

Biblical Studies Bulletin

Edited by Richard S Briggs—Published Quarterly—Read Religiously—Disposed of Reluctantly—Free to Grove Biblical Subscribers

Contents ————— Issue 58: December 2010

1 EDITORIAL

Christmas time for Biblical Scholars

1 RECONSTRUCTING THE POOH COMMUNITY

Cutting edge research from Richard Bauckham

5 INITIAL CRITICAL-EXEGETICAL NOTES ON 'JACK AND JILL'

Michael Thompson previews a forthcoming new commentary series

Editorial

'Tis the season to be merry, even in the world of biblical studies, so a change of style and tone for this issue, which we hope will bless your festive breaks. BSB readers might enjoy the recently blogged <http://www.saet-online.org/tom-wright-reads-humpty-dumpty/09/>, which joins the well known piece by David Clines mentioned way back in BSB29 (Sept 2003)—<http://winnie-the-pooh.ru/online/lib/stud.html>. However, for your delight and delectation, we are delighted that Richard Bauckham has allowed us to reproduce his piece on 'the Pooh community,' which is available, along with many other writings (of a rather different nature) on his fine website, <http://richardbauckham.co.uk/>. We also have a cutting-edge piece of textual analysis from former BSB editor Mike Thompson on the well-known 'Jack and Jill' narrative fragment. We'll be back to news, reviews and other normal service next issue. Merry Christmas.

Reconstructing the Pooh Community

New Testament research is a field which has much to learn from comparative study—from observing the trends and results of research in parallel fields of study. So I begin my lecture this evening with an excursion into just such a parallel field—an excursion from which we may be able to return to recent trends in research on the Gospel of John with a fresh angle of vision.

Probably most of you will be familiar with the Winnie-the-Pooh stories—the popular children's books traditionally attributed to A A Milne. But you may not all be familiar with recent developments in Winnie-the-Pooh scholarship, which has been

revolutionized in recent years as a result of one major methodological breakthrough which virtually all Pooh scholarship now takes for granted. This is the seminal insight that the Winnie-the-Pooh stories can be read on more than one level. Ostensibly, of course, they are the story of a group of animals living in a forest, who are in some sense identified with the soft toys belonging to Christopher Robin. But on another level they are the story of the community behind the books, that community of children for which the books were written. In the Winnie-the-Pooh books one specific community of English children early this century—now generally known to scholars as the Pooh community—has encoded for us a wonderfully revealing account of itself. With this methodological key it is possible to a large extent to reconstruct that community: its character, its history, its passions, its factions. For example, this community of children is clearly situated in a rural and rather isolated context—a small English village, one should assume. All the action of the story takes place in a forest, and the small caste of characters seems to live entirely in a world of its own. The outside world never impinges. Awareness that other children exist beyond the inward-looking circle of the Pooh community is indicated only by the very generalized and vague references to Rabbit's friends and relations.

Clearly the Pooh books were written for a specific community with a strong sense of its distinctive identity—a closed, one might even say sectarian group which prided itself on its special insider knowledge. We can see this in features of the writings which would have baffled any outsider but provide the insider with confirmation of their special status as privy to a kind of esoteric knowledge. Several times we find alleged explanations which to the outsider would not be explanations at all. For example:

When I first heard his name [Winnie-the-Pooh], I said, just as you are going to say,
'But I thought he was a boy?'
'So did I,' said Christopher Robin.
'Then you can't call him Winnie?'
'I don't.'
'But you said—'
'He's Winnie-ther-Pooh. Don't you know what "ther" means?'
'Ah, yes, now I do,' I said quickly; and I hope you do too, because it is
all the explanation you are going to get."

(*Winnie-the-Pooh* [London: Methuen, 1963] p 1)

Or again:

Nobody seemed to know where they came from, but there they were in the Forest: Kanga and Roo. When Pooh asked Christopher Robin, 'How did they come here?' Christopher Robin said, 'In the Usual Way, if you know what I mean, Pooh,' and Pooh, who didn't, said 'Oh!' Then he nodded his head twice and said, 'In the Usual Way. Ah!'

(*Winnie-the-Pooh*, p 88)

In that passage, Pooh, the bear of little brain, fails to understand, but the readers can pride themselves on their own superior understanding. Clearly we are dealing with sectarian literature which not only belongs within the group but bolsters that group's

sense of superiority to the world in general—the general reader who cannot begin to understand what ‘the usual way’ would be.

The very distinctive nature of the Pooh community can be further appreciated when we compare it with other children’s literature of the period, such as the Noddy books or the Narnia books (though it may be debatable whether these were already written at the time when the traditions of the Pooh community were taking shape). Words and concepts very familiar from other children’s literature never appear in the Pooh books: the word ‘school,’ for example, is completely absent, as is the word ‘toys,’ even though the books are ostensibly about precisely toys. Conversely, the Pooh books have their own special vocabulary and imagery: *eg* the image of honey, which is extremely rare in other children’s literature (not at all to be found in the Narnia books, for example, according to the computer-generated analysis by Delaware and Babcock), constantly recurs in the literature of the Pooh community, which clearly must have used the image of honey as one of the key building blocks in their imaginative construction of the world.

The stories afford us a fairly accurate view of some of the rivalries and disputes within the community. The stories are told very much from the perspective of Pooh and Piglet, who evidently represent the dominant group in the community—from which presumably the bulk of the literature originated, though here and there we may detect the hand of an author less favourable to the Pooh and Piglet group. The Pooh and Piglet group saw itself as central to the life of the community (remember that Piglet’s house is located in the very centre of the forest), and the groups represented by other characters are accordingly marginalized. The figure of Owl, for example, surely represents the group of children who prided themselves on their intellectual achievements and aspired to status in the community on this basis. But the other children, certainly the Pooh and Piglet group, ridiculed them as swots. So throughout the stories the figure of Owl, with his pretentious learning and atrocious spelling, is portrayed as a figure of fun. Probably the Owl group, the swots, in their turn ridiculed the Pooh and Piglet group as ignorant and stupid: they used terms of mockery such as ‘bear of very little brain.’ Stories like the hunt for the Woozle, in which Pooh and Piglet appear at their silliest and most gullible, probably originated in the Owl group, which used them to lampoon the stupidity of the Pooh and Piglet group. But the final redactor, who favours the Pooh and Piglet group, has managed very skilfully to refunction all this material which was originally detrimental to the Pooh and Piglet group so that in the final form of the collection of stories it serves to portray Pooh and Piglet as oafishly lovable. In a paradoxical reversal of values, stupidity is elevated as deserving the community’s admiration. We can still see the point where an anti-Pooh story has been transformed in this way into an extravagantly pro-Pooh story at the end of the story of the hunt for the Woozle. Pooh and Piglet, you remember, have managed to frighten themselves silly by walking round and round in circles and mistaking their own paw-prints for those of a steadily increasing number of unknown animals of Hostile Intent. Realizing his mistake, Pooh declares: ‘I have been Foolish and Deluded, and I am a Bear of No Brain at All.’ The original anti-Pooh story, told by the Owl faction, must have ended at that point. But the pro-Pooh narrator has added—we can easily see that it is an addition to the original story by the fact that it comes as a complete *non sequitur*—the following comment by Christopher Robin: “‘You’re the Best Bear in All the World,’” said Christopher Robin soothingly.’ Extravagant praise from the

community's major authority-figure.

Such insight into the tensions between various factions in the Pooh community could easily be extended into more debatable territory (the identification of the Eeyore faction *eg* is still debated—some recent scholars have argued that Eeyore is best seen as representing the adults of the village). But I move on to give you an example of the way in which various crises in the community's history have left their mark in the traditions. One such crisis, we can be sure, was caused by the arrival in the village of an Australian family. This was a highly disturbing event for such a community of rural English children—otherwise isolated from the rest of the world. Rabbit (in the book) voices what must have been the general reaction of the community: 'We find a Strange Animal among us. An animal of whom we had never even heard before!' While Rabbit voices the indignation, Piglet expresses the community's fear of the newly arrived Australian children: 'Generally Regarded as One of the Fiercer Animals.' The Australians are represented in the story, of course, by Kanga and Roo. The story of the plan to capture baby Roo, which must have its basis in some rather nasty prank played by the Pooh and Piglet group on the Australians, should probably be read as the final redactor's attempt to surmount this crisis in the community by advocating the full and friendly integration of the Australians. The paradisaical picture with which the story ends ('So Kanga and Roo stayed in the forest. And every Tuesday Roo spent the day with his great friend Rabbit, and every Tuesday Kanga spent the day with her great friend Pooh, teaching him to jump...' and so on) is obviously idealistic, but brings to expression the final redactor's ideal for the community. This is a case where the social function of the story can be readily understood, as a means of defusing the tensions in the community caused by the arrival of outsiders, and promoting integration and cohesion. Successfully absorbed into the community, the characters of Kanga and Roo now function to reinforce the community's self-image as a friendly, mutually supportive group. Even the threatening oddity of the Australians—Kanga jumps—is transformed into a positive enrichment of the community, as Kanga teaches Pooh to jump. The community's sharp definition as a group of insiders over against putative outsiders is not breached, but reinforced as Kanga and Roo, initially perceived as intruding outsiders, are redefined as insiders.

Well, I hope you can begin to see how remarkably fruitful for Winnie-the-Pooh research has been this seminal, methodological insight that, whatever the stories may or may not tell us about the shadowy figure of Pooh himself, let alone Christopher Robin, primarily they tell the story of the Pooh community. This is their real value. They take us into the very concrete social context of a small community of English children struggling with the conflicts in their community, struggling to define their identity. Of course, every element in the reconstruction I have offered to you is contested by some scholars; research and debate continue; the picture will undoubtedly change radically. But that is the excitement of research. There are dozens of PhD theses still to be written before the time is ripe for someone to retrieve (affecting a kind of third naivety) the words of the little boy in the Hans Christian Andersen story.

© Richard Bauckham

Richard Bauckham was until 2007 Professor of New Testament Studies at the University of St Andrews, and is now Senior Scholar at Ridley Hall, Cambridge

Initial Critical-Exegetical Notes on 'Jack and Jill' ———

Jack and Jill went up the hill to fetch a pail of water.
Jack fell down and broke his crown, and Jill came tumbling after.

Jack. A nickname, most likely derived from John. Is this the Baptist? The son of Zebedee? The elder?

And Jill. Male and female singular recalls Adam and Eve. This confirmed by reference to the Fall. Note the assonance of Jack and Jill suggesting stylistic shaping and possible expansion of tradition to make it memorable. Bultmann: almost certainly a case of textual emendation of an earlier 'Liz' (Elizabeth) by dyslexic scribe.

Went up. Most likely from an apocryphal psalm of ascent; allusion to pilgrimages to Jerusalem? Aorist tense indicates not a repeated action but simple action. Jack was decisive.

The hill. Presence of the article is significant, suggesting a well-known hill, possibly the site of Asherah (pagan trip)? Jerusalem? Sinai? Calvary?

To fetch. Purpose indicated by the infinitive. Archaic/primitive language suggests the material is early, possibly preserving oral tradition.

A pail. Note that only one pail is sought by two people. Clearly if both Jack and Jill belonged in the *Vorlage*, two pails of water would be expected; joint carrying of one would be awkward. This confirms that Jill is an addition, perhaps to create dramatic interest/sexual tension. This has also led to expansion of the tradition in the second strophe of the second line. Was the empty pail carried up, or was it to be found up the hill at pail-Source (P)?

Pail. As opposed to 'bucket,' 'cup' or 'drink.' Jack obviously needs more than simply to quench his immediate thirst: Is he supporting a family at the bottom of the hill? (Käsemann) Is he *very* thirsty (Marshall)? Is he planning to wash the car? (Witherington III)?

Of water. Genitive of content. Why water instead of wine? Is Jack an ascetic? Methodist? *Water* is suggestive. Is it the water of life? (Carson) The water of baptism (R Brown)? Sustenance—Jack (and Jill) is incomplete without this substance. Imperfection even before the fall, so paradise is flawed before it is lost (Barth).

The asyndeton that follows indicates poor grammar or the writer's agitation.

Jack fell down. Where else? This fundamentalist writer clearly cannot conceive of a constructive fall that allows new freedoms. *Down* also raises the crucial question, 'How far?' Did he remain at the top, go part way, or go all the way to the bottom? The answer depends on the authenticity of the following strophe, *Jill came tumbling after*, which suggests some distance.

And broke his crown. The falling had the result (or was accompanied by) the breaking of the crown. Is this metaphor, referring to loss of eschatological reward? If so, we have a realized eschatology (Dodds). Or is 'crown' a reference to his anatomy, curiously confirming the Adamic allusion of being created to rule in the divine image?

Did he have a tooth problem? Or does 'crown' refer to a party hat—was Jack celebratory (part of new year cultic ritual)? This could help us determine the purpose of the ascent! Or does it refer to a royal crown (Jack symbolizing the royal family and hence a prophetic figure)? Or did he perform a prophetic act by deliberately breaking his royal crown after the fall, to show what was to come?

Repetition of 'and' (three in this couplet) points to Semitic origin?

Jill came. Better to take the verb with the following participle.

Tumbling. Early J tradition of acrobatic demiurge?

After. Poor grammar to end with a preposition, indicating this is a wooden translation, of backwoods origin, or maybe influence of Mark's gospel? Jill in second position behind Jack shows male patriarchalism (Fiorenza) and Jill's captivity to his power. Or is this a freely chosen, mimetic action? Did she follow willingly out of faithfulness (Arminius) or was her action simply foreordained (Calvin)?

Further grammatical, structural, text/form/redactional/source/rhetorical/canon-critical liberation theology reader-response reading with a hermeneutic of suspicion will no doubt clarify the interpretative possibilities and keep us employed a long time.

© Michael Thompson

Mike Thompson is Vice-Principal and Lecturer in New Testament Studies at Ridley Hall, Cambridge, and most famously was BSB's editor from 1996–2008

Grove Biblical Series

This month's Grove booklet (B58) is *How to Interpret Old Testament Law* by Philip Jenson. The Law is not usually seen as the most exciting part of the Old Testament—but more often as irrelevant, arbitrary or offensive.

Christian readers have dealt with this by separating ceremonial, civil and moral law—but this is not a distinction made in the Old Testament nor in the New, which sees Law positively. This study offers a new approach which interrelates different levels of law and restores its place in spirituality, doctrine and ethics.

Individual titles in the Biblical Series are available direct from Grove Books at **£3.95** each. Annual subscription (4 books) costs **£11.00, a saving of 30%**. Call, fax, email sales@grovebooks.co.uk or visit www.grovebooks.co.uk to order.

Contributions to BSB should be sent to: Richard Briggs (Editor—*Biblical Studies Bulletin*) at Cranmer Hall, St John's College, Durham DH1 3RJ (or via email to: richard.briggs@durham.ac.uk). Unsolicited material is welcome, but it cannot be returned.

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU

Tel: 01223 46 47 48 Fax: 01223 46 48 49

ISSN: 1365-6090