's duty toward one's fellows, oneself, and one's family. Part Four of

took place within her history (Harrington, 79).

46 Harrington is not as extreme as this in his summary of Heinisch. He wrote: "It is, perhaps, true to say that Heinisch would have been less conservative in his views if he had written after 1943; in fairness to him we must not overlook the fact that the publication of an Old Testament theology which, in many regards, shared the exegetical positions of Protestant scholarship was, at that date, a courageous enough venture." (Harrington, 81).

47 Heinisch, 8-126.

48 Heinisch, 127-177.

49 Let us take the example of faith. The treatment of faith was "hopelessly inadequate"; because, according to Harrington, it was treated from outside the rubrics of hope and trust: "the crippling effect of non-biblical categories is especially apparent here." (Harrington, 80).
Heinisch's book was the shortest by far, and dealt with "Life after Death."\textsuperscript{50} It cursorily (compared to the other sections) dealt with Sheol, retribution, resurrection, and foreign influences upon these concepts. Part Five of the book dealt with "Redemption".\textsuperscript{51} This was examined under two major headings; "Judgment", and the "Messiah". Under "Judgment" were subsumed the judgments upon both Israel and the Gentile nations, and under "Messiah" Israel's restoration and the conversion of the Gentile nations, and the glory of the messianic kingdom were treated.

2.4 HEINISCH ON THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS

Before we begin a detailed analysis of Heinisch's book, it is necessary to note what he said concerning the relation between the Testaments. It was stated in the previous section that, in a qualified way, Heinisch regarded both Testaments as equivalent sources for the task of constructing an OT theology. To investigate this claim, the final essay in his book is the most germane for our purpose, it is entitled "Old Testament Religion Perfected in the New."\textsuperscript{52} In it, Heinisch cited Augustine's famous dictum: "In the Old the New is concealed, in the New the Old is revealed."\textsuperscript{53}

Heinisch's discussion of the law offers an insight into how he saw the relation between the Testaments:

\begin{quote}
The God of the old covenant remains the God of the new covenant in His justice, His holiness, in His omnipotence, in His position relative to the universe as its creator and preserver. The fundamentals of Old Testament law are part and parcel of the new covenant, for both rest upon the obligation of loving God and neighbour.\textsuperscript{54}
\end{quote}

This statement raises some critical questions. For example, in what sense are the fundamentals of Old Testament law part of the new covenant? Is there a development of the concept of law between the Testaments, or is the concept subject to correction or fulfilment by NT revelation? Or does law mean the same

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{50} Heinisch, 280-294.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Heinisch, 296-373.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Heinisch, 370-373.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Augustine, \textit{Quaest. in Hept II.} 73 [\textit{PL.} 34: 623] (cited by Heinisch, 371 n. 3).
\item \textsuperscript{54} Heinisch, 371.
\end{itemize}
thing in both Testaments?

The answers to these questions will be teased out in the following sections, for the relation between the Testaments is a complex matter not easily established. It may be that Heinisch used one or all of these assumptions in the writing of his OT theology; it will be this chapter’s task to ascertain which. What follows is an examination of the way that Heinisch used the NT within his book, with particular reference to the underlying question: how did Heinisch see the OT as Christian Scripture?

2.5 HEINISCH’S USE OF THE NT AS A WINDOW UPON HIS HERMENEUTICS

In order that Heinisch’s hermeneutical presuppositions be better explained and understood, it will be useful to document his usage of biblical traditions outside the OT. This then allows us to examine the manner in which Heinisch both regarded the OT itself, and also how he regarded the OT as part of the Christian canon. To this end, the following table illustrates his use of the NT. In the table, the column of figures upon the left represent the total number of citations of the various sections of the NT within Heinisch's book; the column on the right represents the approximate proportion that each of these contributed to the total number of citations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NT Material</th>
<th>Heinisch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gospels</td>
<td>225 [67.6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>37 [11.1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>33 [9.9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Epistles</td>
<td>1 [0.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Epistles</td>
<td>5 [1.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>27 [8.1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalypse</td>
<td>5 [1.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>333 [~100]</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.** The use of the NT in Heinisch’s book - listed by tradition.

Of Heinisch’s NT citations, the Gospels make up the largest proportion, with 67.6% of the total. It would then seem reasonable to assume that any of the sections of Heinisch's book that contain a significant number of Gospel citations would
offer the best opportunity to assess Heinisch's assumptions. A breakdown of these sections (which shows their relative number of Gospel citations, by Gospel) follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Acts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life After Death</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redemption</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. The frequency of gospel citation within the sections of Heinisch's book.

Heinisch's most attested NT source is the Gospel of Matthew. Therefore it may be useful to trace this use of this Gospel in his work. The sections concerned with "Human Acts" and "Redemption" would seem to be the best candidates for the task. Before doing so, however, we will examine some passages in which the OT's relationship to the NT is more explicitly discussed.

### 2.6 HEINISCH AND A DEVELOPMENTAL MODEL FOR OT THEOLOGY

In the “Introduction” to his work, Heinisch mapped out the way in which he would set about the task of writing an OT theology. Here he seems to be arguing for what we might call a developmental model of the relationship of the OT and the NT, writing:

A theology can present more clearly than a history what is fundamental and accordingly permanent, what is merely transitional, and what preparation New Testament revelation has had in the Old. 55

On the next page, he went on to say:

...just as dogmatic theology cannot disregard the heresies, although it does not treat them ex professo, so also a systematic presentation of the theology of the Old Testament

55 Heinisch, 5.
must take into consideration the development of doctrine; if a doctrine suffered no modification it may show this by placing pertinent texts from various historical periods alongside one another. 56

It therefore remains to be seen whether Heinisch consistently followed these ideas throughout his book.

2.6.1 Heinisch on the Preparation for the Doctrine of the Trinity

Heinisch's views upon the relation of the Testaments were most clearly expressed in his discussion entitled "The Preparation for the Holy Trinity", which comprised part of Part One (on God). 57 The judiciousness with which Heinisch avoided reading the NT back into the OT may be noted here, but Heinisch did show the developments in thought between the Testaments in certain areas. As one of his critics notes:

[Heinisch] surveys a number of themes which in his view prepare the way for the doctrine of the Trinity: the angel of the Lord, Wisdom, the Spirit of Yahweh, and the Word of God. It is only fair to note ... refrains from reading New Testament ideas back into them, though he does take pains to show their New Testament development. 58

Indeed, to clarify his view of the relationship between the Testaments, Heinisch had written that. "the greatest mystery of Christian faith should at least have been foreshadowed in the Old Testament." 59 We shall take a closer look at Heinisch's book to see if this is indeed how he understood the OT.

2.6.1.1 Heinisch on Wisdom

Heinisch used the following texts in his exposition of wisdom: Job 28; Baruch 3: 9 - 4: 4; Proverbs 1-8, and the books of Sirach and Wisdom. In discussing Job 28, for example, he wrote:

When He created the world "then did he gaze upon her and

56 Heinisch, 6.
57 Heinisch, 102-127.
58 Hubbard, 212.
59 Heinisch, 102; Hubbard, 212.
proclaim her; he established her since it was also he who had fathomed her." [Job 28: 27] Wisdom, then, is a good outside of God and man, which God possesses. At the creation of the world He made use of it; it served, as it were, as a model which He considered from every side when He called things into being.\(^{60}\)

It was in a similar vein that Heinisch very briefly treated the text from Baruch: he noted that in Baruch, wisdom is additionally manifested in the Law. Thus far, wisdom was described by Heinisch in less than personal terms.

Wisdom, however, did appear as a person in Proverbs (1: 20-23), with the apex of personhood being reached in the eighth chapter:

The climax is reached in the pericope 8: 22-36 in which wisdom reveals her origin, "Yahweh created me (qanani undoubtedly to be translated in this manner with G S Targ - cf. Sir. 1: 4, 9; 24: 8-9 - as against Aq Sym Th V, "possessed me").\(^{61}\)

While God was creating the universe, wisdom was present at God's side, as an overseer ('amon); and leads people to God according to the divine will. This personification is also present within Sirach: wisdom is created at the beginning of time by God (Sir. 1: 1-10) and "appears as a person" in Sirach 4: 11-19, and at 14: 20 - 15: 10. Sirach 24: 1-29 was seen by Heinisch as the most important passage about wisdom in the book:

There we hear her say, "I came forth from the mouth of the Most High (v.3) ... From the beginning and before the world he created me, and unto the world to come I shall not cease to be (v.9)." How she 'issued' from God is wrapt in mystery; and since this occurred before time began, she is not a creature.\(^{62}\) be

The apogee of wisdom speculation was, for Heinisch, contained within the book of Wisdom, especially Wisdom 7: 22 - 8:1:

The author describes the "origin" of wisdom as an issuance from God, and as words fail him in the effort to describe this clearly, he calls her "breath of the might of God, an emanation of his glory, the reflection of eternal light, the mirror of his activity, the image of his goodness." Hence she must have a share in the divine nature... She possesses divine attributes, is intelligent, changeless, holy (on which account she hates sin), almighty;...Her self-existent character, even though joined to God

\(^{60}\) Heinisch, 107.

\(^{61}\) Heinisch, 108.

in deepest intimacy, seems indicated in that w) she lives together with Him, enjoys His love, x) she is near God's throne, y) she has been introduced into God's knowledge, z) she was sent from heaven to earth.

In what sense did Heinisch see wisdom in the OT as a "person"? Heinisch was well aware that the wisdom literature comprised "poetical books", and is replete with "rich imagery and figurative language." Heinisch also acknowledged that wisdom was also spoken of as a divine good or attribute (see Sirach 1: 1-10; 24: 1-19; Wisdom 7: 22-8:1), but there is no tendency to regard wisdom as a person to be worshipped. In this way, Israelite monotheism is not compromised.

While wisdom appears as a divine person who espoused the cause of men and conferred all temporal and eternal goods, there is no trace of prayers being directed to wisdom as to a person. Neither is wisdom expressly called a divine person, it is only portrayed as such.

What does this tell us about the OT’s preparation for trinitarian doctrine? Heinisch noted the ubiquity of the Christ/Wisdom parallel in the apostolic church:

St. Paul called Christ "the firstborn of every creature ... the image of the invisible God... the power of God and the wisdom of God ... In Heb. 1: 3 He is designated the "brightness of his glory and the image of his substance." The Logos doctrine in the first chapter of John's Gospel agrees remarkably well with the teaching contained in the Book of Wisdom; compare but the first passage, "In the beginning was the Word..." with Wis. 7: 12, 22; 8: 5...  

The synonymity of Christ with wisdom was assumed by Paul, the author of John's Gospel, and the writer of the Letter to the Hebrews. The striking similarities between the teachings of the Book of Wisdom (and less so) that of Proverbs and

---

63 Heinisch, 109.
64 Heinisch, 110.
65 "The author of Wisdom never said, "Wisdom is God," as St. John proclaimed, "The Word is God." All prerequisites seem present, the step needed was not a great one, but no wisdom writer ever took that step... The Old Testament was ordained to prepare men for the revelation to be given by the second person of the Blessed Trinity, who from eternity had proceeded from Its bosom; He was to appear upon earth to instruct, to console, to warn, and to lead to God; the full light first shone in the darkness when Wisdom Itself appeared upon earth" (Heinisch, 111).
66 In the case of Paul, Heinisch noted the similarities between Colossians 1: 15f and Proverbs 8: 22, 30; Ben Sirà 1: 4; and Wisdom 7:22, 26, 27, 8: 1, 4. Hebrews 1: 3 was compared with Wisdom 7: 25-26. John 1: 1-3 was compared with Proverbs 8: 22, 30; and Wisdom 7: 12, 22, 8: 5, 9; 4, 9, 10 (Heinisch, 111, 111, nn. 69-75).
these authors are highlighted by Heinisch and suggest that he employed a developmental hermeneutic here. This is borne out by the following statement:

All prerequisites seem present [for Wisdom to be God], the step needed was not a great one, but no wisdom writer ever took that step. So even in the Book of Wisdom the concept of wisdom hovers between attribute and person. The Old Testament was ordained to prepare for the revelation to be given by the second person of the Blessed Trinity, who from eternity had proceeded from Its bosom; He was to appear on earth to instruct, to console, to warn, and to lead to God; the full light first shone in darkness when Wisdom itself appeared upon earth. 67

What had been described by Heinisch as a personification within the sapiential tradition had been developed into a description of Jesus within the NT and a basis for trinitarian reflection in the post-biblical era. This shows that Heinisch saw the OT in the first step of God's progressive revelation, which the writers of the NT and post-biblical theological tradition took as a starting point for their own work.

2.6.1.2 Heinisch on the Spirit

According to Heinisch, the "spirit" is "a power emanating from God which gives life, confers strength, enlightens, and spurs on to virtue." 68 Within the context of the Exodus account (as narrated in Nehemiah 9: 19-20), Heinisch argued that God gave the children of Israel the pillar of cloud, manna and water, and "His good spirit to teach them." Heinisch admitted that such language may imply a "very definite self existence for the spirit", but he concluded that "but all the author is actually describing is Moses' enlightenment from on high." 69 Additionally, Heinisch remarked that within the book of Wisdom, "[w]hat the writer has to say concerning the spirit is predicated likewise of wisdom." 70 So, for Heinisch, the "spirit" is a literary personification rather than a person in the OT.

After a careful description of the spirit of Yahweh within the OT, Heinisch argued

---

67 Heinisch, 111.
68 Heinisch, 119.
69 Heinisch, 120.
70 "[I]n wisdom is a spirit which penetrates and fills the universe [footnote reference to Wisdom 7: 22-24, 8: 1] even as does the spirit of God [footnote reference to Wisdom 12: 1]; it is a "breath of divine omnipotence [footnote reference to Wisdom 7: 25]. In 1: 4 wisdom, in 1: 5 the holy spirit seeks to shun intercourse wit the wicked, and in 9: 7 wisdom and the holy spirit are placed parallel to each other, almost identified." (Heinisch, 120, 120 an. 99-101).
that the "mystery of the Holy Spirit" was not revealed until the writing of the NT, and expanded within Christian tradition:

It was reserved for the New Testament to reveal the mystery of the Holy Spirit. On Pentecost [Acts 2: 16-18] Peter saw fulfilled Joel's prophecy concerning the pouring out of the spirit [Joel 3: 1-2] and thereafter he was convinced that the spirit of God which spoke in the Old Testament through the prophets is the third Person of the Blessed Trinity [2 Peter 1: 21]. The same is proclaimed in the Creed of Constantinople: *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, qui locutum est per prophetas*. 71

Although Heinisch notes that this development does not occur until the NT, he sees the NT as developing the OT's ideas, ideas which are picked up in the tradition of the Church.

### 2.6.1.3 Heinisch on the Word

Heinisch wrote that a word, once uttered, took on a life and efficacy all of its own.72 The supreme example of this, of course, was Yahweh's creative word, but the will of Yahweh was also manifested to Israel by the revelation of the Ten Words (i.e. the Decalogue) upon Sinai, and by the speaking of the word of Yahweh by the prophets. The question is: was the "word of Yahweh" seen in Heinisch's work as ontologically distinct from its source (thus reflecting later Christian ideas), or did Heinisch see this as another personification?

Heinisch was consistent here. He regarded the "word" as a personification in the same way that he had regarded "wisdom" and "spirit":

> In various passages God's word is likened to a stroke of lightning [footnote reference to Is 9: 8], to scorching fire [footnote reference to Jer 5: 14], to a hammer which shatters rocks [footnote reference to Jer 23: 29]; to it are ascribed eternity [footnote reference to Is 40: 8] and omnipotence [footnote reference to Wis 18: 14]. These passages are but lively personifications, a literary method used when telling of God's might and benevolence toward men. 73

However for Heinisch, these expressions are given a new meaning in the event of

---

71 Heinisch, 121, 121 nn. 102-104.
72 Heinisch, 122.
73 Heinisch, 124-125. nn. 28-32.
the Incarnation: the author of John's Gospel drew upon the OT concepts of wisdom and word to construct the theology of the Logos. Once again, this is in keeping with Heinisch's developmental assumptions about the relation of the NT to the OT.

This hermeneutic is further evidenced in the way that Heinisch discussed the personification of the Word, with particular reference to the Johannine Prologue. After saying that the writer of the Gospel "builds upon the doctrine of wisdom and of the word of God found in the Old Testament", Heinisch went on to say:

However, only after the appearance of the "Word" upon earth did these Old Testament expressions take on new and clarifying light ... Only from New Testament revelation do we know that Jesus accomplished His work by the power of the Holy Spirit and that in the Church the Holy Spirit is continuing that work, bringing it to perfection.

From these observations it is plain that Heinisch saw the OT as the anteroom to the NT, and that the NT could legitimately be used to interpret it. In this, Heinisch is not simply reading the NT back into the OT. What he is doing, as the last citation suggests, is saying that the OT concepts of wisdom, spirit, and word, while personifications in their OT context, find their full meaning within the writings of the NT.

2.6.2 HEINISCH ON CREATION

As we noted earlier, Heinisch uses the Gospel of Matthew far more frequently than any other NT source, but he uses it sparingly in this section. His first use of it would appear to be a case of the NT idea expressed here (the habitat of demons) being a continuation of an idea present in the OT:

In the popular mind the desert and desolate places served as the usual habitat of demons [Baruch 4: 35; Tobit 8: 3; Matthew 12: 32; and Apocalypse 18: 2] 76

Heinisch's second use of Matthew was in connection to the use of Beelzebub (Beelzebul) as a name for the Satan; again, there is a continuation of an OT concept being expressed in the NT:

74 Heinisch, 125.
75 Heinisch, 125-126.
76 Heinisch, 139, 139 n. 6.

These occurrences suggest that Heinisch saw some OT ideas as continuous with those of the NT, thus linking the Testaments with a continuity of tradition that was common to both.

2.6.3 HEINISCH ON HUMAN ACTS

Matthew's Gospel is liberally used throughout Heinisch's treatment of Human Acts, and most often within the "Critique of Old Testament Morality." 78 Heinisch's attitude within this section concerning the relation of the Testaments can be gleaned from such passages as the following:

Old Testament passages which wish evil upon others, whether it be just punishment or not, mirror the imperfection of the Old Law and the maxim, "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth." These texts do not stand on a par with Christ's sublime teaching, "If someone strike you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also... Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who persecute and calumniate you." They do not reflect Jesus' prayer on the cross, "Father forgive them..." 79

This form of argumentation is also present a little further on:

Purificatory laws, which determined cases of defilement and cleansings that effected only an external, physical purity, were not strictly differentiated from laws governing moral purity - as was common in antiquity. In the New Testament, embracing as it does the whole world, these injunctions are obsolete, but they did have a purpose for Israel and her needs... The Pharisees and scribes equated their fulfilment with the essence of religious life and disregarded interior holiness in favor of preoccupation with external purifications. [Matthew 15: 2; 23: 25] 80

These examples illustrate that Heinisch had a "progressive" view of revelation, in seeing that the development of tradition was a forward looking process, with NT

77 Heinisch, 144, 144 n. 59.

78 For this discussion, pages 218-219 are most illustrative, as they contain the most concentrated (in terms of the number of citations) use of Matthew's Gospel (Heinisch, 212-222).

79 The emphasis is mine, and is a citation from Matthew 5: 29, 34 (Heinisch, 218).

80 Heinisch, 219.
revelation acting as the climax and completion of biblical thought.

The first example of the two examples just cited averred the superiority of the Sermon on the Mount to the "lex talionis", while the second alluded to the superiority of interior disposition over external observance of the Law. The other references to Matthew's Gospel within this section refer, in the main, to Jesus' attitude towards tenets of the Torah, or particular religious practices. It is to be admitted here that Heinisch is taking rather a negative view of biblical Judaism in his discussion, if only by implication.

Heinisch was criticized for these judgments, one critic saying that he finds the teaching of the Old Testament and the reactions of Israel definitely inferior to the standards of the New Testament. 81

Similarly, Heinisch cited the OT ideal of marriage as flawed in comparison to the NT, because both polygamy and divorce were permitted. The concept of herem could not be justified from the viewpoint of the Sermon on the Mount; 82 neither could the joy of the Jewish nation in the revenge upon their enemies in the Book of Esther (Nahum could probably also be added here) be worthy of Christian emulation. 83 From these examples (and others), Heinisch adduced the inherent inferiority of what he termed the Old Law when compared to the New Law. In Heinisch's view the NT witness provided a corrective to such tendencies: as the earlier statement upon the relationship between "lex talionis" and the Sermon on the Mount pointed out.

81 Heinisch put it this way: "Since the Old Testament is only an anteroom to the New Testament, the same demands cannot be made upon Old Testament saints as upon those for whom the teaching of Christ serves as the rule of conduct" (Heinisch, 212). Heinisch then noted, among others, Moses' murder of an Egyptian overlord, David's adultery, and Joseph taking advantage of the Egyptians during the great famine as counter-examples of virtue "(ibid.).

82 "Old Testament passages which wish evil upon others, whether it be just punishment or not, mirror the imperfection of the Old Law and the maxim, "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth."
(Heinisch, 218).

83 "Such effusions of hostility, wholly contrary to true Christian piety, we must first of all remember flow from the mouths of Orientals who do not easily control their feelings and who use hyperbole in a way unintelligible to Occidentals" (Heinisch, 217). Earlier on, Heinisch had described Israel's military behaviour (herem excepted) as "gentle compared with the war ethics of neighbouring nations." Examples included no violation of captured women or girls (Deuteronomy 21: 10-14), rare uses of torture and mutilation (2 Kings 15: 16; 1 Kings 20:31; possibly 2 Samuel 12: 31); and respect for horticulture, so as not to impose lasting damage (Deuteronomy 20: 19) (Heinisch, 214).
Despite these judgements, Heinisch went out of his way to show how some of the worst excesses recorded in the OT were later corrected, within the OT itself. For example, *herem* was abandoned before Israel became dependent upon her larger neighbours (although it seems to have been revived temporarily much later on (see 1 Maccabees 5: 5)\textsuperscript{84} Moreover, Heinisch argues that Israel's moral code compares favourably to that of her neighbours:

The ancient Oriental codes (like that of Moses) were promulgated in the name of a divinity, yet in reality (unlike that of Moses) reflect merely the will of the ruler; none of them command the worship of only one God or require faith, hope, love.\textsuperscript{85}

Indeed, Heinisch's comparative assessment of the moral character of Israel and her neighbours gave the impression, in the eyes of one critic, that Israel's unique revelation gave her standards a "certain loftiness."\textsuperscript{86} Heinisch went into some detail within this section concerning the ancient Near Eastern background of the OT writings, comparing and contrasting the morality of Israel with that of her neighbours. Here is an example concerning punishments:

While Deut. 25: 1-3 set the maximum number of strokes for flogging at forty and allowed mutilation in but a single instance [footnote reference to Deuteronomy 25: 11-12], Assyrian and Babylonian law listed many offenses punishable by cudgeling and mutilation, e.g., cutting off the tongue, ear, breast (of wet nurses), tearing out eyes, death by fire in Babylon, in Assyria cutting off of the nose, ear, finger, lower lip, tearing out the eye, piercing the ear, castration (though actual practice may have been more humane). Mosaic Law never resorted to the rack to obtain evidence, and it contains no indication of allowing torture previous to inflicting the death penalty.\textsuperscript{87}

However, Heinisch then proceeded to argue that Israel's ethics were superseded by those of the NT. The Sermon on the Mount (and the rest of the NT) then represented for Heinisch a development from the ethical standards of the OT.

\textsuperscript{84} Heinisch, 214.

\textsuperscript{85} He argued further that Israel's Law demanded an interior disposition as opposed to mere externalities; and governed relationships between people, and between the people and God. Therefore Law and religion were inextricably linked (Heinisch, 222).

\textsuperscript{86} This, of course, is very close to putting Israel upon a pedestal and therefore marking her out as ontologically and religiously separate from her neighbours, a tendency which the proponents of *die religionsgeschichtliche Schule* would have criticized. Heinisch did not cite any authors of this school, however (see Hubbard, 212).

\textsuperscript{87} Heinisch, 220-221.
2.6.4 HEINISCH ON LIFE AFTER DEATH

There is a paucity of reference to Matthew’s Gospel in this section of Heinisch’s book. Here he sketched out the OT background to the concepts of bodily resurrection and retribution after death, which were those held by the Pharisees but denied by the Sadducees at the time of Christ.88 It represents a very good example of a discussion within which Heinisch shows the development of OT concepts within the OT itself, and (as we saw in his section upon creation) the NT continuation of an OT idea.

Heinisch began by discussing Sheol, where

\[ \text{there is no suffering. Neither is there any happiness. It is the} \]
\[ \text{“land of darkness and the shadow of death, the land of} \]
\[ \text{darkness dense as midnight”.}^{89} \]

This idea of Sheol prevailed until the second century before Christ.90 It was during the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes that the issue of bodily resurrection became acute: were the Maccabean martyrs dying in vain? Heinisch saw the beginnings of such reflection in the Maccabean literature, in this case, the mother of the seven brothers addressing her youngest son:

Accept death so that I may again find you with your brothers on the day of mercy [2 Maccabees 7: 29] 91

Resurrection is spoken of in metaphorical terms within Hosea (6: 2; 13: 14) and in Ezekiel (37: 1-14) with Israel as a nation being its referent, but it is in the context of national deliverance (again in the shadow of Antiochus’ persecution) that Daniel

---

88 This represents the only reference to Matthew’s Gospel within this section of Heinisch’s book (Matthew 22: 23; Heinisch, 293 n. 59).

89 Job 10: 21-22; cf. Job 3: 5; 17: 13; Psalms 88: 13; 143: 3; Wisdom 17: 14, 21 (Heinisch, 281 n. 29).

90 Psalms 49 and 73 are sources for the idea of just requital for Heinisch, the virtuous being redeemed from Sheol by God (Psalm 49: 16), and the “rich man trusting in his goods and remaining estranged from God” will be forever within the confines of Sheol (Psalm 73: 19-20) This idea is further developed within the book of Wisdom, where the just are taken (after judgment) into the presence of God, while the wicked are sent to Hades, “which thereby becomes hell, the habitat of sinners“ (Wisdom 1: 11-12; Heinisch, 288; 288, n. 59).

91 Heinisch (Heinisch, 287) reinforced the point by citing the speech of the young man to the ruler: “After enduring short affliction our brothers now share in the eternal reward promised by God, but at God’s judgment you, on account of your pride, will receive due punishment” (2 Maccabees 7: 36).
spoke of individual bodily resurrection:

Many of those who sleep in the dust shall awake, some to eternal life and others to disgrace, to everlasting shame.
And the wise shall shine as magnificently as the firmament, and those who convert many, as the stars for ever and ever

[Daniel 12: 2-3] 92

Bodily resurrection was therefore a relatively late idea within the OT literature. It is not present within Qoheleth, but Sirach, according to Heinisch, spoke of leaving behind a good name and descendants, rather than bodily resurrection.93 The author of the book of Wisdom was “conversant with the notion of bodily resurrection”, but did not expressly teach it,

perhaps because he had in mind Gentile readers who were not well disposed toward this doctrine; he does not reject it, however, and it harmonizes well with his general mentality. 94

However, to illustrate continuity of this idea within the OT, Heinisch did note that

[t]here is some relation between “the just shall shine at the time of their visitation” [Wisdom 3: 7] and Dan. 12: 2-3, which tells of the resurrection. 95

According to Heinisch, then, the development of the ideas of resurrection and divine retribution after death are late. He was at pains to show how they developed from the earlier OT ideas about Sheol, within the context of persecution. In this case, Heinisch is content to point out the continuance of these ideas with the NT (Matthew 22: 23) in this section of his book, and does not read NT ideas back into the OT.

92 Heinisch noted, nevertheless, that it was not a general resurrection to which Daniel referred, but that the context alluded to the Chosen people only. In support of this, he also mentioned the example of the Maccabean brothers crying out in the throes of torture and death, e.g.: “You evildoer! Truly you are taking away our mortal life, yet the King of the universe shall awaken us who die for the Law to a resurrection in eternal life” (2 Maccabees 7: 9; Heinisch 290, 292, 292 n. 33).

93 Sirach 39: 9; 41:11-13; 46:12; 49: 10 (Heinisch, 291; 291 n. 30; 292, 292 nn. 31-32).

94 Heinisch argued that the author of the book of Wisdom was conversant with the idea of bodily resurrection, his conclusion was based upon a reading of Wisdom 4: 20 - 5: 14 [the general judgment] (Heinisch, 292-293).

95 ibid.
2.6.5 HEINISCH ON REDEMPTION

We will consider here how Heinisch dealt with messianism, a treatment of which took up most of Section Five. One critic of his method stated that Heinisch:

skirts most of the problems whether theological, historical, or exegetical and contents himself with brief expositions of passages which traditionally have been given a messianic slant. 96

This critic condemns Heinisch for citing the examples of Genesis 3: 15, Isaiah 7: 14; 9: 5, and Psalm 2: 7 as "clear proofs of the Messiah's divinity." 97 Let us see if this criticism is justified.

In a section concerning the ancestry of the Messiah, Heinisch read Genesis 3: 15 through the eyes of the NT; a specific child of Eve (Christ) "received the bite of the serpent." 98 The curse given to the serpent by God pointed to a deliverance, "it was the first good news after the fall, the protoevangel":

From the New Testament we know how a specific child of Eve fought the battle against the serpent. He who 'was born of a woman' [Galatians 4: 4] was first tempted by the devil in the wilderness; [Matthew 4] then Satan sent a 'brood of vipers' against Him.[Matthew 3: 7], the Pharisees who had 'the devil as father'[John 8: 44]...Dying upon the cross He received the bite of the serpent, but by surrendering His human nature to death, He crushed His adversary's head, broke his might, and he 'who triumphed on the wood (of the tree in paradise) was defeated on the wood (of the cross.' Thus Gen. 3: 15 is true of all men, but in an unique manner applies to Christ who, as Eve's child, delivered us from the serpent's power. 99

96 "The value of Heinisch's work is seriously compromised by his almost simplistic approach to the subject of messianism. He makes no effort to tackle the technical questions which swarm around the topic in the Old Testament. Does the term Messiah ever occur in the Old Testament as a title of the coming king? In what sense are the royal psalms, which describe Israel's kings in ideal terms, to be understood messianically? Is there a connection between the royal office of the Messiah and the suffering servant?" (Hubbard, 210).

97 ibid.

98 "The curse upon the serpent points to a deliverance; it was the first good news after the fall, the protoevangel ... Thus Gen. 3: 15 is true of all men, but in a unique manner applies to Christ who, as Eve's child, delivered us from the serpent's power. Heinisch, 338. Heinisch discussed the ministry, passion and death of Christ as "one born of a woman." Apart from this reference, he made no further comment as to the context of the Genesis passage: rather reading it through the eyes of the Gospel writers. Hubbard misplaced Heinisch's discussion here, mistakenly noting it as being upon p. 304: (Hubbard, 209 n. 30).

Heinisch is plainly reading the NT accounts of Jesus's life, death, and resurrection back into this text, in order to make it into a foreshadowing of Jesus's messianic status. He has used verbal similarity ("serpent", "brood of vipers"), and assumed an analogical continuity of idea between the Testaments (wood of the tree of knowledge of good and evil with the wood of the cross, in short, the type / anti-type relationship) to make his case here. There is no evidence of any dialogue with historical, theological, or exegetical literature, Heinisch is arguing from an assumption that the NT is here completing and clarifying the OT.

When Heinisch discussed the Messiah as being the son of a virgin, Isaiah 7: 14ff was explained in terms of its context within the reign of Ahaz; but more space was given to its christological import:

> Isaias' message involves the Messiah's conception and birth, and by employing the word 'almah instead of issah, wife, he implies that the woman who bears the child will remain virginal throughout life ... The interpretation of this prophecy as referring to the virgin birth, as tradition has always done, has again become popular among critical exegetes. 100

By writing in this manner, Heinisch was demonstrating the use of some of the tools of the historical-critical method (viz. familiarity with and the use of Hebrew) in order to argue his case. Given the time in which he wrote, this was a courageous thing for a Catholic scholar to have done. Before we proceed to look at the way that Heinisch treated this and the other texts to be assessed, it will be useful to consider his view of prophecy.

Heinisch was well aware of the prophetic predilection for metaphorical language, and that contradictions could result if “a strictly verbal interpretation” of prophetic utterances were to be followed:

> Weapons of war according to Osee [2: 20], Isaias [9: 4], Micheas [5: 9-10] and Zacharias [9: 10] will be smashed and burnt, according to Isaias [2: 4] and Micheas [4: 3] they will be useful tools. 101

Instead, Heinisch thought that such illustrations were precisely that, the message that the prophet intended to convey was more important than the words in their

---

100 Heinisch, 341. We are not told who these "critical exegetes" were.

101 Heinisch, 329, 329, nn. 91-96.
context (which served to merely enliven the message) meant on their own. One way in which this was done was to "recall historical events and in an analogical way describe future events": 102

When heralding the exile Osee recalled the trying years Israel had to pass in the land of Pharaoh. 'To Egypt they shall return,' he prophesied, [8: 13] although he knew full well that Assyria would do the enslaving. 103

Allied to this was a tendency for visionary experience to be a vector of divine revelation for prophets. This, Heinsich said, was further evidence of the prophetic use of illustration, but these visions presented events not in historical order, but place the future alongside or before the present, or intersperse present and future events without regard for actual sequence... Thus things which will happen at the end of time appeared immediate to the prophet. 104

In turning back to our discussion of Isaiah 7: 14 ff, it becomes clear how Heinisch could claim that:

The content of [Isaiah] 7: 15 becomes clear if we remember that the prophet saw in one perspectiveless picture the birth of Immanuel together with more immediate events; since the Child was present before him, it could serve well as a terminus for other particulars. 105

Assyria was indeed threatening Israel in the prophet's time, and the sign of Immanuel was to show Israel that Yahweh would not abandon her. Given Heinisch's views upon the lack of perspective within prophetic visions, it was then a small step to claim (as he does) that this prophecy was fulfilled by Mary in the NT. Heinisch has then, by way of his views upon the prophetic charism and the ways in which the prophets saw and wrote down their messages, argued for an understanding of this text which is refracted through the lens of the NT. 106

In dealing with Isaiah 9: 5, Heinisch's view of the prophetic vision need to be

102 Heinisch, 330.
103 ibid.
104 Heinisch, 331.
105 Heinisch, 341.
106 Heinisch (Heinisch, 341, 342) made reference to Luke 1: 26f. and Matthew 1: 20f. here to illustrate the point, writing: "Assyria had become hostile to Judah, and the prophet hopefully speaks of Immanuel for whose sake Yahweh will not let the people perish. - In the person of Blessed Mary, Virgin and Mother, this prophecy of Isaias was fulfilled" [Luke 1: 26f.; Matthew 1: 20f.] (Heinisch, 342. n. 50).
borne in mind. It helps us to understand his approach in passages such as the following:

The prophet sees the Messiah grow up in a devastated land, yet in spite of the seeming time indication, Isaias did not expect the birth in the immediate future. For in 9: 5 he linked the birth of the Messiah with the destruction of Assyria, and the latter would take place only after the fall of the Northern Kingdom.\textsuperscript{107}

We come now to Psalm 2, which is discussed under the heading of "The Messiah as Divine." Heinisch’s treatment focuses on verse 7:

\begin{quote}
You are my son, today I have begotten you [Psalm 2: 7]
\end{quote}

Heinisch noted that this is the only example of God "begetting" a specific person\textsuperscript{108} (indeed the word Messiah is present at Psalm 2: 2). The Messiah would be much more than an earthly king (given that kings were the "anointed ones", which is the basic meaning of Messiah) according to Heinisch, because it is to him that world sovereignty has been given. From this, Heinisch concluded that this figure is the Son of God (as the kings were) in a singular way. This interpretation is borne out for Heinisch by its citation in the NT: in Paul’s preaching at Perga (Acts 13: 33, where he claims that Christ is the Son of God), and in the letter to the Hebrews (1: 5; 5: 5: Christ as the one appointed by God as high priest), and also by a Jewish tradition that identified “the ‘anointed’ One of Ps. 2: 2 [as] the Messiah-King”.\textsuperscript{109} So Heinisch read this psalm through the lens of the NT about Jesus in Acts and in Hebrews.

Now that we have examined all of the “messianic” texts mentioned by Hubbard in his critique, it is time to comment his claim that Heinisch

\textsuperscript{107} "Moreover, the prophet stressed the fact that the Messiah would proceed ‘from the root of Jesse’: (Isaiah 11: 1. 10) hence before the Messiah appeared the royal family would have lost the throne; here again the destruction of Assyria must come first “ (Isaiah 10: 33-34) (Heinisch, 341).

\textsuperscript{108} Heinisch (Heinisch, 347) cautioned here that the expression "begotten" is used metaphorically here, as it is in Deuteronomy 32: 18, and in the Nathanic oracle (2 Samuel 7: 14). "But the words 'You are my son,' occur nowhere in the Old Testament in the sense of adoption. Only in Ps. 2: 7 do we find the expression that God begot, or gave birth to a specific person. The Messiah accordingly is the Son of God in a most unique way. Sovereignty over all nations is given to him, and this would not apply to any of the historical kings of Israel. The word "today" is the day of the solemn proclamation of the Messiah as God's Son."

\textsuperscript{109} On the Jewish interpretation of this text, Heinisch cited Strack-Billerbeck III 1926. 675f. (Heinisch, 347).
skirts most of the problems whether theological, historical, or exegetical and contents himself with brief expositions of passages which traditionally have been given a messianic slant.

In the case of Genesis 3:15, Heinisch was reading the NT account of Jesus's life and ministry back into the text: using verbal similarities and typology in order to do this. This text is then clarified by the NT, the Fall being undone by the mission of Jesus. Heinisch did not dialogue with historical, theological or exegetical literature here. Isaiah 7:14ff (and Isaiah 9:5) was interpreted by utilising a view of prophecy which allowed the prophet to see both current events and those of the future in one, perspectiveless picture. In this way, the virgin birth narrated in both Luke and Matthew could be said to have been within the prophet Isaiah's view when he narrated the Immanuel prophecy in the court of Ahaz, thereby making the NT continuous with the OT, and fulfilled by it. Psalm 2:7 is another case of the NT understanding of Jesus being read back into the OT; this is done by the use of the citations of Psalm 2:7 (in Acts and the letter to the Hebrews) being used to interpret the Psalm itself. There was some attention paid, in this case, to the wording and context of the passage, but the normativeness of the NT in interpreting this text was not put in doubt. Heinisch has interacted with no other secondary literature and, therefore, has not concerned himself with exegetical, historical, or historical issues to any extent. Hubbard's criticism of him in this regard would then appear to have been borne out.

Heinisch summed up his treatment of messianism in these words:

How the Messiah could be both man and God remained hidden from the prophets and psalmists, only to be revealed with the incarnation of the second person of the Blessed Trinity. But Israel was aware that a great mystery would surround the person of the Messiah and that in his person God would reveal Himself in a most extraordinary manner. Jesus was revealing His divinity to the Jews in a very intelligible way when he applied Ps. 110:1 to Himself. And to the high priest's solemn question, "Are you the Christ (i.e., the Messiah), the Son of God," He clearly and solemnly replied, You have said it."

2.6.6 HEINISCH ON OT MORALITY AND THE NT

In Section Five we again find some more explicit statements on the relationship of

---

110 See n. 95.
111 ibid.
the two Testaments. Heinisch notes that God is the God of both covenants, by virtue of creation, and by the fact of divine holiness and justice. The Law is part of the new covenant as it rests upon the obligation of loving both God and neighbour:

To the question put by a doctor of the Law regarding the greatest commandment, Jesus answered, "You shall love your God with your whole heart... commandments depend the whole Law and the prophets." In the Old Testament God demanded holiness of life; in the New Jesus enjoins, "Be perfect as your father in heaven is perfect." [Matthew 5: 48] It is easy to see why our dear Lord said, "I am not come to destroy the Law and the prophets, but to fulfill." [Matthew 5: 17] 112

According to Heinisch, the OT was to "condition men's minds for Christ."113 The Law was in place while Jesus lived, upon his death, the Law was abrogated. Because Israel did not recognize her Saviour, she was cast adrift:

The Jews believed it sufficient to have Abraham as father [Matthew 3: 9]; they forgot that God's choice of Abraham was an act of pure grace and that Abraham's children were obliged to fulfill the divine will even as their forefather did [Matthew 3: 9] When Israel rejected Him on whose account she had been chosen, she spelt her own rejection; she became stale salt, "The kingdom of God will be taken from you and will be given to a people yielding its fruits [Matthew 21: 43] 114

Heinisch was asserting most forcefully the superiority of the new covenant over the old one, and using Matthew's Gospel to drive this message home. The OT thus finds its full meaning in the NT, according to Heinisch; it prepared the way for the incarnation and the new covenant. The OT is Christian Scripture in the sense that it prepares us for the revelation of the kingdom of God in Christ.

2.7 HEINISCH AND THE NT: CONCLUSIONS

Heinisch lived and was schooled in a period very different from that in which later Catholic scholars worked. As the "Historical Overview" demonstrated, there was a tendency of the popes of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to stress the role of the magisterium and of pontifically constituted bodies (e.g. the Holy Office, the Pontifical Biblical Commission) in determining what could or could not be believed or done in terms of biblical scholarship. Popes and pontifical bodies generally reacted negatively to movements within the discipline that they thought

112 Heinisch, 371.
113 Heinisch, 372.
114 ibid.
contravened the spirit of earlier conciliar decrees or papal directives. It is in this climate of suspicion that Heinisch wrote his book.

In order to attempt an answer to the question as to how Heinisch regarded the OT as Christian Scripture, an analysis of his biblical citations was done (with particular reference to the NT, and to the sections of his book where NT citations are most prevalent) after a brief overview of the book's contents. This was in order to see how Heinisch used the NT in the context of an OT theology, and to discover which sections of his book would be most suitable for such an enquiry.

The claim being made here is this: Heinisch wrote his OT theology with the assumption that revelation is progressive. This means that the people and writers of Israel were gradually drawn further into the mystery of life with Yahweh as their history progressed, the climax of this history (according to Heinisch) being the Incarnation. This leads to the conclusion that Heinisch wrote his book by using a developmental model for OT theology.

In his use of Matthew's Gospel (and other NT texts, by implication), Heinisch was attempting to write a theology of development: one in which the accumulated insights of Israel gained through her relationship with her God (and her neighbours) were seen to point toward the life and mission of Jesus, and could be expressed in the language of later theological reflection. However, this did not normally take the form of a reading back of NT ideas back into the OT in order to find Jesus prefigured in OT texts (although occasionally this is done), but rather went in the direction of OT ideas being developed in the NT.

Let us now look more closely at what we discovered of Heinisch's view of the relationship between the Testaments. The areas considered most fruitful for this purpose were the OT preparation for the doctrine of the Trinity, Heinisch's critique of OT morality, and messianism. With the preparation for the doctrine of the Trinity, Heinisch was here most judicious in not reading the NT back into the OT. Heinisch traced the development of Wisdom, the Word, and the Spirit of Yahweh within the OT, and appeared in all of these cases to suggest that these concepts were only fully clarified by the NT writers. Heinisch's critique of OT morality implied the apparent inferiority of the Old Law to the New Law. This was especially evident in the comparison made between the "lex talionis" and the Sermon on the Mount. In his treatment of messianism, Heinisch tended to read the OT and NT as a continuous narrative, neglecting the context of the texts he was citing in an effort to establish a christological reading. This reflects a hermeneutic which saw the OT as
fulfilled or completed by the NT: it is here that the NT understanding of Messiah is read back into the OT. This then points to a hermeneutic in which both Testaments can be freely drawn from in order to construct an OT theology, as Heinisch has done. This conclusion is reinforced by taking into account Heinisch’s hermeneutics within his discussions of creation and life after death, where OT ideas are seen as continuous with the witness of the NT.

So in conclusion, our analysis supports the contention that Heinisch’s view of the relation between the Testaments was essentially a "progressive" one, in the sense that the religion of the OT was seen as perfected in the NT. Both Testaments were the building blocks of Heinisch’s OT theology. This was particularly evident in the citations of Matthew’s Gospel (his most commonly attested NT source) through all the sections of Heinisch’s book. In returning to the question of the OT as Christian Scripture, Heinisch’s answer to this question would depend upon which part of the OT was being spoken of. In speaking of God and the Messiah, the OT finds its full meaning in the NT; when speaking of creation and life after death, the ideas expressed within the OT are continuous with those in the NT; when speaking of human acts, the NT acts as a corrective to the ethical standards of the OT.

This had the effect, in the final reckoning, of making the OT a prolegomenon to the NT, a work marking Israel’s anticipation for her Messiah to arrive. One of the unfortunate effects of this reading, however, is Heinisch’s disparagement of Jewish hopes within God’s plan. The Messiah they had waited for had arrived in Jesus, and in their rejection of him, they separated themselves from God’s salvation. It is in this sense of the OT looking forward to the NT, and "conditioning the minds of men for Christ" that Heinisch’s book is a theology of development.

As was seen in the last chapter, most of Heinisch’s critics wrote of his book as "scholastic" and "dogmatic", and as forcing such categories upon the text of the OT. Given the time in which he wrote, this would have been difficult to avoid. The historical critical method had not then been officially approved for use in the Church (this was to happen three years after his book was published in German). Even so, his use of comparative ancient Near Eastern material was impressive, although his interaction with other scholarship remained limited.

So in answer to the question as to whether Heinisch regarded the OT as Christian Scripture, the answer is “yes”, as an anticipation of the life, mission, and salvation of Jesus.
THREE

PAUL VAN IMSCHOOT: CATHOLIC OT THEOLOGY IN TRANSITION

3.0 INTRODUCTION

The title of this chapter is suggested by two historical foci: the issuing of Pius XII's groundbreaking encyclical, Divino Afflante Spiritu (30 September, 1943), and the promulgation of Vatican II's Constitution upon Divine Revelation, Dei Verbum (18 November, 1965) The first authorised the use of historical-critical method within Catholic biblical scholarship, and the second recognised the method's utility, and enjoined its use among a growing guild of Catholic exeges.

Heinisch's book represented a time when the use of historical-critical method was regarded with some suspicion in Catholic circles, but van Imschoot's books come from a time where cautious acceptance of the method was growing. In short, Divino Afflante Spiritu had had an effect upon the way biblical scholarship was then being undertaken. But there were still those who were suspicious of the historical-critical method, or had spent their professional lives unaware of it. So the times in which van Imschoot wrote (the 1950s) were a time of transition within Catholic biblical scholarship. For this reason, his book marks a transition from one mindset to another. Just how van Imschoot bridged the divide is the subject of this chapter.

3.1 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The shock waves from conservative circles were considerable as Pius X's namesake, Pius XII, opened wide the window that Leo XIII had left slightly ajar. In his groundbreaking encyclical Divino Afflante Spiritu (30 September, 1943), Pius XII (reigned 1939-1958) reaffirmed and gave thanks for the work of his predecessors from Leo XIII onward.1 He confirmed the teaching that Leo had given upon inspiration:

1 Stephenson (319; DAS, 1.1-4; RSS, 81-87; OCT, 317-322) noted the absence of any reference to anti-Modernist literature; Benedict’s encyclical is recalled only in terms of its exhortation to the reading of Scripture.
This teaching which Our predecessor Leo XIII set forth with such solemnity, We also proclaim with Our authority and We urge all to adhere to it religiously. ²

Before the encyclical was promulgated, the Pontifical Biblical Commission had defended the Pontifical Biblical Institute against charges of exhibiting progressive tendencies in its programmes of study in a letter to the clergy of Italy (20 August, 1941). ³ A month before Divino Afflante Spiritu was enacted, the same body had defended the use of vernacular Bibles, translated from the original languages (as well as from the Vulgate); in addition, the consultation of the Scriptures in their original tongues was permitted in order to explicate liturgical readings (letter dated 22 August, 1943). ⁴ From the perspective of events at the beginning of the century, such a volte face was scarcely believable; was this not the same body that was responsible for the negative pronouncements of 1910-1915 upon critical matters?

While averring Leo's teaching upon inspiration, Pius extended it in a new direction. The human author rather than the divine author was now the focus of attention. Acknowledging Aquinas as the source of the doctrine of inspiration, Pius' exposition was along traditional lines, until here:

Let the interpreter then, with all care and without neglecting any light derived from recent research, endeavor to determine the peculiar character and circumstances of the sacred writer, the age in which he lived, the sources written or oral to which he had recourse and the forms of expression he employed. ⁵

Noting the advances in knowledge of archaeology, written documents, "languages,

---

² DAS, 1.4; RSS, 82; OCT, 318.

³ Stephenson (317 n. 102) lists the use of Greek and Hebrew texts over and against the Vulgate; the use of textual criticism; the study of ancient languages as the charges of one Dain Cohene (Dolindo Ruotolo) against the Institute: tendencies 'inimical to true Catholicism.' See also Pontifical Biblical Commission, "Letter to the Archbishops and Bishops of Italy (20 August, 1941)," in RSS, 138-147; OCT, 304-313.


⁵ DAS, 33; RSS, 97; OCT, 331.
letters, events, customs, and forms of worship of most ancient times. Pius noted the responsibility of interpreters this way:

With special zeal should they [interpreters] apply themselves, not only by expounding exclusively those matters which belong to the historical, archeological, philological and other auxiliary sciences ... they should set forth in particular the theological doctrine in faith and morals of the individual books or texts so that their exposition may not only aid the professors of theology in their explanations and proofs of the dogmas of faith, but may also be of assistance to priests in their presentation of Christian doctrine to the people, and in fine may help all the faithful to lead a life that is holy and worthy of a Christian.”

The exegete was also enjoined to take note of idiom and ancient speech forms to explicate the Scriptures; indeed “let him be convinced that this part of his office cannot be neglected without serious detriment to Catholic exegesis.”

While this encyclical was groundbreaking, and while Pius was instrumental in reversing the pre-critical stance of much Catholic exegesis, he did not do this alone. Pius's own influence is not enough to explain the change. It is the contention of both Robinson and Stephenson that individual scholars working behind the scenes (most notably Lagrange) were the ones who helped turned the tide. Robinson gives a brief account of the modus operandi of Lagrange; what follows here is based largely on his work.

---

6 DAS, 11; RSS, 88; OCT, 323.

7 DAS, 24; RSS, 93; OCT, 328. For a negative opinion on the use of Scripture in the manuals of dogmatic theology, see Edward Siegman, “The Use of Sacred Scripture in Textbooks of Dogmatic Theology,” CBQ 11 (1949) 151-164.

8 DAS, 38; RSS, 99; OCT, 333.


10 Robinson, 19-23; Stephenson, 316.
Lagrange, in his life and scholarly work, never doubted the authority of the Church in deciding what was acceptable in regard to interpretive method, and this submission to authority may have helped to give the critical method a hearing. Following the themes of inspiration and inerrancy, Lagrange found a way out of the critical impasse by (ironically) turning to Aquinas, as Leo had done.

In Aquinas, only propositional statements are subject to claims of truth or falsity.\(^\text{11}\) So, Lagrange argued firstly, if the author was not making such statements, the text is neutral. It follows, then, that since the Bible is not entirely made up of propositional statements, not all of it needs to be spoken of in terms of truth or falsity (or inerrancy). The intention of the sacred author must then take pride of place in the exegetical task, so as to distinguish propositional statements from those which are not.\(^\text{12}\)

The way that Lagrange dealt with authorial intent was to discuss it in terms of genre. Lagrange noted the existence of genres other than that of historical proposition: “[e]ach must be interpreted according to its rules.”\(^\text{13}\) Therefore to merge all of the Scriptures into the category of historical proposition was to miss the intent of an author, if the particular passage under discussion was not of that genre.

Lagrange's major contribution, however, was to take the focus away from the divine author and to place it with the human author. Robinson sums it up in this way;

> The emphasis fell on what the author intended to say, in which could be found the inspired testimony to divine revelation. In determining what the author intended, criticism could be of much practical use in specifying the genre used, the circumstances in which the author wrote, the situation addressed. In all cases the interpretive task was to determine what the author had put into the text.\(^\text{14}\)


\(^\text{12}\) Schroeder, 211.


\(^\text{14}\) Robinson, 22.
Given this discussion of Lagrange's conclusions, it is not difficult to see the similarities between his work and the language of the encyclical.15

It is true that in a cautionary note within his later encyclical, *Humani Generis* (12 August, 1950), Pius attacked what he saw as "false tendencies" within the ranks of those with teaching responsibility. While the brunt of his invective was unleashed upon philosophers and systematic theologians, Pius had a message to biblical scholars as well, concerning revelation.16 What is undeniable, nonetheless, is that during Pius XII’s pontificate, the cloud of suspicion under which critical scholars had worked for half a century had finally begun to lift. But the attacks of conservative American and Italian theologians, and Roman officials (who had not been trained in historical critical method and who equated it with Modernism) against biblical criticism (and new movements in theology generally) gathered momentum during the 1950s. The proponents of "Nouvelle Théologie" (Yves Congar, Marie-Dominique Chenu, and Henri de Lubac) were deprived of their teaching posts in France, and in the United States, John Courtney Murray was advised to desist from writing upon matters of religious liberty and Church/State relations in 1955.17 These "battles" came to a head during Vatican II, and were settled there, but these matters will be dealt with in the next chapter.

Nonetheless, the conservative reaction was held in check, at least while Pius was alive. An important step in "freeing" scholars yet further was the letter of the Secretary of the

15 Gerald Fogarty argued in his book *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship: A History from the Early Republic to Vatican II*, San Francisco: Harper & Row 1989: 235 - hereafter cited as Fogarty, *American ...*) that one of the scholars who was instrumental in spearheading the theological paradigm shift concerning inspiration was the German Jesuit, Augustin Bea (1882–1968) rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute (1930–1949). He was also, according to Fogarty, one of the drafters of DAS.

16 Pius attacked unnamed scholars for ignoring the relations between tradition, faith, and the text in the interpretive process. He also noted that there were people reviving the old idea of the inspiration of only the passages in Scripture concerning faith and morals. Pius also attacked those who practice an exegesis known as "symbolic" or "spiritual"; where the books of the Old Testament "a sealed fountain until now ... will at last yield their message to us all." (Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, [Australian Catholic Truth Society #471] tr. Ronald Knox, Melbourne: Australian Catholic Truth Society 1951: 12-13 [hereafter cited as HG]). Finally, the spectre of inspiration shows itself again. Pius warned scholars not to interpret Genesis 1-11 too freely; bearing in mind its provenance. (HG, 22-23 see J. de Fraigne, "L'Encyclique "Humani Generis" et les erreurs concernant la Sainte Écriture," *ScEccl* 5 (1953) 7-28, for an alternative view).

17 Ironically, both Congar and de Lubac became cardinals after Vatican II (Fogarty, *American ..., 259-260*).
Pontifical Biblical Commission [Athanasius Miller] liberating Catholic scholars "from the binding effects of the Commission's decrees issued in 1905-15." Arguing that the climate in which the decrees were issued no longer existed, Miller wrote:

As long as these decrees propose views that are neither immediately or mediatly concerned with truths of faith and morals, the interpreter of Sacred Scripture can pursue his scientific investigations and accept the results of these investigations, provided always that he respects the teaching authority of the Church." 18

It will be part of this chapter's task to determine how "free" van Imschoot felt with regard to historical critical method, and whether Divino Afflante Spiritu marked a turning point for the writing of OT theology within Catholicism.

3.2 PAUL VAN IMSCHOOT: A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Born on 17 September, 1889 in Ghent, Belgium, van Imschoot entered the local seminary after a Jesuit education, in 1905. Two years later he entered the Gregorian University in Rome, graduating with doctorates in philosophy and theology in 1914. After studying Coptic and Hebrew, van Imschoot began teaching the exegesis of both Testaments in 1919 at his alma mater in Ghent. He became a chaplain in 1948, and retired in 1963.19 Van Imschoot’s publications largely concerned the field of biblical theology, and so his OT theology, is, in some sense, a summation of his entire scholarly output.20

Brown (136, 136 n.4) noted that "[v]ery little of the material in the 1905-15 decrees had any connection with truths of faith or morals." The letter is discussed by Edward Siegman, ("The Decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission: A Recent Clarification," CBQ 18 [1956] 23-29). Siegman's balanced view of conservatism is well worth noting: "If conservatism in biblical scholarship means clinging doggedly to traditional positions, however convincing the contrary evidence, it can be only stagnation. If, however, conservatism means a reluctance to forsake these positions until the evidence is in, until the atmosphere is sufficiently cleared so that the scholar can see the cogency of the contrary position, then it represents a wholesome current that promotes progress in truth." (Siegman, 29).


This list of his works has been gleaned from the bibliographies and footnotes within his OT theology: "De adoratione in spiritu et veritate," CollGand (1939) 265ff; "De creatioe hominis in Gn. 2, 7," CollGand 30 (1947) 223-227; "De libri Sapientiae scriptore. De loco et tempore compositionis libri Sapientiae," CollGand 20 (1933) 117-121. 181-183; "De oraculo Isaiae 2, 2-5," CollGand 18 (1931) 149-152; "De serpente tentatore," CollGand 31 (1948) 5-10; "L’action de l’esprit...
3.3 THE QUESTION TO BE ADDRESSED

Comparing the works of van Imschoot and Heinisch in terms of one-to-one thematic correspondence is problematic. For van Imschoot's work is incomplete, making a thoroughgoing thematic comparison impossible. For example, in Heinisch's case, we saw that a major barometer for gauging his views upon the OT as Christian Scripture lay in his treatment of messianism. However in van Imschoot's books, there is no treatment of messianism; this is due to the fact that messianism was to comprise part of van Imschoot's projected (but unpublished) third volume upon "Salvation and Judgment."21

We noted in the previous chapter how Heinisch's views upon the relation of the Testaments and upon the OT as Christian Scripture were particularly evident in his analysis of OT morality, and what he described as the preparation for the doctrine of the Trinity. It was argued that Heinisch saw the OT as Christian Scripture in a developmental sense: the OT is an anticipation of the life, mission, and salvation of Jesus for all Christians. The crucial questions here are: did van Imschoot answer this question in the same fashion? Did the more widespread acceptance of the historical-critical method make any difference here? What did van Imschoot make of OT morality, and did he see the doctrine of the Trinity as "prepared for" in the OT? This chapter will endeavour to answer these questions.

After the style of the previous chapter, a statistical comparison of van Imschoot's use of the NT (to that of Heinisch) will be offered. The object of this exercise is not merely
to count citations and infer reasons for any difference, but to prepare for a study of
the way that the texts are used. Is the assumption of the NT being a development or
fulfilment of OT ideas valid for van Imschoot? Does the OT need the NT to be fully
understood in van Imschoot's eyes? Again, this chapter will attempt an answer to these
questions.

3.4 AN OVERVIEW OF VAN IMSCHOOT'S WORK

Before any detailed work upon any of these questions is undertaken, it is in order that a
brief overview of van Imschoot's books be furnished. It needs to be recalled at this
juncture that van Imschoot's planned three-volume opus is incomplete, with the third
volume unpublished. Before doing so, however, we might pause to compare van
Imschoot's work in its totality with that of Heinisch.

We have already seen that Paul Heinisch had seen the revelation of God to Israel as a
preparation for the Incarnation, which became the lens through which development in
doctrine could be seen. In his “Preface” to van Imschoot's first volume, Lucien
Cerfaut seemed to suggest that a developmental OT theology (such as that of Heinisch)
is both appropriate and desirable:

The theology of the Old Testament, while adhering methodically
to what is stable and capable of further growth in the religion
of the chosen people and while describing the constants of
revelation, cannot fail to suggest in the course of its expositions
the unity and harmony of the two Testaments. 22

In his introductory chapter (“Object, Method and Division of the Theology of the Old
Testament”), van Imschoot adopts the same position:

More than this, while paying scrupulous respect to the
special characteristics of the Old Testament, biblical theology
will bring about a synthesis of the doctrines of the Old
Testament with a view towards the new revelation,
since the new crowns the old and testifies to the final
pattern God was following in the old economy and
throughout the vicissitudes of Israel's religion. 23

22 Theology...God, IX.
23 Theology...God, 3.
At the outset, then, van Imschoot claims to be employing a similar view of the relation of the Testaments to that found in the work of Heinisch.

When we come to the structure of van Imschoot’s work, we find other similarities to that of Heinisch. For example, van Imschoot espoused the same systematic "God, Man, Salvation" schema for his work that Heinisch had used; hence the titles of his books. He justified his usage in these words:

> Without doing violence to Israelite thought, it is permissible to disengage and to group these ideas in order to unite them into a synthesis, which, while respecting the originality of each author and the differences which at times separate them, highlights both the basic unity of the revelation, that was entrusted to the chosen people and set down in their sacred books, and its continuity with the revelation of the New Testament for which it was the preparation.24

The language in the above citation makes an important point: the schema that van Imschoot had chosen for his OT theology was understood by him to have attendant dangers. The schema could be used to distort Israelite thought by ignoring the context of the biblical writers, and the "individuality" which they brought to their work. One consequence of this is a theology where one text is as good as any other when used to construct an argument or to make a point. Verbal similarity, for example, could be one criterion for associating texts, which, if shorn of their context, can be made to say whatever the modern author wishes. This form of reading places the whole Bible upon the level of proposition, irrespective of genre, time and occasion of writing, and other historical-critical concerns. Van Imschoot seems to have been aware of these dangers when he wrote:

> Since the old revelation, as it is recorded in the sacred books, is the object of Old Testament theology, the latter must take into account the historic context and the various stages marked by the heralds of the divine word who succeeded one another from Abraham to the Precursor. To fail to do this would be to lose perspective and to falsify the thought of the inspired authors. 25

So van Imschoot was aware of the potential dangers involved in using this schema.

---

24 *Theology...God*, 4.

25 *Theology...God*, 3.
However, he justified his use of this schema in these words:

> Because the Old Testament has preserved divine revelation just as it was given, that is in a successive and fragmentary form, and has made no effort to present a systematic report nor an ordered plan, some pattern must therefore be introduced that will permit the logical arrangement of doctrines. At the same time no violence must be done to the structure of Israelite thought in order to adapt it to requirements of a more advanced theology. 26

We turn now to the contents of his work. Van Imschoot's first chapter was entitled "God Considered in Himself".27 Though he followed the dictates of his systematic schema in presenting the material (e.g. "Anthropomorphisms", "God's personal character", "The One God", etc.), van Imschoot began with an exposition upon the various names of God, with considerable linguistic skill. He traced the origins and occurrences of such divine names as El, Eloah, Yahweh Seba'oth in both Israelite and ancient Near Eastern usage, showing to impressive effect his familiarity with both the ancient Near Eastern background and the literature about it. Following this he moved on to the attributes of God, both metaphysical and moral, using a chronological approach to these subjects in order to show how these concepts developed. His second chapter concerned "God and the World".28 In keeping with the preceding chapter, van Imschoot began with a study of creation and cosmology in Israel and her neighbours. He then followed this (after a short discussion of the conservation and government of the world) with a "chronological" study of angelology and demonology which took up the rest of the chapter. "Revelation" represents the third chapter of van Imschoot's first volume, and the largest chapter in this book.29 A major part of this chapter is given over to the study of prophetism, with sections also upon the spirit, word, face, and glory of God, using the same methodology as before. The idea of covenant is the major focus of the last chapter of van Imschoot's first book; entitled "God and His People".30 This idea is traced through the historical books and through the prophets, but with only

---

26  *Theology...God*, 4-5.
27  *Theology...God*, 6-85.
28  *Theology...God*, 86-133.
29  *Theology...God*, 134-223.
30  *Theology...God*, 224-255.
a passing nod to ancient Near Eastern background. The chapter (and first volume) concludes with a short excursus upon divine election.

Van Imschoot's second book (which remains in French) concerns the relations between God and humanity. 31 This book is dominated by a very large chapter concentrating upon human duties toward God and fellow Israelites, which includes the cultus and codes of morality. The initial chapter in this volume concerned the origin and nature of humanity (Origine et nature de l'homme.) In it, van Imschoot considered the Hebrew terms for flesh, breath, and spirit, and argued that a trichotomous view of humanity was not contained in the OT, a synthetic view being more likely in his opinion. The second chapter concerned the life and destiny of humanity (La vie et la destinée de l'homme). This is where van Imschoot discussed life, death, and resurrection, as well as the cult of the dead. The third chapter is the large chapter mentioned earlier; detailed discussion of its contents will be undertaken in the next section. The fourth and final chapter of van Imschoot's second volume dealt with sin: its nature, universality, and remission.

The remainder of this chapter will be concerned with two major tasks; the first is to establish a comparison between Heinisch and van Imschoot by addressing issues raised by Heinisch's volume; the second is to establish how and why van Imschoot's volumes are different from Heinisch. The effect of Divino Afflante Spiritu (which was issued after Heinisch's book was published in German), the level of interaction with contemporary scholarship, and some reflections upon hermeneutics will be among the matters discussed.

As Heinisch had employed a hermeneutic which saw both Testaments as interpreting each other, his use of the NT was crucially important in establishing his view of the OT as Christian Scripture. Therefore our first point of comparison between the two scholars will be their use of the NT.

3.5 VAN IMSCHOOT AND THE USE OF THE NT

The use of the NT within Heinisch and van Imschoot is tabulated below. As was the

31 Paul van Imschoot, Théologie de l'Ancien Testament Tome II: L'Homme, Tournai: Desclée et Cie 1956 [hereafter cited as Theology...Man]
case in the last chapter, the column of figures to the left represent the number of citations within each tradition of biblical material, whereas those on the right represent the approximate percentage of the total that each tradition contributed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NT material</th>
<th>Heinisch</th>
<th>van Imschoot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gospels</td>
<td>225 [67.6]</td>
<td>107 [55.2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>33 [9.9]</td>
<td>41 [21.1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Epistles</td>
<td>1 [0.3]</td>
<td>2 [1.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Epistles</td>
<td>5 [1.5]</td>
<td>3 [1.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>27 [8.1]</td>
<td>4 [2.1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalypse</td>
<td>5 [1.5]</td>
<td>16 [8.2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>333 [100]</td>
<td>194 [99.9]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8. A comparative table of the NT usage of Heinisch and van Imschoot.**

For both authors, the Gospels take up the lion's share of the references (Heinisch 67.6%, van Imschoot 55.2%). When the Gospel citations of both authors are compared, as in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOSPEL</th>
<th>Heinisch</th>
<th>van Imschoot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>118 [52.4]</td>
<td>46 [43.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>9 [4.0]</td>
<td>27 [25.2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>225 [99.9]</td>
<td>107 [100.0]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9. A comparative table of the use of the Gospels by Heinisch and van Imschoot.**

We find that Matthew's Gospel has the pre-eminent place in van Imschoot's NT citations that it did in Heinisch. This raises the question of hermeneutics: if a similar frequency of NT citations is found within both authors, does this then point to the same or similar hermeneutical assumptions in both authors?

Of course, the frequency of citation is not decisive evidence *in itself*. What is also
needed is a sense of how and where the citations are used, and what this tells us about the assumptions governing their use. The first stage in the process is complete: we have discovered Matthew's Gospel to be the most commonly cited NT authority for both authors. This then furnishes a basis for comparison: what needs to be established is a context for the Matthaean citations within van Imschoot. To this end, the table below charts the use of Matthew's Gospel within the chapters of van Imschoot's books, in order to establish the most useful parts for study. These parts will then be compared with the equivalent sections in Heinisch, so as to document any hermeneutical differences, or changes in argumentation.

The Gospel of Matthew appears in van Imschoot's books as in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God in Himself</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God &amp; The World</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God &amp; His People (^{32})</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Nature &amp; Origins</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Life &amp; Destiny</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Duty</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10. The use of Matthew's Gospel by van Imschoot - listed by chapter.**

At first glance, the chapter with by far the most Matthaean citations is that upon Human Duty (*Les devoirs de l'homme*). This is by far the longest chapter in van Imschoot's books (at a little under two hundred pages in French), which may be the reason for the number of citations. We will examine van Imschoot's use of the NT by noting an example from each chapter, so as to ascertain whether he is consistent in his hermeneutic. When that has been done, we will be in a position to compare van Imschoot with Heinisch.

The single example of Matthaean usage within van Imschoot's first chapter lies within his discussion of "God's personal character." Van Imschoot was concluding his

---

\(^{32}\) This chapter marks the end of van Imschoot's first volume. For the sake of continuity, the chapter headings for his second volume have been translated from the French.
discussion of the expression "the living God" when he wrote:

Later, "the living God" that is to say, the only God, Yahweh, is often placed in opposition to the gods of the peoples (Jer 10: 1-10; Dn 14: 4.5,24,25. V) who are only "dead gods" (Ep. Jer 26.70), "powerless gods" (Is 44: 18; Ps 135: 15-17), lacking all life (Wis 15: 17). It is mostly in this sense that the expression survives in Judaism and in the New Testament (for example, Mt 16: 16). 33

At first glance, van Imschoot appears to be working under the same hermeneutic as Heinisch, in using the Matthaean text as he did any other biblical text: in other words, it might seem that the Bible was all of a piece to him. It will be argued that van Imschoot's approach is rather more nuanced than this: van Imschoot is treating the Matthaean text here as an example of the continuation of an OT concept within the NT. There is no hint of any "fulfilment" language here: note that the NT text is not being used to give a fuller understanding of the OT idea. In other words, the NT is continuous with the OT, but not needed to gain a full understanding of the OT.

Matthew's Gospel is employed within van Imschoot's second chapter in his discussion of "Angels and Devils." In these examples, van Imschoot seems to be employing a developmental view of the relation between the Testaments; here he is discussing the idea of the faithful being protected by Yahweh's angels (see Psalm 91: 11-12):

In recent Judaism, and in the New Testament it develops into a belief in guardian angels (Test. Jos. 6; Targ. Ps. Jon on Gn 33: 10; 48: 16; Acts 12: 15ff.; Mt 18: 10). 34

The same may be said of his discussion of demons:

The book of Isaiah (13: 21; 34: 14) mentions in poetical descriptions demons who, according to popular belief (Lv 16: 22; Bar 4: 33; Tb 8: 3; Mt 12: 43), haunt desert places and ruins... 35

In the first instance, van Imschoot is noting a development of an OT tradition within the

---

33 Theology...God, 30.
34 Theology...God, 117 n. 32.
35 Theology...God, 124.
NT, and in the second, he is noting the continuance of an OT belief in the NT. This
would tend to confirm the impression given in his first chapter that the NT's teaching
can be seen as a development of that of the OT, and also marks out van Imschoot as
having a similar view of the relation of the Testaments to that of Heinisch. 36

Van Imschoot's third chapter (upon "God and His People") used the same kind of
rhetoric that Heinisch had used in his undervaluing of Jewish tradition in the light of
the Incarnation. In speaking of Israel's election, van Imschoot had this to say:

These two traditions [election of Israel under Moses, and
election in patriarchal time] have been united by Deuteronomy,
the prophets of the exile, and the Sacerdotal code into a doctrinal
synthesis... a synthesis in which the election of Abraham and of
his posterity finally surpasses Israel's election by the events
associated with the Exodus; as a result the belief in the divine
election came to be expressed by the proud formula of the Jews:
"We are of the seed of Abraham" (Jn 8: 33.39; Mt 3: 9; Rom 2:
28.29; 4:12) 37

Further on, he remarks:

The Jews, furthermore, forgot that the divine election was
addressed to the nation, not to the individuals; they interpreted
the love and promises of Yahweh toward their ancestors... as a
blind partiality and trusted too much in the merits of their father,
so that eventually they believed that the sole fact of belonging to
the race of Abraham would assure the salvation of their descendants
(cf. Mt 3: 9). Against this deformation of the doctrine of election
rose up John the Baptist (Mt 3: 7ff.), and Jesus (Jn 8: 33ff.), and
St. Paul (Rom 2 17ff.: 4: 9 ff., etc.). 38

To be sure, van Imschoot does not cast the Jewish nation adrift from God's plan as did
Heinisch, but his hermeneutic here is similar. This case presents an example of the NT
"correcting" a tendency (in this case, religious exclusivism) within the OT.

Now we move to van Imschoot's second volume. The initial chapter of van Imschoot's
second volume also suggests a hermeneutic of continuity in its Matthean citation:

L'auteur de Sap. dépasse de peu l'idée du psalmiste (Ps.,

36 Theology...God, 165.
37 Theology...God, 247.
38 Theology...God, 255.
78, 39): Dieu pardonne le péché, se souvenant que les hommes sont chair (cf. Gen., 6, 3; 8, 21); il la précise cependant, en attribuant la faiblesse de l'homme au corps, comme le dira le Nouveau Testament: "l'esprit est prompt, mais la chair est faible" (Mc., 14, 38; Mt., 26, 41). 39

The second chapter does the same, this time van Imschoot is discussing resurrection and the "day of Yahweh":

Il en est de même des récits d'assomption d'Enoch (Gen., 5, 21-24; cf. Eccli., 44, 16; 49, 14) et d'Élie (II Reg., 2, 1-11; cf. Eccli., 48, 9), puisque ni l'un ni l'autre ne sont morts: pour Élie, il n'y a aucun doute: il fut, suivant le récit de II Reg., 2, 11, enlevé vivant dans un char de feu ou un tourbillon (v.1), au ciel, d'où l'on attendait son retour sur la terre "au jour de Yahweh" (Mal., 3, 23 suiv.; Eccli., 48, 10 suiv.) (cf. Mt., 11, 14; 17, 10 suiv.; Mc., 9, 11 suiv.). 40

Van Imschoot is more explicit concerning a developmental hermeneutic in the third (and by far the longest) chapter in his second volume, that on "Human Duties." In his discussion of prayers and vows, van Imschoot made this statement:

... les pieux Israélites qui s'en servent contre leurs ennemis, font, en somme, appel à la vengeance de Yahweh contre leurs injustes agresseurs et oppresseurs. Il reste, sans doute, que l'esprit de vindicte n'est pas conforme à la loi de perfection exigée par le Christ (cf. Mt., 5, 38 suiv., 43 suiv.); mais si dans l'Ancien Testament, la haine des ennemis est déjà défendue ... elle était cependant considérée par les Israélites comme un sentiment normale... 41

In other words, van Imschoot was reading these texts through the lens of the Sermon on the Mount, and finding them wanting by comparison. There are other instances within this chapter (particularly in reference to the Sabbath) where van Imschoot mentions Jewish traditions that have been taken over by the Christian church, but his tone there is not one which devalues Jewish tradition.42

39 Theology...Man, 15-16.

40 The point is reinforced three pages later, when van Imschoot noted the transfer of the language of the Jewish apocalyptic tradition: those blessed on earth are transported to heaven and are blessed there in the NT (see Matthew 13: 43) (Theology...Man, 65).

41 Theology...Man, 170.

42 See, for example, Theology...Man, 197 and 201.
Space precludes an examination of all the Matthean references in this chapter, so we will conclude the analysis of this chapter with one more example. This example, taken from the last page of the chapter, expresses very well what we have been saying about van Imschoot's hermeneutics: he assumes that the OT is the first stage of God's progressive revelation to humanity. He is here speaking about sexual morality:

Si la morale sexuelle est plus exigeante que celle des autres peuples de l'Orient ancien, elle reste à un niveau notablement inférieur à celle du Nouveau Testament... le Dieu d'Israël accommoda ses exigences à <<la dureté de leurs coeurs>> (Mc., 10, 5; Mt., 19, 8), c'est-à-dire aux possibilités morales de son peuple. Ce principe s'applique à autres points de la doctrine de l'Ancien Testament. Pour juger équitablement celle-ci, il est indispensable de se souvenir qu'il est une révélation progressive en marche vers son achèvement définitif, que lui conféra le Verbe incarné, qui est et apporta <<la vérité.>>

To conclude this survey of Matthaean references within van Imschoot's books, we may note several points of similarity between the hermeneutics of Heinisch and van Imschoot. The most obvious similarity, of course, is that Matthew's Gospel is the predominant NT tradition drawn upon by both authors. The second is the shared assumption that the OT is part of God's progressive revelation to humanity. We have seen in both authors how the NT has been seen as in continuity with or as a development of the OT, and how OT traditions have been seen (sometimes unfavourably) through the eyes of the NT. In effect, both Heinisch and van Imschoot employed the same hermeneutical assumptions to their respective OT theologies.

We next turn to another issue raised in the previous chapter: that of a critique of OT morality. This has been discussed in relation to the issue of sexual morality; here we will focus upon a brief comparison of our two scholars upon one issue raised earlier (that of herem).

---

43 The third occurrence of Matthew's Gospel concerned the adaptation of God's promises to the moral standard and intellect of the "Hebrews." (Theology...Man, 277). Jesus' statement on divorce (Mt 19: 8) was used to illustrate this. (Theology...God, 165).
3.5.1 Van Imschoot and OT Morality

It was noted in the last chapter that Matthew's Gospel was used liberally in Heinisch's discussion of "A Critique of Old Testament Morality." It was further explained that Heinisch thought the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount to be superior to that of the "lex talionis." He took the example of herem to make the point. Heinisch argued that as the chosen people of Yahweh, Israel was constantly on guard against assimilation (in terms of religion and jurisprudence) with neighbouring peoples (this is particularly so in the case of the Canaanites and Amalekites). So Israel saw herself as enjoined to utterly destroy her enemies in order to eliminate any possibility of this happening. Heinisch had had this to say upon the matter: "Old Testament passages which wish evil upon others whether it be just punishment or not, mirror the imperfection of the Old Law and the maxim, 'Eye for eye, tooth for tooth.'" How does this compare with van Imschoot's treatment of herem?

Van Imschoot began with a lexical note:

Le mot hêrem que l'on traduit d'ordinaire par anathème, est dérivé de la racine verbale hrm, qui a un sens très complexe, en Arabe haram signifie ce qui est tabou (interdit), soit parce qu'il est particulièrement sacré...

He continued this analysis to show how the term had a double meaning: the destruction of that which is regarded as abominable, and to see God as sacred. He was therefore obeying the precepts of Divino Afflante Spiritu in his attention to the original language and to parallels in the ancient Near Eastern background.

He agreed with Heinisch in his analysis of the practice of herem, further denoting it as a religious duty. He also noted:

il n'a jamais été une règle absolue et habituelle, puisque ni la population, ni beaucoup de villes canaanites n'ont disparu totalement après l'occupation de la Palestine.

---

44 See Exodus 23: 23-33; 34: 11-16; Leviticus 26: 1; Numbers 33: 50-56; Deuteronomy 7: 1-5; 12: 2-3; 20: 11-18; Heinisch, 14, 14 n. 46).
45 Heinisch, 218.
46 Theology...Man, 146.
47 Theology...Man, 147.
What is interesting here is that there is no reference whatever to the NT in his treatment of this practice; he merely stated the development of the concept within the OT, and made no comment as to its acceptability.

3.5.2 Van Imschoot and the Preparation for the Doctrine of the Trinity

It was argued in the previous chapter that one of the places where Heinisch's views upon the OT as Scripture were most prominent was the section of his book entitled "The Preparation for the Holy Trinity." In brief, while Heinisch did not read NT ideas into those OT texts, he saw the OT passages as being fully understood only in the light of the NT. It now remains to be seen how van Imschoot treated these ideas in his works, and to see whether his hermeneutic was different to that of Heinisch.

3.5.2.1 Van Imschoot on Wisdom

Van Imschoot took a position upon the personification of wisdom that reflects the spirit of Divino Afflante Spiritu, where Pius XII spoke of the importance of literary form:

Lest we misinterpret their [the Wisdom writers] thoughts, we must keep in mind at the same time the general context, the essentially practical purpose of their writings and the poetic character of their descriptions, where highly colored images and picturesque traits abound. 49

This discussion takes place in the context of a section in van Imschoot's book entitled "Hypostases". Towards the end of this section, van Imschoot, while affirming the

48 Heinisch, 102-127.
49 Theology...God. 215.
50 This forms the last section of van Imschoot's treatment of revelation (Theology...God, 212-223). He begins this section with a discussion of hypostasis as it has been understood in Catholic and Protestant circles. He wrote: "For the greater number of Catholic authors, as also for Scholastic theologians, hypostasis is synonymous with person, that is to say, according to the classical definition, a rationale suppositum, an individual substance of rational nature. On the contrary, some Catholic and Protestant critics speak of hypostasis where the term 'person' would seem misplaced to them. Hypostases, according to their opinion are 'more or less hybrid beings,' halfway between a personification and a person. They are the creations of a still puerile spirit, incapable of arriving at a complete abstraction." (footnote reference to B. Botte, "La Sagesse dans les livres sapientaux," RSPT
continuity between the Testaments, (as Heinisch had done) also affirmed Heinisch's views when he wrote:

Now, in the literal sense, which is the one which the sacred writers perceived and wished to convey to their Jewish readers, the wisdom, the word, etc., are nowhere real divine persons, nor entities on the way to becoming persons; these entities, who in God as well as in man are conceived as concrete and active, present themselves in certain passages as simple personifications, more or less alive and picturesque, but always conscious. 51

There is, however, an important difference between the two writers. As noted earlier, Heinisch saw the OT personifications of the Word, the Spirit, and Wisdom as precursors to the doctrine of the Trinity, in that the NT and later theological tradition shed new light upon what the OT writers had written. In the case of van Imschoot, such language was generally eschewed. There are practically no examples of NT fulfilment language within van Imschoot's discussions of word, spirit, and wisdom.52

To further illustrate the point, van Imschoot's discussion of wisdom will be examined, in concert with an examination of Heinisch's treatment of the same topic.

Van Imschoot began by noting the type of biblical argument used by those who suggested that

in the books of Job (28) and of Baruch (3: 9 - 4: 4) wisdom is only a simple personification of a divine attribute (Jb 29: 12. 20; Bar 3: 15); but [that] afterwards wisdom develops into a hypostasis. For some wisdom is already a hypostasis in Proverbs 8, for others in Ecclesiasticus, for others finally in the book of Wisdom. 53

---

51 Van Imschoot had earlier said (Theology...God, 214) that 'the Hebrews' were 'less inclined to abstractions.' This is because something that we would call an abstract concept (e.g power) was seen by them as a concrete substance, bound to a 'material substratum'. Therefore there was for 'the Hebrews' no distinction between the concrete substance and its substratum, in terms of action. Van Imschoot could then write: "This manner of speaking does not imply a proper personification, although these entities are conceived as efficient and active, just as there is no personification when we say that fire 'gives' heat or that lightning 'strikes.'" (Theology...God, 222).

52 One exception to this may be noted. In his discussion of the spirit of Yahweh, van Imschoot made the following comment: "Because the spirit is holy, it cannot come into contact with what is stained (cf. Ps 51: 13). It does not transform the sinner into a saint, as the spirit promised by Ezechiel and described by St. Paul (for example 1 Cor 6: 11; Ti 3: 5)." Theology...God, 180-181.

53 Theology...God, 215. Heinisch, in a section entitled "Wisdom as Self-Existent", argued the point in this way: "Three stages may be distinguished in the development of the wisdom idea. In Job 28 and Bar. 3:9-4:4 wisdom is still a thing; in Prov. 1-8 and Sirach it is presented as a person, and this
By way of contrast, the only mention of the book of Job in van Imschoot's treatment of wisdom is as a text speaking of wisdom's essential inaccessibility to humans; this is to be found within his discussion of Sirach (see Sirach 1: 1-10). This inaccessibility is also present within the book of Baruch (Baruch 3: 29-38), where, in agreement with Heinisch, van Imschoot noted the identification of wisdom with the Law (Baruch 4: 1-2; see also Sirach 24: 23-24). The identification of wisdom with the Law militated against wisdom being considered as a divine person in van Imschoot's opinion. 54

Moreover, van Imschoot stated that wisdom is not a person within the book of Proverbs, any more than wisdom's literary nemesis, Dame Folly, is so. The author of the book of Proverbs, when referring to the creation and activity of wisdom (Proverbs 8: 22-36):

represents wisdom as formed by God before all creatures, playing before Him when He established the heavens and separated from the earth the waters (Prv 8: 22-31), he thinks of the divine attribute which manifests itself in the order and beauty of the divine work (cf. Prv 3: 19.20; Ps 104: 24; Sir 1: 8-10), and exalts the divine origin (cf. Prv 2: 6) and the antiquity of the moral teachings of which he is the depositary and which he communicates to his disciples (Prv 3: 32-36); he does not intend to open up new perspectives on the intimate nature of the divinity. Here divine wisdom is poetically personified and nothing more. 55

Van Imschoot said that the purpose of the sapiental tradition was practical, moral exhortation, which therefore characterised its writers as poetic moralists. Further to this, philosophical speculation upon the divine nature was therefore not the wisdom authors' primary concern. 56 This, however, does not deny that these authors used figurative, metaphorical language; it merely means that the context into which these authors wrote was more concerned with behaviour before God than with how God interacted with the world. This use of historical critical insight by van Imschoot marked a significant difference between his books and the work of Heinisch. Heinisch had

tendency becomes more pronounced in the Book of Wisdom. Wisdom itself, however, always remains intimately united to God in a most mysterious manner." Heinisch, 107.

54 Theology...God, 217.
55 Theology...God, 216.
56 Theology...God, 215.
adverted to the poetic, metaphorical language of this tradition, but, it will be recalled, did not hint at its purpose.

Van Imschoot agreed with Heinisch that the personification of wisdom is further advanced within the book of Wisdom, saying:

She appears as distinct from God, since she emanates from Him and forms His reflection and His image (7: 25-26); she occupies a throne next to the one of God (9: 4), and the glory of her birth merits for her the honor to live in God’s intimacy like a bride (8: 3).57

But wisdom could not be a truly divine person, argued van Imschoot, for how could an emanation of God be God’s bride, or wisdom a goddess in Israelite thought? Again, the author of the book of Wisdom is speaking in metaphors, but with a practical intent:

His aim is not to speculate on the intimate life of God or on God’s action in the world; it is, as in the books of the Proverbs and of Ecclesiasticus, essentially practical: to teach wisdom which he receives from God, a wisdom which has her origin in God and... is manifested in the creation and government of the world (7: 22 - 8: 1).58

Van Imschoot therefore concluded, that in their context, the sapiential writers’ descriptions of wisdom as a person were prosopopoeic.59

Heinisch and van Imschoot are therefore in significant accord in denying that Wisdom was any more than a literary personification within the OT. While they have both used an organizational principle for their OT theologies that was drawn from dogmatic/systematic theology, neither of them have spoken of Wisdom as a person in

57 Theology...God, 217.
58 Heinisch had said, of course, that there was no evidence of prayer being offered to wisdom as though wisdom were a person. (Heinisch, 111; Theology...God, 218).
59 “If a divine origin is attributed to wisdom, it is because in all sapiential collections the wisdom of the wise is considered as a gift of God (Prv 2: 6-7; Eccl 2: 26; Ps 32: 8...) in whom ‘reside wisdom and power,’ with whom ‘are counsel and understanding’ (Jb 12: 13; Sir 1: 8). God possesses her fully (Jb 21: 22; Is 31: 2; 40: 13) and manifests her in His works (Jb 28; Ps 104: 24...). Since divine wisdom appears in the world as created by God, and is communicated to the wise, she is represented as detachable from God and as capable of acting apart from Him; and, if one writes as a poet - which is the case of all the texts concerned - one makes her appear as a person. But this is nothing more than a figure of speech, which the context forbids understanding in the proper sense.” (Theology...God, 218-219).
the scholastic sense of the term (a rational being) but as a literary personification.  

Where Heinisch and van Imschoot differed slightly was in the application of the term wisdom in the NT. Heinisch claimed that the OT sapiential writers developed the concept of wisdom, for which Jesus was the fulfilment. Van Imschoot largely eschewed such "fulfilment language" in his treatment. His noting that Judaism's radical monotheism would have debarred any worship being given to any personification of divine attributes is in accord with Heinisch. However, his eschewal of fulfilment language, lack of reference to trinitarian doctrine, and his tracing of OT ideas within the OT alone (and not carrying them forward into the NT) mark a significant move away from the methodology of his predecessor. In addition, van Imschoot used much more contemporary scholarship within his presentation than his predecessor did, as was seen in his treatment of extra-biblical materials (and in the number of entries in his subject bibliography upon this occasion).

3.5.2.2 Van Imschoot on the Spirit

But what of the spirit and the word? These will be briefly examined in the same fashion as wisdom, to ascertain any points of convergence or "controversy" between the two authors on these topics. We begin with the spirit.

Both authors agreed that the spirit of God was a "principle of psychic phenomena"  

---

60 Pius had enjoined biblical scholars to study other ancient literatures, histories, and archaeology in order to cast new light upon the times and texts of the Scriptures. So another point of comparison between these two authors is the amount of extra-biblical material used in their exposition, and, by extension, their dialogue with the scholarly world. In the subject bibliographies that form such a distinctive part of his presentation, van Imschoot collated twenty three books and articles upon hypostases and wisdom: including three of Heinisch's books, and an article of his own. Apart from biblical references (and two references to Justin Martyr), Heinisch had only two references to outside authorities, neither of whom were named. Both authors made mention of gods within the Babylonian (Ea, Marduk), Egyptian (Nebo, Ishtar), and Persian (the Ameshas Spentas) pantheons who were termed wisdom gods (Heinisch) and religionistic hypostases (van Imschoot) but both were agreed that Israel's radical monotheism precluded either any worship of these "beings" or any of them influencing the development of Israelite wisdom tradition. (van Imschoot's sources here were B. Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien II [n.p., n.d.] 47; W. Baudissin, Kyrios III [n.p., n.d.]; volumes within James Hastings (ed.), Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, [13 vols.], Edinburgh: T & T Clark [1908-1926]; and A. Bertholet - E. Lehman, Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte, (4th ed.) Tübingen: [n.p.], Theology...God, 222 nn. 24-28. Heinisch's authorities were a book cited thus: "Hudal 106-124"; and an article within Revue d'histoire des religions cited thus: "RHR 113, 1936, 21-41" Heinisch, 111 n.77; 112 n.79). Van Imschoot has shown much more acquaintance with scholarship on this point.

61 Theology...God, 173.
which enlivened Israel's warriors and prophets to perform their mission among the people or on their behalf:

The spirit of Yahweh is an active agent of the divine revelation and providence toward Israel. It is this aspect which will be considered here. 62

But the spirit was much more than that, the spirit was also, in van Imschoot's expression, a "principle of moral life":

...Yahweh, because He is holy, will save His people (Os 11: 8.9) or at least a remnant (Am 3: 12; Is 10: 21; cf. 7: 3), and will conclude with them a new covenant. The new covenant will attain its end, for it will bring about a religious and moral regeneration of the chosen people. 63

It was stated at the beginning of this chapter that van Imschoot's books lacked a comprehensive treatment of messianism. In his treatment of "spirit", however, van Imschoot had this to say:

The messianic king will be endowed with the spirit of Yahweh: "Upon Him shall rest the spirit of Yahweh, a spirit of wisdom and of understanding, a spirit of counsel and of strength, a spirit of the knowledge and of the fear of Yahweh" (Is 11: 1ff.). In order to make of Him the ideal king, who will establish the reign of justice and of peace, the spirit of Yahweh will rest upon Him, no longer intermittently as upon the heroes of old, but in a permanent way. 64

The question that was asked of wisdom above will now be asked of the "spirit": is the "spirit" a personification or a hypostasis in the OT? The answer for both authors is that it is a personification.

Van Imschoot took a different approach to the question than did Heinisch. He began

62 Van Imschoot elaborated further: "The consideration of the spirit of God as principle of the physical life of man in the world as well as the study of the human spirit are taken up in the chapter dealing with the human composite." Theology...God, 172.

63 Heinisch is in agreement here, saying: "According to the author of the Book of Wisdom, God's spirit possesses omniscience [footnote reference to Wisdom 1: 7], and holiness [footnote reference to Wisdom 1: 5], and guides men morally [footnote reference to Wisdom 1: 5]." (Theology...God, 176; Heinisch, 120, 120 nn. 96-98).

64 "As the covenant belongs to the future, so also is the moral activity of the spirit reserved for the future." Theology...God, 176. This is substantially the conclusion of Heinisch as well. (Theology...God, 176-177; Heinisch, 118).
(as Heinisch did) with a discussion of ruah, and then proceeded with a lexical analysis of verbs used in concert with ruah; this was in order to give some idea of the function of ruah. An example of this is given below:

The most frequent expression is "to be upon" (hāyetah 'al, Nm 24: 2; Jgs 3: 10; 11:29; 1 Sm 19: 20.23; Is 59: 21; 61: 1), which suggests the image of a power which envelops and dominates, rather than that of a personal being; the same can be said of the parallel expression "the hand of Yahweh was upon" (3 Kgs 18: 46; 4 Kgs 3: 15; Ez 3: 22, etc.) 65

The relation between ruah and Yahweh, is for van Imschoot, illustrated within the text of Isaiah (specifically Isaiah 31:3):

The Egyptians are men and not god ('êl); their horses are flesh, and not spirit. When Yahweh stretches out His hand, the helper will stumble, and he who has been helped will fall, and they all will perish together. (Isaiah 31: 3)

Van Imschoot argued for the equivalence of the terms ruah and Yahweh on the basis of the synonymous parallelism between them in this verse.66 He inferred from this equivalence that the spirit is divine and that God is a spirit. Van Imschoot went on to argue that the Hebrew disinclination towards abstraction meant that what we would call an abstract concept (in this case, the spirit) was thought of as a concrete reality bound to a material substratum. Therefore the action of the spirit is equivalent to the action of Yahweh, and the spirit is not an existent being separate from Yahweh. This of course, is hinted at the synonymity of ruah and Yahweh mentioned earlier. However, van Imschoot does not (as Heinisch did) link the spirit to the development of trinitarian theology within the NT or later theological endeavour. The following comment is illustrative of his attitude:

From the equivalence of the terms 'êl and ruah it may be deduced that God is spirit and that the spirit is something divine; but it would be forcing the sense of the text to see

65 ""To come mightily upon" (sâlah 'al, Jgs 14: 6.19; 15: 14; 1 Sm 10: 6.10; 11:6;16: 13; 18: 10), "to envelop" (or to envelop oneself with, lâbas, Jgs 6: 34; 1 Par 12: 18; 2 Par 24: 20), "to pass" (lîbar, Nim 5: 14.30; 3 Kgs 22: 24; Jb 4: 15), "to fall upon" (naphâl 'al, Ez 11: 5), "to enter in" (Exz 2: 2; 3: 24), "to depart" (sîr, 1 Sm 16: 14), can be understood of an impersonal power, since these verbs are also used with the name of a thing as subject." (Theology...God, 183).

66 The terms for man ('âdâm) and flesh (bâšâr) are also synonymously parallel here. 'âdâm and 'êl (with bâšâr and ruah) are antithetically parallel. It follows from the text, then that ruah and Yahweh are synonymously parallel. This is my own summary of van Imschoot's (Theology...God, 185) argument.
here only an affirmation of the spiritual, that is to say, the immaterial nature of God (cf. Jn 4: 24). The spirit (or God) is here opposed to flesh (or to man), not as something immaterial to something material, but as a powerful and durable element to that which is weak and perishable. 67

To conclude, van Imschoot agreed with Heinisch that the spirit of Yahweh was a literary personification rather than a divine hypostasis within the pages of the OT. The ways in which they argued their respective cases, however, were significantly different.

Although van Imschoot shared the developmental view of Heinisch in principle, in practice he did not attempt to show how the spirit of Yahweh represented a stage in the development of trinitarian theology. Rather, van Imschoot's lexical approach showed the tendencies encouraged by *Divino Afflante Spiritu* in his reliance upon the original language of the text (see p. 80 n. 61), and also in his use of literary criticism (by noting the various uses of parallelism) to make his case. It is true that Heinisch was aware of literary methods when he noted the use of the spirit as a metaphor for the enlightenment of Moses, but his treatment did not display the lexical sensitivity of van Imschoot's book; it was from a different time. This is also reflected in Heinisch's dearth of interaction with a wide range of critical works: he wrote in a time when this was less encouraged.

3.5.2.3 Van Imschoot on the Word

Finally, we come to the "word." Van Imschoot agreed with Heinisch's basic analysis of what the "word" meant (even citing his book in a footnote): 68

For the ancients and the uncivilized the word is not simply the expression of a thought or of a will; it is something concrete, something existing and active, and is, so to say, charged with the force of the soul of the one who pronounces it. 69

There are, however, two major differences in van Imschoot's account. First, there is

67 *Theology...God*, 186.

68 *Theology...God*, 189 n. 2.

69 *Theology...God*, 189.
no mention of personification, hypostasis or language of that type. Second, as we have come to expect, there is no "looking forward" to the doctrine of the Trinity, as Heinisch had done.

The fact that there is no mention of personification or hypostasis in van Imschoot's account of the "word" can be explained by van Imschoot's recognition that the "word" (and its plural form):

no longer designate only the word spoken by God, but the written word as well, and are applied to the whole Law. The Law is considered as the expression, henceforth fixed, of divine revelation, and it is forbidden to add to it or to subtract from it (Dt 4: 2; 13: 1)  

When allied to the post-exilic concept of the "holy book" (which contained not only the Law, of course, but the prophets and wisdom writers) there is no need for hypostasis or personification: the "word" was physically present among the people and able to be consulted directly.

It is in discussing the "word" where van Imschoot is at his most impressive to date with regard to ancient Near Eastern parallels, noting parallels and contrasts with Egyptian and Babylonian deities, where it could not be clearly distinguished whether the "word" (usually a magical incantation) was efficacious by itself or by their intervention. As was the case in Israel, these deities also created everything by their word.  

To conclude this particular discussion, it appears that the concept of "word" is where Heinisch and van Imschoot diverge the most. Heinisch's approach is most evident in his discussion of this question; the concept of "word" is indeed a personification in the OT, but its meaning is transformed by the event of the Incarnation, and by the use the writer of John's Gospel made of the concept in the construction of a theology of the Logos. Van Imschoot, on the other hand, made no reference to personification at all; nor did he speak of any development of the idea into Logos theology. It has been suggested that the idea of the "holy book" (which contained the "word/ words" of Yahweh to Israel) that was physically present to Israel made personification language

---

70 Theology...God, 193.

71 Theology...God, 193-194.
unnecessary.

Generally speaking, van Imschoot and Heinisch agreed that "wisdom" and the "spirit" of Yahweh were literary personifications in the OT, rather than divine hypostases. Heinisch, given his assumption that the OT and NT marked a continuous stream of tradition, inferred from this that these concepts found their fulfilment in the NT. While van Imschoot may have shared this view of the OT, he made no reference to it while discussing these concepts.

The concept of the "word" showed the difference between the two scholars most acutely. Van Imschoot did not speak of personification here at all (while Heinisch made a connection between this personified idea and the Incarnation/Logos), although he substantially agreed with the rest of Heinisch's argument. So in terms of a comparison between the two scholars upon whether these ideas constituted a preparation for trinitarian doctrine, Heinisch's "yes" may be contrasted with van Imschoot's more cautious treatment, which may be seen as a distancing from the older approach.

3.6 CONCLUSIONS

The work of Paul van Imschoot is significantly different from that of Heinisch in several ways. Historically speaking, Pius XII had issued Divino Afflante Spiritu (1943) after Heinisch's book was published (in German in 1940), which authorized the use of the historical-critical method among Catholic scholars. Given what was indicated earlier in the chapter regarding Pius' enjoining scholars to use the tools of this method to aid dogmaticians, priests, and laity alike, it may be reasonable to expect that van Imschoot's work would be written differently to that of Heinisch.

The first difference concerns the use of sectional bibliographies in his work. Heinisch's contact with scholarship had been limited, but van Imschoot, in his bibliographies, showed an impressive understanding of French, German, and English-speaking scholarship. This understanding was not merely confined to bibliographies, however: van Imschoot was in constant dialogue with other scholars within the text of his books. This point will be explored in more detail in the following sections. Secondly, van

---

72 This is in spite of a caveat that he had written in his foreword: "Far from any big library and forced by circumstances to work under particularly disadvantageous and really painful conditions, the author has restricted the bibliography to well-known works which, with few exceptions, he has been able to study and which he has found profitable. He hopes he has neither omitted nor missed anything essential." Theology...God, XII.
Imschoot also had an impressive command of the ancient Near Eastern background and Semitic languages, which is evidenced in his sectional bibliographies and in his footnotes. Thirdly, van Imschoot's citations of the NT are much fewer than those of Heinisch; proportionately he has less than a third of the NT citations of his predecessor (see Figure 8). This may well be due to the fact that his work is incomplete: his work upon judgment and salvation has not been published. It will be remembered that many of Heinisch's citations of the NT are concentrated in just these sections of his book, and provide much evidence of his views upon the relation of the Testaments, and upon the OT as Christian Scripture.

However, the two scholars' works do share some similarities. Firstly, they share the God-Man-Salvation schema (although van Imschoot's third volume concerning salvation was never published). Secondly, they are products of a time when historical-critical method was not yet the norm in Catholic biblical scholarship. The times were changing, though, and moves were being made to incorporate the new methods into the mainstream of Catholic scholarly literature. In this sense, van Imschoot's books are essentially transitional works. On the one hand, he espouses the same view as Heinisch with regard to the relations between the Testaments, and sees the OT as the first step in God's progressive revelation to humanity. This has been seen in his use of the NT, and of Matthew's Gospel particularly. The NT was seen by van Imschoot as part of the larger biblical tradition, and was therefore able to be used to interpret the OT, whether by showing continuity of tradition, development of tradition, or correcting tendencies within the tradition. The NT could thus act as a yardstick by which the OT could be measured. In the end, therefore, the OT functioned for van Imschoot as preparation for the definitive revelation of God in the Incarnation. On the other hand, his use of Hebrew and other ancient Near Eastern languages marks him out as one following the injunctions of Divino Afflante Spiritu, as does his extensive dialogue (when compared with Heinisch) with contemporary scholarship.

So van Imschoot's books are truly transitional, utilising the newer methods, but assuming and utilizing a traditional view of the relationship between the Testaments. Between the appearance of Heinisch's work (in German) and the appearance of van Imschoot's first volume in French (1954), there had been a sea change in the official attitude toward historical-critical method. The eggs that Lagrange and von Hummelauer had laid in the early years of the twentieth century had hatched, and the chicks were now being fledged. In terms of this process, van Imschoot represents the chick
stretching its wings for the first time.
FOUR

JOHN L. McKENZIE: IS THE OT A CHRISTIAN BOOK?

4.0 INTRODUCTION

The title of this chapter is taken from a comment made within John L. McKenzie's book *A Theology of the Old Testament*. In the last chapter of that work, McKenzie claimed to have written this book as if the NT did not exist. At first sight, such a comment could give the impression that, for McKenzie, the OT has a theological value in its own right, even apart from its relationship to the NT. What did our author mean by this comment, and in what ways does this view distinguish him from his predecessors?

4.1 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

We have already seen in previous chapters how the historical-critical method slowly gained a foothold in Catholic scholarly circles, and how both Leo XIII's encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (1893) and Pius XII's *Divino Afflante Spiritu* (1943) provided encouragement for Catholic scholars to use the new methods in their biblical works. Heinisch did this in a limited way (given that his book was originally published three years before Pius's encyclical was issued), and van Immschoot in his work exhibited a commendable familiarity with a wide range of scholarship pertinent to the expanding field of biblical studies. Since McKenzie wrote his book two decades after van Immschoot's first volume appeared in French, it will be useful to note what had happened in the meantime.

When Pius XII died, theologically conservative members of both the scholarly

---


community and the hierarchy began attacking the historical-critical method anew (often in an *ad hominem* way). The Holy Office issued a monitum (warning) to scholars in 1961 concerning popularization of their work, and in the same year, a scholar at the Catholic University of America was removed from his post as a result of “office politics.” This is the world in which McKenzie was trained and was working for much of his life, and goes some way toward explaining the severity of his tone toward those with whom he disagreed.

All of the politicking and infighting was not helped by the fact that Pius’s successor, John XXIII (reigned 1958-1963) was an unknown quantity: no one knew how he regarded the issue of biblical scholarship. John soon showed his mettle by announcing a new Ecumenical Council; shocking many in the ecclesiastical world. This Council, Vatican II (1962-1965) produced a Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum* (18 November, 1965), which was promulgated on the seventy-second anniversary of *Providentissimus Deus*.

---

3 One incident in the US showed the depth of conservative unease. This incident involved a scathing attack upon biblical experts by an Italian member of the hierarchy: who had not been trained in the new methods. The new Apostolic Delegate, Egidio Vagnozzi, delivered the commencement address at Marquette University in Milwaukee on 5 June, 1961. Vagnozzi was not a biblical scholar; but gave what, in McKenzie's words: “was a vile and slanderous attack on biblical scholars, in no way founded on scholarly arguments, which His Excellency was incapable of handling” (John L. McKenzie, “American Catholic Biblical Scholarship 1955-1980,” in John J. Collins & John Dominic Crossan, *The Biblical Heritage*, Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier 1986: 211-232: 226). The address was printed in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* (AER 145 [1961] 71-79) and reached a wide readership; underlying the unease with which many in the Catholic communion had with biblical scholarship. The Catholic Biblical Association of America resolved to reply to the address at its Annual Meeting that year; and had drafted a reply, but could not get it published. It appeared only in the *Catholic Universe Bulletin*, in Cleveland.

4 On 20 June, 1961 the Holy Office issued a *monitum* to biblical scholars (with the approval of the Pontifical Biblical Commission). This was a warning to take care in the dissemination of their work to the faithful. Joseph Fitzmyer argued that this was a warning, not a decree; while Fogarty contended that this may have formed the backdrop for Vagnozzi's attack; the problem remaining was this: how was the monitum to be interpreted?

5 Edward Siegman (d. 1967) came from teaching in Ohio (in 1950) to the Catholic University, to both edit the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* and to teach at the Catholic University. Siegman came into conflict with both dogmatic theologians and the *American Ecclesiastical Review* in the person of Joseph Fenton. After the CBA meeting (at which Vagnozzi’s attack was discussed), Siegman (then-editor of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*) had a heart attack, and while he was recuperating, the Catholic University replaced him as a faculty member. This was greeted with protest, but the rector (William McDonald) claimed Siegman’s illness was the ostensible reason for his removal. However, McDonald admitted that he had secured the approval of Vagnozzi and the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities before the decision. Siegman was not Fenton’s only target though. He variously attacked three prominent Jesuits, John Courtney Murray (on religious liberty and church-state relations), Roderick MacKenzie (on biblical inspiration), and David Stanley (on the historicity of the Gospels) (Fogarty, 240).
Dei Verbum had a turbulent history, having been twice rewritten and later amended before being acceptable to the Council as a whole. This process of writing and re-submission also represented the coming of age for critical biblical scholarship in the Catholic Church. The first draft, which was submitted in 1962, was rejected by the Pope (after the Council was divided over it) and redrafted. The first draft was called by Joseph Ratzinger “a canonization of Roman school theology.” In other words, the views of the conservative theologians who had been attacking biblical scholarship were more evident in the document than those of biblical scholars working under the influence of Divino Afflante Spiritu.

When the first draft was voted upon in the Council, those of the conservative position were in the majority. However, John XXIII ordered the document to be withdrawn and redrafted, under the supervision of a biblical scholar (Augustin Bea) and a theologian (Alfredo Ottaviani, prefect of the Holy Office). When the second draft was completed, this became the working document for the Council, and was the document finally approved by a majority of conciliar delegates.

Beginning with the traditional formulation of the canon and its inspiration by the Holy Spirit, the document cites Leo XIII’s teaching that the Scriptures contain no more than what God wanted written, and that they:

faithfully and without error, teach that truth which God, for the sake of our salvation, wished to see confided in the sacred Scriptures.

Dei Verbum thus eschewed the controversial questions of inspiration and tradition which had been the cause of much of the animosity which some felt toward the historical-critical method, and was framed in a much more eirenical spirit. This document marked the beginning of the presently settled period for Catholic exegetes, who found and find themselves encouraged and vindicated by this

---


7 Ratzinger, 159.

8 Dei Verbum, par. 11. The document goes on to note that in order to ascertain the meaning of Scripture, the exegete is enjoined to discern the literary form of the writing; noting the characteristics of the writer’s perceptions, speech, and narrative. Citing Benedict XV, the document writers note that the tradition of the Church and the “analogy of faith” must not be neglected; as the Bible must be seen as a unified whole in its content and its divine authorship. The role of the Church as judge of the manner of interpretation employed is the final note.
Although *Dei Verbum* marked the beginning of a new period of freedom for Catholic biblical scholars, much of John L. McKenzie's writing shows the marks of the earlier battles. Indeed, in the writing of his OT theology, McKenzie's combative spirit is much in evidence, both in his new topical methodology, and in his use of the historical-critical method to interpret the OT in a manner radically different from that of his predecessors.

4.2 JOHN L. McKENZIE - A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

John Lawrence McKenzie was born in Brazil, Indiana on 9 October, 1910. He was educated by the Jesuits at St. Mary's High School in Kansas, a boarding school run by the Missouri Province of the Society. McKenzie had earlier expressed an interest in the Society, so his parents sent him interstate to Kansas. Upon graduating from high school in 1928, McKenzie entered the Society of Jesus at its novitiate in Milford, Ohio.9

McKenzie was marked out by his Jesuit superiors to become a Scripture scholar. After an already lengthy Jesuit formation (in McKenzie's case, twelve years), this would have entailed a further five-year course in Rome that would culminate in the doctorate in Sacred Scripture. However, McKenzie was prevented from studying in Rome by the outbreak of war in Europe. His philosophical studies were undertaken at St. Louis University, where he wrote his first scholarly articles and book reviews: these were written for a student-run magazine called *The Modern Schoolman*.10 In 1934, he moved to West Baden College in Indiana to begin his theological studies. After ordination in 1939, McKenzie returned to St. Mary's to complete his theological studies, followed by a year's tertianship (preparation for

---


Given the impossibility of Roman studies, McKenzie was sent to Weston College in Boston to prepare his doctoral dissertation. After a year, however, he had to return to West Baden to teach, but his doctorate was completed later. He taught at West Baden for nineteen years, and during that time served as book editor for the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (1951-1954), and wrote what was for many his finest book, *The Two Edged Sword* (1956), a “spiritual study of the OT.” In 1960 McKenzie moved from West Baden to the Loyola University of Chicago. In 1965 he moved to the University of Chicago to become the first Roman Catholic Visiting Professor in its Divinity School, later moving to Notre Dame. It was while at Notre Dame that McKenzie took the decision to leave the Society of Jesus, in 1970.

After a short stay in Madison, McKenzie moved to DePaul University in Chicago, a university run by the Vincentian Fathers. It was from here that he wrote the book with which this chapter is concerned, *A Theology of the Old Testament* (1974). After a productive and controversial life, in which the horizons of biblical scholarship in the US were dramatically expanded, McKenzie died in 1991.

### 4.3 McKenzie's Book: An Overview

McKenzie's book marked a watershed in OT theology in that it eschewed the dogmatic schema that had been used by so many of his predecessors, including Heinisch and van Imschoot. Further discussion of this matter will follow; for now it will be enough to offer an impression as to how McKenzie's book is structured.

McKenzie began with "Cult", the normal and "most frequent manner in which the

---

11 Munson gave the supposed reason for McKenzie's move from West Baden; the rest of his community could not bear the sound of McKenzie's typewriter during their afternoon siesta! This, along with other problems peculiar to those living in community (i.e. cars not for personal use, books not to be marked because they were communal and not individual property, and the inability to afford secretarial help) precipitated McKenzie's departure, according to Munson (8).


13 Munson (11-12) posited lack of loyalty on the Society's part toward members ostracized by society at large or the hierarchy for taking dissenting positions as McKenzie's major reason for leaving. Daniel Berrigan's stand against the Vietnam war would be one example of bold stances taken by Jesuits, McKenzie himself had been under suspicion after the Vagnozzi affair (his 900 000 word *Dictionary of the Bible* had nine censors). Nearer to the time, he had chided the pope (who blamed the lack of religious vocations upon the lack of personal mortification) in a letter.
Israelite experienced Yahweh. "Revelation" was the subject of McKenzie's second chapter, which contained an extensive discussion of prophetism. McKenzie next treated "History" as the locus of Israel's experience of Yahweh; in which Israel believed that Yahweh was active on their behalf. The chapter upon "Nature" contains a major discussion of mythology, which Israel shared with her neighbours. Israel also shared with her neighbours large amounts of material grouped under the heading of "Wisdom". McKenzie's fifth chapter. The final three chapters of McKenzie's book (namely "Political and Social Institutions", "The Future of Israel", and his "Epilogue") will be discussed in detail later on, because the material within them will form a large part of the answer to the central question of this study: how did McKenzie see the OT as Christian Scripture?

4.4 PRINCIPLES, METHODS & STRUCTURE

McKenzie's topical approach to writing an OT theology is, given the "dogmatic" schema which characterized the works of Heinisch and van Imschoot, somewhat novel. Therefore an explanation as to why McKenzie chose this method is needed. Additionally, some reasons for McKenzie choosing the topics that he used (and why they are in the order in which he treated them) are necessary. We now turn to an explanation of his methodology.

The opening pages of McKenzie's book form a programmatic essay ("Principles, Methods, and Structure") that endeavoured to set out McKenzie's distinctive approach, along with an appraisal of how the discipline has developed. The title of this section is an apposite one, because McKenzie began with the premise that OT theology as a discipline had historically lacked principles, methods, and structure.

---

14 McKenzie, A Theology, 32. This chapter is contained in McKenzie, A Theology, 37-63.
15 This section is to be found in McKenzie, A Theology, 65-129.
16 McKenzie, A Theology, 131-171.
17 McKenzie, A Theology, 173-203.
18 McKenzie, A Theology, 203-233.
19 McKenzie, A Theology, 235-266.
20 McKenzie, A Theology, 267-317.
21 McKenzie, A Theology, 318-325.
22 McKenzie, A Theology, 15.
So to create an OT theology involved a choice:

The writer is compelled at the very beginning of his task to a choice between some structure already created and to the accompanying duty of meeting the criticisms levelled at the structure, or to the creation of a new structure and the accompanying risk of new criticism. 23

The old structure, according to McKenzie, was the legacy begun by the early medieval *summae*, which gave less of a historical (in the modern sense) view of the Scriptures than a systematic approach to answering particular questions. Their authors assumed that Scriptures would support the theological edifice constructed upon them, if interpreted correctly. McKenzie summed it up thus:

The systematic theologies of the classical period of theology were weak in the theory of development and haunted by the principle that the entire system of doctrine was found in the Scriptures, if one could interpret them properly. 24

Another problem with such systematic theology was that it assumed that no development has occurred since its time, so that, according to McKenzie, contemporary problems may be rendered insoluble. However, he noted that such syntheses are no longer the preferred method; rather the discussion of particular questions (e.g. covenant) is the way that the discipline has advanced. 25

Within Catholicism, biblical theology traditionally came under the umbrella of "positive theology", that branch of theology concerned with the study of written sources (including the Scriptures). Biblical texts were not studied in their own right, but were taken and concatenated to provide proof texts for dogmatic theologians. Under this rubric, "[m]ost of the Bible is irrelevant to systematic theology." 26 But any other arrangement was seen as being out of the question.

This idea of biblical theology, according to McKenzie, was called into question by the introduction of historical-critical method into biblical studies in the nineteenth

Scholars therefore wrote histories of Israelite religion in this period, because:

biblical scholars seriously doubted whether the theological method would permit historical and critical scholarship...

It was felt that theological method, which had always dealt with eternal verities, would not allow a true presentation of Israelite religion. 28

The renewal of interest in biblical theology (which continued to McKenzie’s own day) can be traced, in McKenzie’s view, to the publication of the first volume of Walther Eichrodt’s three-volume Theologie des Alten Testaments (1933). McKenzie characterized Eichrodt’s work as a move away from the history of religion, and back to being a systematic "exposition of doctrine". However, he adds that such a work:

should not ... follow the categories of systematic theology but should find its own categories based on its own material. 29

Eichrodt arranged his work around the theme of "covenant", but McKenzie (and others) criticised this as being artificial, arguing that the belief system within the OT is not consistent enough to support "covenant" as a centre for the theology of the OT.30 Eichrodt had also claimed that OT theology is meaningless without some demonstration of a positive relationship between the Testaments.31 This relationship had traditionally been expressed in terms of allegory, typology and prediction, but McKenzie, by way of contrast, eschewed these approaches by arguing that

the proper function of the interpreter seems to be rather to interpret the Old Testament than to proclaim its value. If he can succeed in making its meaning clear, he will not have to show its relevance for Christian theology. 32

Is it really possible, though, to speak of “systematic” and the Old Testament in the

---

27 McKenzie, A Theology, 17.
28 McKenzie, A Theology, 18.
29 McKenzie, A Theology, 18.
30 McKenzie, A Theology, 19.
31 ibid.
32 ibid.
same sentence? McKenzie argued that in collecting all of the "God-talk" (or theology) within the OT,

a fairly clear personal reality emerges which is not entirely consistent with itself. 33

So if such a work is to be "systematic", a way of thinking from outside the OT must be employed to reconcile any inconsistencies within the material and make it comprehensible to an audience that it wasn't written for. McKenzie stated an OT theology must follow the principles of logical discourse, given that modern people are trained to think in these terms, and that the forms of the OT are those of modern thought. 34

It is not the experience of Israel that is important to McKenzie (that is the province of history), but the documents of the OT. These bear witness to the "totality of the utterances", which a piecemeal approach of looking at isolated passages would not do. This also gives a view of the whole that no Israelite would have ever had. It is this view of the whole that can form the basis for new insights.

These insights come from asking modern questions of this totality of "God-talk" and seeing what light can be cast upon the present situation by this totality. The modern questions then become the topics for an OT theology, but this still leaves open the question of order or "system." The order or structure of an OT theology, according to McKenzie, is furnished by the emphases of the OT itself, those that give the OT its distinctiveness. 35

However, McKenzie also claimed that the OT did have a principle of unity:

What is the principle of unity? It can only be the discovery of Yahweh, the God of Israel. 36

In the questions that are asked of the totality of "God-talk", not all of the OT will be of equal profundity, so value judgments on the part of the interpreter are inevitable. The questions to be asked are also (in this case) shaped by the Christian faith of the

33 McKenzie, A Theology, 20.
34 McKenzie, A Theology, 21.
35 McKenzie, A Theology, 24-25.
36 McKenzie, A Theology, 26.
interpreter, but the answers to be gained from the OT alone. The Christian faith of the interpreter should not influence the answers received from asking the questions.

In the light of this explanation, we may look again at the chapter headings of McKenzie's book. These are, in fact, a mixture of biblical, theological, and modern concepts: "Cult" is a term borrowed from the history of religion; "Revelation" is a Christian theological concept; "History", "Nature", and "Political Institutions" are modern terms not known in biblical times: "Wisdom" is the only biblical category used. Thus for the most part, these headings reflect the questions of a modern Christian OT scholar.

4.5 McKENZIE AND THE NT

It was noted in the two previous chapters that both Heinisch and (to a lesser extent) van Imschoot made extensive use of the NT in their works, and, indeed, this feature of their works became a major key in determining their views upon the relationship of the Testaments, and ultimately, as to how they saw the OT as Christian Scripture. It will now be useful to consider how McKenzie utilised the NT.

McKenzie's references to the NT are very sparse indeed, when compared to his predecessors. There are fifteen references to the NT in his entire book (of 325 pages). It will be useful to examine the NT texts cited by McKenzie, so as to ascertain how he used these texts within his OT theology.

The first NT citation in McKenzie's book is from John 4: 42:

Revelation in religions is the experience of of a few who communicate their responses to other members of the religion. Quite literally, the others believe in the god on their word and not because of their own experience, inverting the saying in John 4: 42. 38

The use of John 4: 42 here is merely an illustration, from which no clue can be drawn as to hermeneutical method. In his second and third citations, McKenzie is also illustrating an OT idea (the Sabbath) by using an example drawn from the NT.

Against the antiquity of the Sabbath it has been urged that the nomad is unable to spend a day in idleness. Strictly

37 This is to be compared with Heinisch's book, which has 333 NT citations, (and is 15% longer than McKenzie). Van Imschoot has 194 NT citations, which are spread over 593 pages.

38 McKenzie, A Theology, 66.
speaking, this is no more valid for the nomad than it is for the peasant or the modern churchgoing Christian. The modern version of the Sabbath rest demands the employment of a large number of people in profane business. One may postulate for the ancient Israelites the rationalization of Jesus concerning the ox which falls into a pit on the Sabbath (Lk 14: 5) and the watering of the ox and the ass on the Sabbath (Lk 12: 15). 39

McKenzie’s fourth and fifth examples are noted as OT quotations within the NT; in this case, he was pointing out the use of Habakkuk 2: 4 by Paul in both Romans and Galatians (Romans 1: 17; Galatians 3: 11). These examples point to some continuity of concept and expression between the two Testaments, as the sixth and seventh examples also make clear. Here McKenzie notes that

[i]third Isaiah exhibits the “piety of the poor,” a theological view paralleled in several of the psalms, a scheme in which “poor” and “needy” become synonymous with “righteous” and “pious.” 40

The best known examples of this type of thinking within the NT are the beatitudes, where the “poor” are noted as being (eschatologically, at least) particularly blessed by God. McKenzie’s examples are taken from both the Matthaean and Lukan beatitudes (Matthew 5: 3-6; Luke 6: 20-21). McKenzie’s eighth and ninth examples are also illustrations, although here, particulars may differ slightly. The context here is a discussion of Jonah:

The prophet is unwilling to offer a chance of repentance and forgiveness to the Assyrians, the ancient enemies of Israel and Judah, extinct by the time the book was written. The answer of Yahweh is that his compassion is extended even to the Assyrians - and even to their animals. The Assyrians, like the Samaritans in the New Testament (Lk 10: 29-37; John 4: 7-42), were the most unlikely objects of compassion which could be proposed. 41

The tenth example illustrated Jesus’ radical re-interpretation of OT expectation, in this case, that of the messiah. The idea of messianism will be discussed in the next section, but here McKenzie affords us a glimpse of his thinking:

While Jesus fitted no Jewish category exactly, the numerous allusions to his descent from David show that many of his contemporaries and many early Christians thought of him as

39 McKenzie, A Theology, 81.
40 McKenzie, A Theology, 120.
41 McKenzie, A Theology, 122.
the Davidic Messiah. It is significant that Jesus himself never certainly claimed this title. In the one passage in which he is said to accept the title of king (Jn 18: 33-37), Jesus defines his kingship in a purely religious and nonpolitical sense, the claim is made in a context in which Jesus is reduced to utter helplessness. The Davidic kingship, when examined more closely, in no way fits the role of Jesus. 42

The impression that Jesus was both related and unrelated to the OT is brought out in the next three NT citations:

As a religious figure, Jesus can be grasped as a man who arose in Judaism and therefore to some degree from the Old Testament. He certainly cannot be conceived as a product of Hellenism or of the Oriental cults of the Hellenistic world. Once this is said, one must recall the gospel figure that Jesus put new wine into new flasks (Mk 2: 22; Mt 9: 17; Lk 5: 37-38); he shattered the categories of the Jewish religion and culture from which he emerged. 43

Any other approach, namely reading Jesus back into the OT, is, in effect, a “Christianization of the Old Testament”: something that McKenzie indicated should be excluded from an OT theology. 44 Is McKenzie distancing himself from the traditional Christian view that the NT sheds light on the OT? (We saw that Heinisch and van Imshooot, for all their use of historical methods, continued to share this view). This question will be addressed in our penultimate section.

McKenzie’s final NT citations, like most of those that we have considered, imply a continuity of ideas between the Testaments:

The theme of apocalyptic judgment of the nations is briefly expressed in the apocalyptic gloss of Zephaniah 3:5-10. Another apocalyptic gloss in Malachi 4:1-6, however, is more probably derived from the judgment between true and false Israelites in Third Isaiah. There is no explicit reference to the nations, and the reconciling mission of Elijah is most obviously directed to the Jewish community. From this passage, however, Elijah became the precursor of the apocalyptic day both in the apocryphal books and in the New Testament (Mk 9: 11-13; Mt 17: 10-12). 45

The question which emerges from these examples is: did McKenzie use the NT in

---

42 McKenzie, A Theology, 245.
43 McKenzie, A Theology, 268.
44 ibid.
45 McKenzie, A Theology, 303.
the same way as his predecessors? Heinisch and van Imschoot, it will be remembered, both assumed a developmental relationship between the Testaments: this is especially evident in Heinisch's treatment of "The Preparation for the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity," and in van Imschoot's treatment of "Human Duties."

McKenzie's usage of the NT would appear to suggest that there is some conceptual continuity between the Testaments (as some of his citations assume). However, his comment regarding Jesus pouring new wine into new wineskins, and his surpassing of the Jewish categories would indicate at least some unease with a developmental approach. (This issue will be taken up in the following section upon messianism.) This hints, at least, at a significant hermeneutical difference between McKenzie and his predecessors, which will be the subject of the following sections.

4.6 McKENZIE UPON PARTICULAR ISSUES

Both Heinisch and van Imschoot have been compared with regard to common elements within their works, namely use of the NT, and their discussions of wisdom, and OT morality. It will now be useful to ascertain where McKenzie stood on these issues; and to note any divergences. Messianism will also be covered here, although van Imschoot lacked any discussion of this in his (incomplete) work.

4.6.1 McKENZIE ON MESSIANISM

McKenzie began by noting the ubiquity of this subject within previous Catholic OT theology (he did not note the absence of it in van Imschoot's work), and then set out his own view:

I have been convinced for years that messianism is a Christian interest and a Christian theme; that it is a Christian response to the Old Testament and should be treated as such; that in a theology of the Old Testament, as I have described it thus far, messianism would appear neither in the chapter headings nor in the index.46

This is in stark contrast to Heinisch, who had devoted a sizable section of his book to this question. Heinisch had spent some time with OT texts that for him proved

46 McKenzie, A Theology, 23.
the messianic status of Jesus (Genesis 3: 15; Isaiah 7: 14ff, Psalm 2: 7 etc.), and was criticised for this by David Hubbard, on the grounds that he had ignored a number of difficult theological, historical, and exegetical issues. McKenzie treated one of these texts (Psalm 2: 7) in his book, so this will afford a comparison.

Heinisch had argued his case by citing NT texts (Acts 13: 33; Hebrews 1: 5; 5: 5) that, to him, supported a messianic reading of Psalm 2: 7. In doing this it does seem he was reading the psalm through the lens of the NT. McKenzie took a different tack. Following Artur Weiser and Roland de Vaux, he notes that Psalm 2 is to be characterised as a psalm of accession, with a *Sitz im Leben* of an enthronement festival. The ritual of enthronement was (according to de Vaux) imitative of Egyptian models, with Psalm 2: 7 acting as the equivalent of the affirmation of the Pharaoh's divine status. The idea of the adoption of a particular person by Yahweh was rather problematic for Israel's monotheism, so McKenzie invoked H.Wheeler Robinson's idea of "corporate personality" so that the king:

incorporated into his person the totality of Israel, whom Yahweh now reached through the king. 47

There is no talk of NT fulfilment in this discussion. For McKenzie, the psalm simply represented an anointing of the Israelite king. There is no developmental hermeneutic present: McKenzie simply used the results of historical-critical method to describe this text within the OT context. This is why his conclusions are different to those of Heinisch: Heinisch's developmental assumptions are not present, and McKenzie made full use of the historical-critical methodology that Heinisch used only sparingly.

As was noted in the section above (on NT usage), Jesus' contemporaries and the early Christians saw him as in the line of David, and as a messianic figure on that basis. Jesus himself did not claim the title of Messiah, according to McKenzie. 48 He goes on to note that

[i]t lies outside the scope of this book to show that this [expected King Saviour] is precisely the role which Jesus of Nazareth, as far as we know him at all, made every effort to avoid; certainly the writers of the New Testament made every effort to avoid it, and the Savior who created the new Israel in no way resembled

---


the King Messiah of Israel and Judah.\textsuperscript{49}

Jesus, however, was a Jew, shaped by the traditions and hopes of the OT,

and we should not leave the impression that as a religious figure he was entirely unrelated to the Old Testament. At the same time, the Judaism from which Jesus emerged is a larger and more complex historical reality than the Old Testament...

As a religious figure, Jesus can be grasped only as a man who arose in Judaism and therefore to some degree from the Old Testament... \textsuperscript{50}

As someone who arose out of Israel, and was shaped by the OT, Jesus is nonetheless for Christians a figure of the NT. Christian questions about Jesus are answered within the NT. We might note that McKenzie’s discussion raises a further issue. If, as McKenzie admits, the questions addressed by an OT theology can arise from his Christian faith\textsuperscript{51} then why can a Christian not address the totality of OT utterance and ask what light this sheds upon Jesus? This appears to be a step that McKenzie is reluctant to take, perhaps for fear of reading NT concepts back into the OT. We will now see how McKenzie dealt with a subject that Heinisch (in particular) tried to show as being the precursor to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, namely wisdom.

\textbf{4.6.2 McKenzie on Wisdom}

It will be recalled that Heinisch and van Imschoot had both discussed the subject of wisdom extensively in their books: with particular attention being paid to wisdom’s personification. Heinisch argued that personified wisdom was a precursor to the development of trinitarian doctrine, whereas van Imschoot refrained from making these connections. What did McKenzie think of this?

In the first place, McKenzie eschewed any notion of personified wisdom being a precursor to trinitarian doctrine. He was aware of the literary personification in Proverbs:

Ben Sira (24: 1-34) may have been influenced by the personification of wisdom in Proverbs 8: 22-34. The wisdom of Yahweh, we noticed, was seen especially in creation; in this poem

\textsuperscript{49} McKenzie, \textit{A Theology}, 267.

\textsuperscript{50} McKenzie, \textit{A Theology}, 268.

\textsuperscript{51} McKenzie, \textit{A Theology}, 28.
wisdom appears as a companion of Yahweh while he creates... In Proverbs 9 wisdom again appears as personified, a female figure set in contrast to Dame Folly... 52

Similarly, he says of Ben Sira that

[the wisdom of Ben Sira is also a female figure; she exists before creation, and she seeks a place to dwell on earth. The creator commands her to pitch her tent in Israel, and she settles there in the book of the Law.53

That these figures are literary personifications is assumed by McKenzie, but he takes the discussion no further. There is no discussion of personification per se, nor any talk of hypostases or trinitarian doctrine, as there was in his predecessors' works. Apart from a historical reading of the wisdom tradition and its ancient Near Eastern precedents, McKenzie adds nothing more, except a treatment of individual and corporate morality, which is discussed below.

4.6.3 McKenzie on OT Morality

McKenzie claimed that the wisdom tradition was concerned with successful living in a stable political climate; stability was the secret to success.54 Every Israelite (and Judahite) was intimately related to Yahweh via worship, and torah. The warnings of the prophets about impending disaster were addressed to the group, and all individuals in it. Morality was a matter for all Israel, not primarily individuals. The disaster of 587 BCE changed all of that, McKenzie argued. Two prophets responded to the changed circumstances.

Jeremiah was made an outcast for prophesying the end of all Judah's institutions, the relationship of Judah to Yahweh was broken. What then of collective guilt or morality? As a pariah, Jeremiah was cut off from the community which was the basis of his relationship to Yahweh, and his prophetic ministry. Jeremiah's answer was that the individual will know God directly (31: 31-34), an idea which may have reflected his own experience. The proverb immediately before this: "the proverb about sour grapes eaten by the fathers and tasted by the children"55, according to McKenzie, may have expressed the author's unease with the idea of collective guilt.

52 McKenzie, A Theology, 211.
53 ibid.
54 McKenzie, A Theology, 228.
55 McKenzie, A Theology, 231.
Ezekiel reiterates this view, but adds one case of shared responsibility: that of the prophet failing to warn the wicked (33: 1-20). This apart, Ezekiel argued that each case is dependent on individual merit, not the sins of the father, or on one's previous life. McKenzie comments:

The affirmation is so rigorous that most commentators have found it unrealistic. 56

McKenzie went on to say:

Perhaps Ezekiel lacked the resources both of ideas and of language to make the necessary refinements in his argument. The result is a kind of moral atomism... Ezekiel makes a clumsy effort to affirm the importance of the moral decisions of the individual man, and he believes that Yahweh has regard for them, whatever experience may suggest. It is unfortunate that the statement had to be expanded into moral atomism and a distortion or rather an ignoring of the social character of man's moral experience. 57

What is interesting here is that we find McKenzie passing judgment upon the author of the book of Ezekiel, a fact which illustrates his explicit claim that evaluations of the work of OT writers cannot be avoided. 58

4.7 THE NOVELTY OF MCKENZIE'S POSITION

Many of the reviewers of McKenzie's book commented upon his divorce of NT concerns from his treatment of OT theology. 59 What caused surprise was his claim:

I have written a theology of the Old Testament. I present it with the full expectation that reviewers will be displeased because I wrote it as if the New Testament did not exist. 60

56 McKenzie, A Theology, 232.
57 McKenzie, A Theology, 232-233.
58 McKenzie, A Theology, 27, 320.
59 For example, the review of A. A. Mackintosh [JTS 27: 2 (Oct. 1976) 434-435: 435] reads in part: "An epilogue takes up in apologetic manner the question of the relationship of the Old Testament to the New Testament..." It may be remembered from our first chapter that Gerhard Hasel argued that McKenzie wrote his book as if the NT did not exist; believing at least in principle (with von Harnack, Bultmann, and Friedrich Baumgärtel) that the OT is not a Christian book.
60 These comments were written to differentiate his own work from three others whom he is critiquing: namely, Brevard Childs, Gerhard Hasel, and Hans-Joachim Kraus. McKenzie
To explain this stance, McKenzie adduced the following considerations.

First, for McKenzie, the OT is not a Christian book, although a theology of the OT is a Christian book in that it is written by one who professes faith in Christ. On this basis the author of an OT theology may be forced to pass judgment upon the OT writers. As he wrote in his defence, "the Christian faith makes demands which are incompatible even with the religion of the prophets." McKenzie, A Theology, 320.

For McKenzie, the question of the relationship between the Testaments is not a question with which an OT theology has to deal. McKenzie, A Theology, 27.

Moreover, McKenzie denied that one could trace a clear development from the OT to the NT. Jesus and Christianity are products of historical experience, not the development of doctrine. So in what sense can the OT be a Christian book?

One link between the Testaments is the identity between the Yahweh of the OT and the Father of Jesus. Unlike Moses, Jesus' disciples did not need to ask the name of God. The second link proceeds from the first: Jesus could only have arisen in the context of Israel and be understood in the light of her Scriptures. This understanding of Jesus does not arise from an allegorical, typological, or predictive reading of the OT. For Jesus breaks through the categories present in the OT, categories such as Messiah:

The role of Jesus can be protected from distortion only by holding fast its connection with biblical antecedents: a non-Israelite and non-biblical Jesus makes no sense, already said by Paul when he said that Christ is "folly to Gentiles" (1 Cor 1: 23) ... Jesus arises from the categories of the Old Testament but he surpasses them; he corresponds to no religious figure of the Old Testament. McKenzie, A Theology, 322.

McKenzie also noted that the OT is a legacy of the earliest Church. The first Christians were Jews reading their Scripture, albeit in a way that most of their

acknowledged that both Eichrodt and von Rad had devoted much space in their respective works to the relation between the Testaments; and that Childs and Kraus saw this as a problem of biblical theology, whereas Hasel saw it squarely as a problem for OT theology (McKenzie, A Theology, 319).
contemporaries found intolerable. With time, the thought patterns of the OT were impressed upon the mind of the early Church, and appropriated in literature and theology, at least until the theologians of thirteenth century high scholasticism. The Reformers then sought to reassert the primacy of biblical patterns in the sixteenth century.

The novelty of McKenzie's position lies in his affirmation that, while Jesus could only have arisen out of Israel's history and her record of that history (the OT), he does not represent the *inevitable conclusion* of this history. This is where McKenzie departed from both his Catholic predecessors and his Protestant critics; he denied that the unity of the Testaments could be based upon a theory of continuity and development. About such a theory, he had this to say:

> All believe that it is the office of biblical theology to show the continuity of the two Testaments - or the unity of the Bible; here it means the same thing. I can only submit the opinion - I cannot argue except to repeat the presentation that I have given - that the unity which consists in continuity does not exist and cannot be shown. It is a devious and tortuous path through a tangled wilderness that we trace; and I do not know by what assurance the biblical theologian can say that we are out of the woods and know where the path leads us.65

While Heinisch and van Imschoot shared with their Christian predecessors the assumption that the OT texts find their fullest meaning in the NT, McKenzie argues that the OT is (from this point of view) deeply ambiguous. While Jesus did, in fact, emerge from the Judaism which had grown up out of the OT, there was nothing inevitable about this development. The OT cannot be regarded as a series of signposts pointing to Jesus.

This writer has said elsewhere that Jesus is the Messiah of Judaism, and that he can be understood only as the Messiah of Judaism. I stand by this observation; but I do not believe that it obliges me to find faith in Jesus Messiah in the Old Testament, nor to base faith in Jesus Messiah in the Old Testament. Jesus transformed the idea of Messiah when he fulfilled it. The total reality of Jesus Messiah is found nowhere in the Old Testament, not even in its totality. Jesus could have emerged from nothing except the Old Testament, but the study of the Old Testament does not demand that Jesus Messiah emerge from it.66

While Heinisch and van Imschoot had tried to treat the OT historically, on its own

terms, they assume a traditional Christian understanding of the relationship of the OT to the NT. McKenzie’s work, however, represents a break in that tradition.
CONCLUSION

The history of Catholic OT theology has been a relatively short one, when compared with its Protestant counterparts. It was a perceived lack of coverage of this tradition within scholarly discourse that has occasioned this study.

In the first chapter, comparisons were drawn between reference works, OT theologies themselves, and “histories of the discipline” so as to ascertain the amount of scholarly attention that Catholic OT theologies had garnered in the past fifty years. The results were mixed, although the “histories of the discipline” were generally the place where most accounts of Catholic OT theology were to be found. Many critics accused the authors of those Catholic OT theologies written in the 1940s and 1950s of using the categories of dogmatic theology when studying the OT. However, by the 1970s, critics were hailing at least one Catholic OT theology as offering a new approach.

Our historical surveys have shown that there have been three distinct phases in the history of Catholic biblical scholarship in the twentieth century:

1) From 1893 to 1943, when critical methods were cautiously allowed by Leo XIII (1893) until the Modernist crisis halted critical biblical scholarship (1907 onward).

2) From 1943 to 1965, when Pius XII approved historical-critical method within Catholicism (1943), and Vatican II’s Decree on Revelation (1965); this represented a period of uncertain consolidation.

3) From 1965 onward, official approval of historical-critical method was unanimous, and biblical scholars were free to study as they chose.

A scholar from each of these periods was selected so as to illustrate changes in official Church policy, and the rise of historical methods. Paul Heinisch (1878-1956) represented the first phase, Paul van Imschoot (b. 1889) represented the second, and John L. McKenzie (1910-1991) the third. The question to be asked of all of these men was this: how did they regard the OT as Christian Scripture?
It was argued that Paul Heinisch adopted a traditional hermeneutic: the OT is Christian Scripture in that it looked forward to the NT, and that the NT provided a clarifying light to what was obscure in the OT. This conclusion was arrived at primarily by way of an analysis of the NT citations within his book. However, Heinisch's understanding of the Old Testament's relationship to the New was also evident in his treatment of the question of messianism, and also of personified wisdom, the spirit and the word. Heinisch saw no problem (whilst discussing these ideas) with seeing the OT as further clarified and developed within the NT, and (to a limited extent) further developed within post-biblical theological tradition. His work was structured in the categories of dogmatic theology ("God", "Man", and "Salvation"), because any other schema would have been difficult to sustain at that time.

Paul van Imschoot also used this dogmatic schema, but of a projected three volume work, only two volumes were published. This truncated his treatment, omitting the topics of messianism and redemption. Van Imschoot was much more open to historical method than Heinisch, using Semitic languages and other scholarship very extensively. His expressed hermeneutic was the same as that of Heinisch: the OT was the first step in God's progressive revelation to humanity. Unlike Heinisch, though, van Imschoot was much more reserved in his discussion of the development of OT ideas within the NT. While claiming (in theory) that the NT fulfilled the OT, van Imschoot was more reticent about making these connections explicit.

John McKenzie eschewed the dogmatic schema in favour of a topical approach, based both on the emphases of the OT as a whole, and modern questions. This method used a thoroughgoing historical treatment of the text, which denied that one could find any continuity between the Testaments based upon doctrinal development. Jesus could only have emerged from the Jewish context which grew out of the OT, but for McKenzie this development was not inevitable. Where Heinisch and van Imschoot assumed that the OT directed its readers towards the fuller revelation which would take place in the NT, McKenzie denied that there was any necessary relationship between the two.
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