

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

pretation of the ways of God and of the word of God. Hither, then, when the youth comes, with his soul kindled with high and holy aspirations, while here he seeks such preparation as will best fit him for posts of honor and influence, while he aims in the highest and best sense to become "the man for the times," not for *this* time only but for all times, let him remember that "a *new* language is a new world," that it opens new forms of thought and feeling; nay more, let him remember that he who has mastered a new language in its letter and spirit, has, in the very act, had as if a *new soul* breathed into his own intellectual nature, to enhance his immortal being.

ARTICLE VII.

THE CITATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.

Translated from the German of Tholuck, by Charles A. Aiken, Resident
Licentiate, Andover.

[THIS translation is made from the third edition of the author's treatise on "The Old Testament in the New," which is usually found as an appendix to his Commentary on the Hebrews. The preceding edition of the appendix was translated with the commentary, and published in the "Cabinet Library," of Messrs. Clark, Edinburgh, in 1842. The treatise has since that time been entirely remodelled (1849), and is, in its present form, in Germany, the standard discussion of this important and difficult subject. The fact of a former translation seemed to render desirable a new translation, rather than a mere abstract, as had been intended. Here and there a quotation or reference has been thrown into a foot-note; and one omission will be found noticed in its place. The high reputation of the author and the importance of the subject will be a sufficient justification of the attempt to lay this discussion before the readers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. — TR.]

‡ 1. *Historical Introduction.*

The way in which all the writers of the New Testament, and especially the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, use the expressions of the Old Testament as proofs, is to us somewhat striking at the stage of development which exegesis has now reached, inasmuch as the passages of the Old Testament thus employed, have frequently a sense which seems to make them inappropriate to the argument, and, indeed, for citation at all in the connection. The Arminian theologians had, in their time, in support of the *historical interpretation* which they advocated, called especial attention to the fact, that among Jewish authors a like arbitrariness in the application of the Old Testament prevails; that they also explained passages of the Old Testament, and adduced them as proofs, or at least as parallels, altogether without regard to the original context. "So much every one perceives," says the Fragmentist, at the end of the last century (on the Design of Jesus and his disciples, p. 176), "that unless one is ready to assume beforehand, on the ground of his faith in the New Testament, this principle, — this passage speaks of Jesus of Nazareth, — no single one of these quotations proves anything, but that they all in their natural sense speak of quite other persons, times and events." Whether now, under the influence of the imperfect cultivation of the age, the Old Testament, in the passages in question, was expounded by the apostles, by Christ himself, generally in inconsistency with the connection, is to appear in the course of the following examination. True, special investigations are never undertaken without certain dogmatic presuppositions, more or less fixed; on the other hand, the results of the inquiry exert a reflex modifying influence upon former convictions, as here upon the Christology, and the doctrines of revelation and inspiration.

As long as the absolute freedom of the authors of the New Testament from error, stood fast as a premise unquestioned by interpreters, on account of the assumption of an *inspiratio literalis*, the interpretation and application of the Old Testament given in the New, must be the standard for Christian exposition. This was then the problem: to discover, in any possible way in these passages of the Old Testament, the specific Christian sense which had apparently been found in them by the

writers of the New Testament. Two methods were here pursued. Without regard to the connection, one portion of the earlier interpreters seek to establish the specifically Christian sense as that historically given in the Old Testament; the other, believing that these passages of the Old Testament must be understood in the first place from their connection, assume a double sense, a *ὑπόνοια*. Some follow now the one, now the other mode of explanation; so in the early church, the expositors Chrysostom and Theodoret, who occupy middle ground between the Alexandrian and the elder Antiochene schools. Yet Chrysostom expressly lays down this canon, that the connection is sometimes suddenly interrupted by a historical reference of the New Testament, that the discourse refers partly to circumstances of the time, partly to the future.¹ With equal measures of orthodoxy the one class of commentators, nevertheless, at times, comes into sharp conflict with the other. While Calov, alluding to the citation in Heb. ii., says on Isa. 8: 17, 18: *sunt verba ipsius Domini, habemus enim interpretationem indubitata*, and remarks on the citation in Heb. 1: 5: *non sensum geminum habet, sed ut omnia scripturae loca unicum tantum, quia spiritus sanctus non Apollinis more locutus ambigue sensum diversum iisdem verbis occultavit*; and, accordingly, on account of Matt. 2: 15, 18, finds in Hos. 11: 1, Jer. 31: 15, a prophecy of those events of the New Testament; the no less orthodox Chemnitz declares, on Matt. 2: 15: *coacta et contorta est eorum explicatio, qui contendunt Oseam in Matt. 2: 15, de solo puero Jesu vaticinari*; and Schöttgen on the same passage: *nemo negat haec verba proprie de populo Israelitico intelligi debere*. Among the early writers there belonged to the first class Augustine,² Jerome, Cyril Alex., Luther,³ most of the Lutheran interpreters, so Tarnov, Seb. Schmidt,

¹ He says on Psalm cix.: *Περὶ τίνος ὁ ψαλμὸς εἴρηται; ἕνα περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδα — τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ περὶ ἐτέρων · καὶ γὰρ οὗτος προφητείας πάλιν τρόπος ἐστίν. — καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο προφητείας εἶδος, μεταξὺ διακρίπτει καὶ ἱστορίαν τινὰ ἐμβάλλειν, καὶ μετὰ τὸ ταῦτα διεξελθεῖν πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ πρότερα ἐπανέινα.*

² Clausen, Aug. scripturae sacrae interpres, p. 159.

³ Yet Luther follows in this respect, as in others, no fixed rules of hermeneutics. In the Psalms he applies the words everywhere to Christ, so that he, e. g., in Ps. 102: 27, which is applied to Christ in Heb. 1: 10, refers "but thou art the same," to the fact, that God incarnate is no other than God in eternity. On the other hand, he does not allow himself to be in the least bound by the application of Isa. 8: 14 by the apostles to the Messiah, 1 Pet. 2: 8. Rom. 9: 33, but in the interpretation of Isa. viii. treats the expression as a "locus communis," thus: so

Calov, A. H. Francke, in his exposition of the Psalms, and others; and, among the Reformed theologians, prominently Surenhus, who has applied this mode of exposition to all the citations from the Old Testament in his *βίβλος καταλλαγῆς*. Even down to the time of Andreas Cramer (1757) on account of the citation in Heb. 1: 10, the Messiah is regarded as the subject of Psalm cii., and, in yet more recent times, on account of the quotations in the New Testament, the Psalms in which the singer speaks in the first person are regarded by many as Psalms in which the Messiah is introduced as speaking; so Dereser, Kaiser, Klaus, Hengstenberg, in the Christology. Yet more widely extended in the early church was the assumption of a *double sense*; its advocates were Origen, Eusebius Cæs., Basil, Gregory of Nyssa and of Nazianzen, Ephraim in the Mesopotamian school of interpreters; in the Latin church, Hilary and Ambrose, and, as has been already remarked, to some extent, Chrysostom and Theodoret. Psalm lxix., e. g., according to Theodoret, treats in its proper sense, of the miseries of the Jews in exile, typically, of the Redeemer; Psalm viii., according to Chrysostom and Theodoret, primarily of man in general, *κρυώτερον* of the first born of the human race, of Christ. The majority of Catholic interpreters, also, belong to this class. The most of the Reformed commentators, Zuingli, Pellicanus, Calvin, Bucer,¹ Cocceius, also, attached themselves to it, for the sake of the historical interpretation. Melancthon, also, on Ps. 22: 4, follows this method of interpretation. By Bengel this principle of hermeneutics is thus expressed (Gnomon on Matt. 1: 22): *saepe in N. T. allegantur vaticinia, quorum contextum prophetarum tempore non dubium est, quin auditores ex intentione divini interpretari debuerint de rebus jam*

soon as one turns aside from the faith, we stumble at all the miracles and words of God, and adds: the apostles have in 1 Pet. ii. Rom. ix., applied this general expression to a particular thing. He also explains Isa. 8: 17, 18, not according to Heb. ii. of Christ, but of the prophet (Walch. VI. p. 121 seq.). The same free manner, regardless of consistency, he uses with regard to the language of the apostles, when he says on Matt. xxiv.: Matthew and Mark confuse the two (the end of the world and the destruction of Jerusalem), do not observe the order which Luke has preserved (Walch, XI. 2496).

¹ Zuingli on Matt. 2: 18, says: *evangelista detorquet haec verba ad Christum, omnia enim quae in Vetere Testamento etiam vere sunt gesta, in figura tamen contigerunt et figurae fuerunt, in Christo omnia consummantur et vere implentur.* Bucer, after much hesitation on the question, whether the historical sense is in all the Psalms to be regarded as the primary, decides at length in the affirmative, with the words: *veritati enim nihil officit, et facit omnia clariora.*

tum praesentibus. Eadem vero *intentio divina longius prospiciens, sic formavit orationem, ut magis proprie deinceps ea conveniret in tempora Messiae* et hanc intentionem divinam apostoli nos docent. Bengel, accordingly, explains the citations, Matt. 2: 15, 18, with the remark, which may, however, be understood also in a freer and modern sense:¹ *unius dicti sensui minor et maior non unius temporis eventus respondere potest, donec vaticinium exhaustur.* Among living commentators Stier is the only one who maintains the doctrine that two or even more senses were intended by the Holy Spirit as author of the Scriptures.

Especially in Calvin do we see the conviction pressing upward, that in many instances, like Matt. 2: 18. Rom. 10: 6 seq. Eph. 4: 9. Heb. 2: 6—9. 4: 4, the passages of the Old Testament are not to be at all regarded as prophecies, but *are used by the New Testament author merely as the substratum for his own ideas.*² In this way an expedient would be suggested for the explanation of passages of the Old Testament according to their connection, without accusing the author of the New Testament of a *παρεμψηφία*. The earliest fathers of the Antiochene school, Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsueste, are, as it appears, still more committed to this principle. As they attached special importance to the *ἀκολουθία*, i. e. the sense gathered from the connection, they find in the Old Testament but few prophecies that relate properly to Christ, — Diodorus only three or four Messianic Psalms. Kosmas Indicopleustes, who follows Diodorus, declares it not allowable to refer, in the Psalms, aphoristically, part to Christ, part to other persons, it being an unworthy assumption, that, in the same Psalm, here the experiences of the Lord, there those of his servants, are depicted. Therefore, where others find the Messiah to be the exclusive or the coördinate subject,

¹ Nitzsch, *System of Christian Doctrine*, 5th ed. p. 88: the more there is that is typical contained in a prophecy, so much the more does it await a various and gradual, a very near and a very remote fulfilment, e. g. the prophecies of Ezekiel and of the second part of Isaiah.

² He remarks on Heb. 2: 6: *respondeo, non fuisse propositum apostolo genitiam verborum expositionem referre. Nihil enim est incommodi si allusiones in verbis quaerat ad ornandam praesentem causam. Quemadmodum Paulus cum Rom. 10: 6. testimonium citat ex Mose: quis ascendit in coelum, etc., statim non interpretationem sed exornationem attexit de coelo et inferis, etc. While he attempts in Matt. 2: 15, to point out more accurately the typical element, on verse 18 he remarks only: non intelligit Math., illic praedictum fuisse, quid facturus esset Herodes, sed Christi adventu renovatam esse luctum illum.*

these interpreters abide by the reference to David, Solomon or Zerubbabel, and are consequently accused, even by Chrysostom and Theodoret, of Judaizing. The citation of other passages by the apostles is regarded as mere accommodation, *ex similit.*¹ In all probability the justification of such applications and parallels was based on a reference to the complete organic parallelism of the Old Testament and the New; such as Theodore of Mopsueste refers to in the preface to his exposition of Jonah (Theodori Mopsv. quae supersunt ed. Wegnern, T. I. p. 277 seq.).

This mode of treating citations was carried to the greatest extent in its application by the Arminians; see Grotius on Matt. 1: 22, Episcopius on Matt. 2: 15, and especially Wetstein on Matt. 1: 22. According to the manner of Jewish authors, *ἵνα πληρωθῆ*, they say, introduces a significant simile.² The same conclusion is reached in the full, though irresolute, discussion of the citations of the Old Testament in the New, in Eckermann's Theologische Beiträge; see particularly II. 213. The period of illumination had meanwhile, in order to reconcile the irrationality said to be found in the Scriptures with the authority still ascribed to them, brought into vogue the theory of *accommodation*, which was employed especially to excuse the application made of these citations. "It is for the sake of the Jews," says Semler (in "The last Confession of Faith concerning the Christian and natural religion," p. 246), "that passages of the Old Testament are adduced in the New, that they might attach a wider significance to their former narrower interpretations." On 1 Cor. 10: 4, he remarks, after adducing some Jewish legends: *haec talia, ingenio Judaico propria, a Christiana vero mente plane aliena, non*

¹ "Ὅσα δὲ ἕτερα, says Kosmas (Montfaucon collectio nova Patrum II. 227), ἐξέλαβον οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐκ τῶν ψαλμῶν, οἷχ' ὡς εἰς αὐτὸν κυρίως εἰρημίνα ἐξέλαβον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀρμόζοντα τῇ ὑποθέσει· οἷον· διμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια μου (Ps. 22: 9) — οἷον ἐποίησε καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, τὴν χρῆσιν Μωυσέως μεταβαλὼν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπόθεσιν (Rom. 10: 6) — μεταφράσας τὴν χρῆσιν ὡς ἀρμόδιαν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπόθεσιν. Theodore of Mopsueste judges in the same way of the passage from the Psalms in Heb. 10: 5, which refers, he says, properly to the Jews in captivity: *μεταλλάξας εὖν αὐτὴν ὡς ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ταύτη φησὶν, κ. τ. λ.* (Fritzsche, Theod. Mopsv. in N. T. comm. 1847, p. 169).

² Hammond on Matt. 2: 23: respondeo, aliquando prophetias dici impleri, etsi stricte ac proprie et primario prophetiae sensu non implentur, sed latiori, cum aliquid accidit cui accommodari possunt vel quod earum memoriam in mentes hominum revocant.

miramur Paulum isto tempore non refutare, *quia illis utendum erat καὶ ἄνθ' ὁμοίων*. The parallelism with the Jewish priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews is nothing but an adaptation to Jewish readers, to wean them more entirely from their old notions (Freiere theol. Lehrart, pp. 111. 447). The same principle is held with reference to the argumentation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by Griesbach, Ernesti, and, to a great degree, by Stuart. After the authority of Scripture had been given up, "illuminated" theology, which now appeared as Rationalism, began to speak of accommodation to Jewish prejudices; the theological partialities of that period were ascribed to the apostles themselves. On the way to this result we find Clericus, when he says of the citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews: solebant Judaei pleraque magnificentiora promissa in V. T. de Christo interpretari sensumque mysticum in iis quaerere. Credibile autem est, loca, quae huius Ep. scriptor de Christo explicat, dum sensum eis mysticum adsignat, sic vulgo etiam a Judaeis intellecta esse, certe partim. That the apostles, in the passages of the Old Testament cited by them, found genuine oracles relating to Christian events, and this because they were led astray by the perverted modes of exposition prevailing among the Jews, is maintained in the article in Eichhorn's Bibliothek on "Accommodations in the New Testament" (V. 420 seq.). This view is carried out by Döpke in his "New Testament Hermeneutics, Part I. 1829." In exegesis, it was applied especially by Rückert, Röth Ep. ad Hebraeos, Böhme in his comm. in Ep. ad Hebraeos, Meyer, Fritzsche (first with reference to Matt. 1: 22); by these last two with manifest prejudices against the New Testament authors.

A certain relationship between the apostolical and the Jewish hermeneutics could no longer be denied. The decided majority of commentators within the last twenty years, adhering to a more conciliatory orthodoxy, have gone back to the method of the elder Antiochene school. On the one hand it is conceded, that the Old Testament expressions quoted have in their connection a different historical relation; on the other it is contended, that the charge of a groundless arbitrariness can be raised against the applications made in the New Testament. Reference is made to the organic parallelism existing between the Old Testament and New Testament economies, by virtue of which a certain degree of truth attaches to these several quotations of Old Tes-

tament passages. From a more rational point of view this principle is applied to the arguments drawn from the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews, by De Wette "on the symbolical typical style of teaching in the Epistle to the Hebrews," in No. 3 of the Theol. Journal of Schleiermacher, De Wette and Lücke. Bleek follows him in the article "on the dogmatic use of passages of the Old Testament in the New Testament," Stud. and Krit., 1835, No. 2; compare his Commentary on Hebrews, II 108 seq. Billroth, also, in commentary on 1 Cor. 1: 19, insists on this organic mode of conceiving of the relation of the two Testaments in judging of separate citations. The same view, only that it rests on a more positive dogmatic basis, in Bengel's style, is developed by Olshausen "on the deeper import of Scripture," 1829, and is applied in his exegetical writings. Beck agrees essentially with Olshausen, in his "attempt at a pneumatic exegetical development of the ninth chapter of Romans, with a supplement on the pneumatic exposition of Scripture" (1833, of his Lehrwissenschaft, II 360 seq.). With the same fundamental principle, yet with results which differ but little from the rationalistic view of prophecy, Hofmann unfolds the organic connection between the Old Testament and the New, and discusses the nature of prophecy, in his work "Prophecy and Fulfilment" (I 1841, II 1844); cf. the criticism of this singularly confused work in Delitzsch's "Biblical prophetic Theology" (1845), p. 172 seq. Inasmuch as Hofmann insists that prophecy never reaches out beyond the then present field of view, and that it is only within this that the Christian idea is obscurely presaged, there remains only typical prophecy possible. By this so-called *organic* mode of exposition, that which lay at the basis of the old assumption of a double sense, a *ἰνóρoια*, is brought out more clearly. It likewise gives its due weight to the historical connection of the Old Testament text, and, on the other hand, vindicates the New Testament citation from the charge of mere subjective, wanton arbitrariness. This latter advantage is so far from being impaired by the admission that this mode of citation is characteristic of Jewish development in the apostolic age, that a justification must rather be accorded to this parallelizing Jewish exegesis, to a certain degree, which, it is true, is often exceeded.¹

¹ Many of the earlier expositors who defended the double sense, made, at the same time, the admission, that the Apostles' mode of citation was that then prevalent among the Jews. — See Schötgen on Matt. 1: 16.

The orthodox theology of the church has been gradually coming round to this view. The change in Hengstenberg's opinions was first expressed in an article in the *Ev. Kirchenzeitung*, 1833, Nos. 23, 24, where the principle is laid down, that the idea which forms the basis of a prophecy is to be distinguished from its realization in time. This canon is satisfactorily applied in Vol. III of the *Christology*. The prophet Elias, announced in *Mal.* 3: 1, 2, 3, is not directly John the Baptist; it is the personification of the preaching of repentance, which must precede salvation (*Christol.* III 441). *Hag.* 2: 6 does not refer directly to the period of the New Testament, but conveys the idea, in accordance with which Hengstenberg explains *Heb.* 12: 26, that the heathen are to be brought to repentance by a desolating judgment of God on the heathen world (as above, p. 337). The explanation according to which *Joel* 3: 1, 2, as quoted in *Acts* 2: 16, receives its sole fulfilment in that event, is pronounced (p. 190) "gross, wooden, leathery;" the fulfilment reaches rather as far as the subject itself, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. According to Hengstenberg's more recent interpretation of the Psalms, the application of the Psalms to the Messiah by the New Testament, in those passages in which the singer speaks in the first person, rests on this principle, that these passages are fulfilled in the Messiah, inasmuch as they describe the righteous man according to his idea. Otto von Gerlach, also, in his popular commentary, in connection with *Matt.* 2: 16, gives the following abstract statement of the idea of prophecy: The word *fulfil* in this and similar passages does not convey the notion that the words introduced from the prophets contain a prophecy which finds its fulfilment only in the single events before us. Every word of God contains rather an idea which is realized whenever that which it expresses becomes in greater or less degree actual (see Bengel, as above). So even in this work of a Jewish missionary, "Exposition of the New Testament, by C. Teichler" (Berlin, 1847). We may then regard this organic biblical mode of treating the citations from the Old Testament in the New Testament as solely prevalent among biblical and ecclesiastical theologians.

‡ 2. *The Citations of the Old Testament in Jewish authors.*

The mode of using the Old Testament, prevailing among Jewish authors, is certainly in the highest degree arbitrary. Authorities at our command have not hitherto been sufficient to exhibit fairly its characteristics. Döpke's work, "Hermeneutics of the New Testament authors," 1829 (properly rabbinical hermeneutics, with which he discusses that of the New Testament), is merely an uncritical compilation of passages, and needs very much to be sifted. The most thorough discussion of the subject, but unfortunately very diffuse and uncritical, especially in Part 2, is found in Hirschfeld's "Spirit of the Talmudic interpretation of the Bible" (Part 1. Exposition of the Halacha, 1840; Part 2. Exposition of the Haggada, 1847). Geiger's treatise, "The relation of the natural sense of Scripture to the Talmudic application of Scripture," in the *Scientific Journal for Jewish theology*, Vol. V., VI., gives more critical results. Of an earlier date, *Halichoth Olam*, by R. Levita, edited by Bashuysen, 1714, is to be consulted for details; and Wähner's *Antiquitates Sacrae*, 1743, gives a very accurate survey of the subject.

The Rabbis were not content merely with quoting passages severed from their connection. In order to press from the Scriptures new sense and new allusions, ingenuity resorted to many artifices, transposition of letters, interpretation according to their numerical value, and even exchange with similar letters and words, etc. In their hyperbolic way, some maintain that every verse can be explained in 49, 60, or even 600,000 ways (Eisenmenger's *Judaism unveiled*, I. 454 seq.). A learned Jew from the interior of Russia was once, in the author's presence, pressed with the assertion, that Moses was also a sinner, a murderer, in allusion to Ex. ii. "What did he kill?" was the surprising retort. "A man? Is it not written: and he looked about him, and behold, there was *no man*?" A great part of the arguments from Scripture collected in Eisenmenger's work, I. Ch. 9, are no better than this. This art of the expositor, to twist and press the single words of the text in all directions, is praised with the epithet *מְדַקְדֵּק* (*subtilis*), as a peculiar art of the commentator. Examples of this kind are given in great number, yet without discrimination, in the compilations, much used by our commentators, of Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Eisenmenger and Wetstein;

passages from Targums of the second century, and from Prague Rabbis of the seventeenth, interpretations of law, and allegorical witticisms, by Rabbis from Arabic schools of philosophy, and utterly uncultivated Polish and Galician Rabbis, are thrown together in motley confusion. It will be seen, at once, that a comparison of New Testament usage with the illustrations preserved in these collections, must be made with more careful discrimination than has been common. See my dissertation "de ortu Cabbalae," 1837. In regard to the mode of interpretation, and still more with respect to spirit and taste, distinction must be made according to the times of the expositors, and the sphere and species of the exposition.

In respect to this latter, it is to be remarked, at the outset, that not precisely the same style of interpretation is appropriate to the juristic legal exposition and the dogmatic and practical, in the Halacha and Haggada. By Halacha is to be understood the authorized legal decision; by Haggada, the moral practical applications, the historical confirmations and illustrations.¹ Received customs, which had been introduced in the course of time, must be proved accordant with the Scriptures; this was the aim of the Halacha. It had, e. g., become customary to read the passage, Deut. 6: 4—9, together with 11: 13—21 and Num. 15: 37—41, twice a day; in the Scriptures this is not required. The attempt was made, however, to justify it from Scripture; it is said in the Mischna of Berachoth, "the Schammaites teach: in the evening the passage shall be read in a lying posture, in the morning, standing, for it is written, Deut. 6: 7, 'when thou liest down and when thou risest up.'" Hillel draws an inference from this passage only in respect to the time, holding that it contains nothing concerning the posture. Sometimes practice was directly in conflict with the Scriptures. In the Scriptures it is said: "Ye shall kindle no fire in your dwellings on the Sabbath." This, however, was done; the greater, therefore, was the need of reconciliation. There were, then, discussions among the teachers of the law, and according to the weight of authority or the number of voices a decision was made; this was the Halacha. "The precepts attached to Scripture and conceived in its spirit originally formed the Halacha" (Frankel's *Vorstudien zur LXX.*,

¹ מִצְוָה from הִלַּךְ, according to the lexicon, Baal Aruch, "a prescription according to which the Israelites walk." הִגְדָה from נָגַד, "the narration, explanation."

1841, p. 180). According to Geiger's investigations (as above, p. 67, cf. 244) in regard to פָּשָׁט, in the Mischna the distinction is not yet made between פָּשָׁט (simple sense), שֵׁנִי (secondary sense);¹ שֵׁנִי, in the Mischna, means only "explain." The exposition of the Mischna aims, then, merely at giving the literal sense, and even the Gemara repeatedly lays down the proposition אין מקרא יוצא מִדָּבָר טָבוֹעַ; Scripture does not pass beyond the literal sense (Jebamoth, f. 24, 1. Schabbath, f. 63, 1). Only by way of exception, when the practice fixed by tradition found no warrant in the natural sense of the words, does this interpretation resort to such artifice and violence as we have alluded to. Here, also, in such a case it is allowed that letters be transposed, that the text be read with other vowels, and that the arrangement of words be altered. Certain limits are, however, set to these caprices. Exchange of letters is permitted only at the beginning or end of words, not in the middle; further, the words to be exchanged must stand not too far apart. Again, a definite distinction is made between proofs from Scripture, רְאִיָּה, and mere supports, אֲמָרָה (Wähner's Antiqu. Hebr. 346. 372, Geiger, as above, p. 72); some teachers reject the latter class, others, certain modes of indirect proof from Scripture (Geiger, p. 72, note). Even in the Gemara, objection is still made to too violent treatment of Scripture; thus Rabba once, in opposing a Rabbi who went too far in the transposition of words, said in reproof: "A sharp knife does certainly cut up the verses" (Baba Bathra, f. 111, 2).

Far above all other books of the Bible, in the esteem of the Hebrew, stood the Thora; the others might be sold to procure a Thora with the money; the Pentateuch might be laid upon the other books; the reverse could not be. The exposition of the law must, therefore, be more exact with the words; even Philo will not sacrifice the literal sense of the words of the law. It is then conceivable that, where the interpretation of the law was not involved, greater license was allowed. The interpretation of the Halacha could come only from legal authority, and had reference to general religious duties; that of the Haggada served for personal edification and instruction, and might be given by any private individual.² "The exposition of the Hala-

¹ Thus, or by "subordinate sense," is this word more exactly translated, than, as is usually done, by "Allegory."

² Hirschfeld (I. 13) seeks, therefore, to press upon the word דְּבַר הַדְּבָרִים the signification, "opinion."

cha aims to point out in the Bible any special law that in life is esteemed biblical, guards, however, against the perversion of other passages by an interpretation consistent with this; it therefore defines laws of interpretation. The exposition of the Haggada, on the other hand, occupied with ideas, moves more freely; proof is not so necessary in the Haggada" (Hirschfeld, II. 7). When Zunz compares the relation between the Halacha and Haggada, with that between the prophet and the priest, it must be said that the dissimilarity is greater than the resemblance. The Haggada, then, which has nothing to do with the law, avails itself for its ends not merely of the explanation of the words; as it falls entirely within the province of subjective application, it makes the freest use of the license mentioned in connection with the Halacha, and employs also the Midrasch in the narrower sense, allegorical explanation. An exhibition of the unbounded freedom allowed, is given by Wähner, *Antiqu. Hebr.*, 306, Hirschfeld, II. 353 seq. But for this very reason the principle is explicitly laid down, *לֹא מִזְרֵר לֹא מִזְרֵר וְלֹא מִזְרֵר*, "the Haggadist (Döpke translates incorrectly "Allegorist") can neither bind nor loose" (*Cod. Horajoth*, f. 48, 3). Zunz, in his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, 1832, p. 327, says: "But this freedom aimed neither at corrupting the Scriptures, nor at robbing them of their natural sense, for the purpose for which it was indulged was only free thought, not binding commandment. The greater the license allowed to the Haggada, in its treatment of the sacred books, the less could be conceded to the word of the individual; therefore, the Haggada has no binding authority either in interpretation or in practice."

But, in respect to the liberty thus authorized, a distinction is to be made in periods. Hirschfeld says (II. 212): "In the earlier period of the exposition of the Haggada, these methods were applied more severely; in the later, when men had become accustomed to them, more wantonly." To have exhibited the progress of this license is a special merit of Geiger's treatise. The Mischna is followed by the Thosifta (additions to the Mischna) and the Boraitha (Mischna lying beyond the range of the proper Mischna). As appeal to these was not so decisive as to the preceding (Wähner, as above, 307, 311), we should expect to find here yet greater degeneracy in interpretation, which, however, is not the case. These books, which are to be found copied in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, distinguish between proper proof and

mere allusion, *רָמַז* and *זָכַר* (see proof in Geiger, 243); in the main they give a sharp grammatical exposition, although here and there the above mentioned arts of interpretation are practised, such as exchange of letters, e. g. Sifri on Lev. 1: 10. This characteristic cannot surprise us, if Zunz is right in maintaining that the books of the Boraitha are older than the proper Mischna (as above, p. 46). The authority of the Gemara is much less; in it the interpretation of the *זָכַר* occurs with the simple literal exposition. If, now, in these different collections of Talmudic tradition there is a progressive arbitrariness of interpretation, and if it is, therefore, to be assumed that the authors of the New Testament stand nearer the elder, simpler and more natural mode of procedure, it will be at once seen, how cautious one should be in treating expositions after the style and taste of the later Rabbis as parallel with the New Testament method.

When we now come to the question, whether Rabbinic citations with *בְּפִנְיָאֵם* and *בְּפִנְיָאֵם* always permit us to assume that the author regards the sense which he assigns to the citation as the original and primary sense, we should be obliged to confine ourselves, according to the remark just made, to citations in the Mischna; but, as we shall not readily be allowed to limit ourselves to these literary productions, which in point of time are nearest to the Apostles, we will, in what follows, refer to the Rabbis generally. Now that the Rabbis always and in all circumstances quoted in the consciousness of employing only the proper sense of the passages of the Old Testament, we must decidedly deny; and first, on the ground of general analogy. It follows, from the nature of the case, that the words of prominent writers should be employed by their admirers as substratum and verification of their own ideas, indeed, even as predictions of later events. In the first use, one seeks in an important authority a confirmation of his own thoughts, unless it be a mere play of wit; subsequent use rests upon this truth, that every profound utterance is realized, not once, but many times, in the course of history; that, in fact, there is nothing new under the sun. In this sense, the Greeks were wont to cite passages from their poets, especially Homer, à propos; Plutarch, *Symposiaca*, IX. 1, collects a number of illustrations, in which extracts from the poets are applied thus pertinently to the matter in hand. The later occurrence being regarded as, in a sense, a mere copy of the earlier deed or dictum, it is conceivable that, in such a case, even a pre-

diction should be discerned. In an epigram on a high building in Byzantium (*Anthologia*, ed. *Jacobs*, IV. 20), it is said, after *Hesiod's* words: τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἰδεῖν τε θεοὶ κ. ε. λ., have been cited: ἔνεπεν Ἀσκησίως, δῶμα τόδε προλέγω. In Christian usage this custom of referring to significant passages of Scripture, or analogies in the facts of the Bible, with an "as stands recorded," is well known. Some examples, such as we have at hand from the earlier period of the church, may be here introduced. In the panegyric of *Eusebius*, on occasion of the building of the church at Tyre, *Hist. Eccl.* 10. 4, it is said, e. g., of those who risked all dangers to accomplish the building of the church: ὡς τὰς πάλαι στήλαις ἰσραὶς καταγραφείσας προφήσας, ἔργω πιστὰς ὁμολογῆσθαι (the Divine word is thereby again proved true, and becomes the more credible), δι' αὐτὰ τε ἀλλὰ ὁ θεὸς ἐπαληθεύει λόγος, ἀσὰρ καὶ τὰδε περὶ αὐτῶν ἀποφαινόμενος: "δογμαίαν ἐσπάσαντο οἱ ἀμαρτωλοί. ἐπίτεταν τόξον αὐτῶν," κ. ε. λ. Below he says further: καὶ τότε ἐν τοῦτοις προκαταφρονῶν: "κύριε, ἐν τῇ πόλει σου τὴν εἰσοδα αὐτῶν ἐξουθενώσους," ἀληθὴς ἐν' ὀφθαλμοῖς πάντων ἀναπίπτεται. Again, of the spiritual desolation of the church he says, that it had become so changed, ὡς ἀναφρονεῖν αὐτῇ τὴν προφητεῖαν Ἠσαίου ταῦτα: εὐφράσθητι ἱερῆμος διψῶσα, κ. ε. λ. *Theod. religiosa hist.* opp. III. 1104, says of the Ascetics, inasmuch as they had heard the words of the prophet: death comes in at the windows, *Jer.* 9: 20, they shut up their senses with the Divine commandments as with bolts. On p. 1179, he writes of the persecutions and afflictions of the Christian church under the Emperor *Valens*, that it had sung the song of David: "By the rivers of Babylon," etc., and continues: τὰ δὲ λειψὰ τῆς εἰδοῦς οὐκ εἶναι αὐτοῖς ἀγμῶδία ἦν. *Hegesippus* in *Eusebius Hist. Eccl.* 2, 23, after recording the murder of *James*, adds: καὶ ἐπλήρωσαν τὴν γραφήν τὴν ἐν Ἠσαίᾳ γεγραμμένην. In the *Chronicon* of *Barhebraeus*, p. 326, it is said of the inhabitants of the destroyed city *Edessa*: 𐤊 𐤊𐤁 𐤁 𐤂 𐤃 𐤄 𐤅 𐤆 𐤇 𐤈 𐤉 𐤊 𐤋 𐤌 𐤍 𐤎 𐤏 𐤐 𐤑 𐤒 𐤓 𐤔 𐤕 "They saw the wrath of which the prophet says: I bear the wrath of God, because I have sinned." *Mohammedans* quote from the *Koran* in the same way. These applications of the words of Scripture will be the more frequent in proportion to the profoundness of the author, and his quickness in perceiving analogies in the midst of differences.¹

¹ The translator has taken the liberty of omitting here a long, highly figura-

It would be mere partisan prejudice to refuse to recognize solely among Jewish authors a custom which prevails everywhere else. This custom is especially natural in connection with sacred books, into the spirit of which the soul has so penetrated, that present events and ideas involuntarily suggest some familiar expression of Scripture; and this so much the more, if, as with the Jews, education is almost entirely restricted to the sacred codex. This is also the origin of the custom of weaving biblical phraseology immediately into the text, a custom that differs only in form from that of introducing by *מְזַמֵּן*, as is very common with the Jews. "To find everywhere biblical phrases given with verbal accuracy, must seem to readers a great advantage, partly because they have in this the best evidence that the author is well grounded in the Bible, and partly because this is the surest guaranty of his harmony with the Bible" (Duke's *Rabbinische Blumenlese*, 1844, p. 35). Sachs expresses the same idea (*Jüdische Poesie in Spanien*, 1846, p. 161): "So long as the popular consciousness is complete and independent; so long as it lives shut up in a world of views and conceptions of its own, which surround and envelop it as its atmosphere; so long as it continues productive in the same style and spirit that characterized the old intellectual works which first revealed its peculiarities; so long it seeks and finds in these works only a reproduction of itself; renews in them its own life, and recognizes them as bearing the valid impress of its own modified, enriched and deeply excited spirit." Accordingly, even Döpke, whose whole aim is to exhibit the perverseness of the Jewish style of exegesis, as rising even to absurdity, is obliged to admit, that sometimes, at least, in the application of Old Testament passages to later events, prophecy was not assumed (as above, 167); and, although the admission is made so reluctantly, that it seems to be retracted, p. 159, yet he finally abides by it. He himself gives a confirmation of it, when he mentions the fourfold sense recognized by the Rabbis, which they expressed concisely in the abbreviation *פְּסוּט, סוּר, דְּרָשׁ, וְרָמָז*, and defines it thus: (1) the literal sense, (2) the *ἰστορία* certainly intended by God, (3) the allegory possibly intended by God, (4) the arbitrary application. The conception and definition of these *termini*

tive, and obscure quotation from Hamann, which could hardly be made intelligible without copious explanation, and is not at all essential.

technici belongs, it is true, to the author's subjective view,¹ yet it shows that even he recognizes a province within which the Jewish author remained conscious that the application of the text was purely subjective. We must, however, after what has been said, go still further. The expositions of the Haggada, to which those of the Midrasch in the narrower sense, the allegorical, belong, have no binding authority as law; and, therefore, the influence of the subjective view must be recognized also in them. In the exposition of the law no figurative explanations at all were allowed. "In three instances has R. Ishmael explained the Thora בְּשָׁלֹשׁ מְקוֹמֵי תּוֹרָה, i. e. improperly, yet the Haggada agrees with him in only two of them" (Hirschfeld, as above, I. 143). We can readily see how little disposition there was to allow to the allegorical interpretation objective authority. In respect particularly to the quotation with מְשַׁמֵּר, the formula קִבְּרָה קִבְּרָה, "perhaps he here says," points distinctly to the subjective nature of the application. We are further pointed to a mere application of the text by passages where, for the sake of the practical moral truths in the style of the Haggada, the language of the text, as in Eph. 4: 8 (and two examples to be quoted directly show this), is first made pertinent to the end by exchange with words of like sound; and, in respect to this, Maimonides remarks (More Nebochim, III. 43), that this can be regarded only as a pleasant enigmatical play, to make a truth more impressive. Many expressions are, furthermore, of such a sort that only a determined prejudice could deny the obvious propriety of understanding them in this way. Such are the following, which Döpke, it is true, cites as examples proving that a hidden sense of words of the Old Testament is assumed by the author. Midrasch Thillim, f. 3, c. 1: He will be like a tree planted by the rivers of water; that is, Abraham, whom God took and transplanted into the land of Israel. In Tr. Joma, f. 38, c. 1, it is said, the family Garun has always eaten clean bread, as stands recorded, וְרֵי רֵי תָהוּם נְקִיִּים, Num. 32: 22, words from the

¹ The Rabbis did not themselves define these ideas so, and this classification was purely individual. True, it is mentioned in the Gemara. Tr. Chagiga, but is found more definitely in the Commentary on the Pentateuch, by Bechai ben Asher, about 1290. The word סוּר denotes frequently (Schöttgen on Eph. 5: 32) the Cabbalistic exposition. מְשַׁמֵּר is said by Fürst (Bibl. Jud. 1849, I. 75) to be the rational interpretation. מְשַׁמֵּר is used of every application of Scripture, e. g. by Abarbanel in מְשַׁמֵּר מְשַׁמֵּר ed. Hulsius, p. 529.

passage in which command is given to the Reubenites and Gadites to aid their brethren in the conquest of Canaan, for then they would be clean (guiltless). Tr. Berachoth, f. 10, c. 2, R. Jose says: "Of him who eats and drinks before offering his morning prayer," is it written in 1 Kings 14: 9, "thou hast cast me behind thy back." Thou must read, however, not אַחֲרַי נָקַדְתָּ, but נָקַדְתָּ אַחֲרַי, behind thy pride. Tr. Kilaim Jerush. f. 32, c. 2, it is said: "R. Judah had a toothache for thirteen years, and during this whole time no woman in Israel miscarried, אָמַרְתָּ, Isa. liii., 'verily he bore our sickness and took upon himself our pains.'" We add two other examples from a portion of the Talmud, to which, above all others, a sober practical discretion is ascribed, from Pirke Aboth, c. 3, †22. The question is asked, to what he is to be compared whose ideas are greater than his deeds, and the answer is, to a tree with many branches, but few roots; when a storm comes it is torn up and thrown prostrate. By a אָמַרְתָּ reference is then made to Jer. 17: 6. To the question, to what he is to be compared whose deeds are better than his understanding, the answer is, to a tree with few branches but many roots; all the storms in the world could not move it from its place. Again follows with a אָמַרְתָּ, Jer. 17: 8. Ch. 6, †2, it is said: "he who does not devote himself to the Thora is culpable," after which Ex. 32: 16 is cited with an אָמַרְתָּ: "the tables are God's tables, and the writing God's writing graven upon the tables. Read not, however, it is said, תְּרִירוֹת but חֲרִירוֹת, freedom; for none is free but he who busies himself with the Thora. Lo, he will be exalted, as it is said, Num. 21: 19, from Mathana to Nachaiel, and from Nachaiel to Bamoth, i. e. "from the gift, that is, the Thora, to God's possession, and from there to exaltation." The practical spirit of this portion of the Talmud leaves no room for doubt that this language, far from designing to exhibit the sense of the text, intended merely an application of it. If, in the examples above cited, the ambiguous formula אָמַרְתָּ or אָמַרְתָּ should leave the matter uncertain, then another passage with less doubtful formulas, in Halichoth Olam, ed. Bashuysen, Vol. I. †3, may be compared: "R. Juda united with others to draw up the code of law; this was not accomplished until the Jews had peace under Antonine, וְעַתָּה יָבִיחַ עַם יִשְׂרָאֵל לְיְהוָה, i. e. in this they rested on the word of Scripture: Now is it time to bring sacrifice to the Lord."

The consciousness of a subjective construction of such paral-

lels from Scripture we can in any case regard only as relative. The more significant the coincidence of the earlier expression or fact with a later one, so much the stronger must we regard the inclination to discern in it a Divine intention, and, therefore, a prophetic element in the language of the Bible. Thus is a religious consciousness, that has not been scientifically developed, wont to recognize in one event of life a special Divine interposition, in another not, according to the relative degree of significance. We find even in a philosopher of antiquity the inclination to regard the correspondence of a poet's language with an important fact, as a divinely intended prediction. In the work *de fortuna Alexandri*, c. 10, Plutarch records, that Alexander, of all Homer's verses was most fond of this: "Both a good king and a valiant combatant in war," and adds, that it really appears as though Homer in that verse had not only celebrated the valor of Agamemnon, but predicted that of Alexander: ὄψ' εἰπεῖν Ὅμηρος, ὅτι τῷ ἀντὶ μέρει τῆς μὲν Ἀγαμέμνονος ἀνδραγαθίας κακόςμηρος, τῆς δ' Ἀλεξάνδρου μεμάνισται. If here, even to a philosophically cultivated man, the line of distinction between objective and subjective parallels disappears, between the sense put into a passage quoted and that drawn from it, how much more must we expect this by Jewish authors. Sachs accordingly (as above) says: "The word that had come down from the past was not to stand apart from the present, strange and indifferent as a thing of history that had passed away forever. The life of the present was, therefore, infused into the letter of the past, and it can hardly be determined, in this peculiar mode of treating the word of Scripture, whether more was derived from the given form, or more put into it." As a question of dogmatics, this theory of divinely intended parallels will be examined in § 5.

† 3. *Application of the Old Testament in the Discourses of Christ.*

Former discussions have comprehended Christ and the Apostles, without discrimination in this particular. But, as a difference in degree distinguishes the hermeneutical method of Paul from that of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, so does Christ's use of the Old Testament rise above Paul's application of it.

If we bring together the different quotations of the Old Testa-

ment in the discourses of the Redeemer, the interpreter of the nineteenth century will in many ways detect the profoundest insight into the spirit of the older Scriptures, will never prove one exposition false, nor discover in a single passage a trace of Rabbinical artifice. The interpreter, free from dogmatic prejudice, will at least recognize the originality and the religious profoundness of a great soul standing far above his times. Only one application of the Old Testament has, and not without reason, made the impression of Rabbinic subtlety. This we bring forward first, in order to test by it the truth of the proposition which has been laid down. It is the proof of the resurrection given to the Sadducees, Matt. 22: 32. This mode of proof, it is said, involves Rabbinical hair-splitting dialectics, and is, further, not original, but borrowed from Rabbinic predecessors; so the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist, in Lessing's Contrib. (4, 434 seq.), who regards this "faded, Cabbalistic" exposition as evidence that the doctrine of immortality, which had been derived from other nations, could not be proved at all from the Old Testament. Cf. Döpke (p. 55), Strauss, Hase. The argumentation would be a quibbling, quite in Rabbinic taste, if, as some assume, e. g. Zuingli, Calov, Macknight, the weight of proof lay upon the Pres. *εἰμί*, particularly as neither the Hebrew text, nor Mark, nor Luke has this. Clericus, Grotius, and Bengel, long ago declared themselves decidedly opposed to this construction, and the latter refer properly to Heb. 11: 16, as a parallel which suggests Christ's meaning here. That God could not put himself into such intimate relations with men, could not call himself their God if they were mere transient existences, is the great fundamental idea (Neander's Life of Christ, Ed. 3, p. 603), which is brought forward in Heb. xi., probably with reference to this passage in the Gospels, and may be expanded thus: the relation to God in which man finds himself in time, is the condition of the consciousness of his eternal relation to God. On this truth all philosophical proofs of immortality rest (see Erdmann in Br. Bauer's Zeitschr. für die Specul. Theol., I 213 seq.). In so far, therefore, there is given by Moses an intimation (*ἐμψυχον*, Luke 20: 37) of the resurrection. When Christ, as confirmation, adds, that God was not the God of the dead, there lies in this only a profoundly suggestive allusion to the law, by which the dead (corruption) pollutes; according to this analogy, he with whom God enters into so close relations, must be a victor over death,

a living being. If we now compare with this language, so full of import, the parallels gathered by Wetstein and Scheid (addimenta to Meuschen's N. T. e Talm. illustrata) from the Rabbis, to whom Jesus is said to be indebted for his words, is there one of these that makes the remotest approach to it? Even Dr. Paulus remarks: "how entirely Jesus's train of thought on this topic also surpassed the notions common in his nation, in his pure sense for the simple and essential, deserves to be shown by a comparison with the argument of the Rabbis for the continuance of the life of the departed." There is only one Rabbinic passage that strictly corresponds with this, the oft-quoted passage from Manasseh ben Israel de resurrectione mortuorum, 1836.¹ But how is it with this passage? It is expressly adduced by Manasseh, not among the proofs furnished by the ancients, which he collects in Vol. I. Ch. 1, but among his own, which he gives in Ch. 10 seq.; and, that this learned Dutch Rabbi, who in this work quotes also Plato, Plutarch and others, should in the *recte inferatur* have had Christ in mind, can hardly be doubted. Another evidence how it is with many Rabbinic parallels to the New Testament!

Where reference is made in Christ's discourses to direct prophecies, this always finds a justification from the point of view of modern historical exegesis. The chief passage is Matt. 22: 43, although Matt. 26: 21, Luke 4: 18, 22: 37, may be classed with this. In Matt. 22: 43, Christ by the *ἐν προφηταῖς* declares Psalm cx. to be a really prophetic, inspired utterance. That it can, in a typical sense, be called Messianic, is not disputed. "The Psalm utters for the theocratic king the promise of a high priestly dignity and authority combined with the kingly; which promise had not been realized in the person of him whom the poet had immediately in his eye, nor in any of his earthly successors, but was to find its deepest fulfilment first in Christ" (Bleek, Comm. on Hebr., II. 186). He, however, who regards the prophecy as typical, holds an ideally depicted king of Israel to be its object, and, therefore, can no longer regard the $\frac{1}{2}$ of the superscription as the $\frac{1}{2}$ auctoris. But this Christ does; his conception of the Psalm must, therefore, be the directly Messianic.

¹ L. I. c. 10. § 6: cum Mosi primam appareret, Dominus dixisse legitur: Ego sum Deus patrum tuorum, Abrahami, Isaaci, Jacobi. Atqui Deus non est Deus mortuorum, quia mortui non sunt, sed vivorum quod vivi existunt. Itaque patriarchas etiamnum respectu animae vivere ex eo recte inferatur.

If one holds, as most recent commentators do, the direct Messianic construction, and also the superscription of the Psalm as incorrect, then Christ explained the Psalm falsely in its historical bearings; unless one will with Neander (*Life of Christ*, ed. 3, 607), assume an *argumentatio ex concessis*, in which case the *ἰσχυρισμὸς* must be set to the account of the Evangelist, and not to that of Christ himself. It is understood that the principal motive of those who reject the superscription altogether, or, contrary to all analogy, regard the ψ as designating the subject of the Psalm, has been the dogmatic assumption which cannot allow such a Messianic prophecy in the Psalms. If, under a different view of prophecy in general and of that in the Psalms in particular, this motive is taken away, there is nothing besides that should make the direct Messianic conception inadmissible (cf. Hengstenberg on this passage); and it has been admitted by commentators who are not dogmatically prejudiced, such as Köster, Umbreit, von Lengerke. In respect to the prophetic passages quoted in Matt. 26: 31, Luke 4: 18, 22: 37, they in themselves favor the assumption that they are mere parallels, a substratum for Christ's own thoughts. Yet, when Christ, Luke 4: 18, opens to the prophecy in Isa. lxi., and declares that these words are today come into fulfilment before them, we are less at liberty to think of mere parallelizing, than of an indirect Messianic prophecy; Christ intends to designate the substance of the passage as prophetic, now in his appearance come to its fulfilment. With reference to Isa. liii., the most various authorities agree in this, whatever may still be thought of the subject of the passage, in recognizing there a presage of facts of the New Testament; cf. Gesenius on this passage, and Vatke (*Bibl. Theol.*, I 531): "The contemplation of the sufferings and the glorification of the servant of Jehovah forms the most remarkable presentiment of redemption in the Old Testament, and is thus prophecy (not prediction) of Christ." And this indirect prophecy becomes direct under that exposition, according to which the prophet in 42: 49 "describes Israel in its totality according to its design, but in ch. liii. views the ideal Israel as an individual" (see Oehler "On the Servant of God," in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.*, 1840, No. 2, and Umbreit, "The Servant of God," 1840, whose view is, however, rather wavering, and Sack's *Apologetik*, second edition, pp. 321, 328 seq.). The citation in Matt. 26: 31, from Zech. 13: 7, is also a mere simile, according to Calvin and Drusius, who

understand by the shepherd the aggregate of the rulers of the people. Yet it can hardly be doubted that the shepherd is rather here, as often before, a representative of God (Hengstenberg's Christology, II 332).

Christ's interpretation of Matt. 24: 15, seems most questionable of all, in case the expression from Daniel was regarded by him as a direct prophecy. According to most commentators this is so; see Hävernick and Hengstenberg on Dan. 9: 26, 27. Olshausen on Matt. 24: 15. Stier's Discourses of Jesus, II 546. Now, most weighty arguments may be adduced against the genuineness of Daniel, so that even Olshausen places the book in the same rank with second Peter. Yet the question can by no means be considered decided; cf. especially Hävernick's treatise, which has been too little regarded, "New critical investigations regarding the Book of Daniel," 1838. The fact urged by Sack (Apologetik, second edition, 333 seq.) is further indisputable, that this controversy grows out of a view of prophecy in general that is by no means established. Were the book written *post eventum*, then the passage to which Christ appeals would relate, not to a future, but to a past event, the desecration of the temple under Epiphanes. If we now assume this to be correct, would Christ's view of the passage be proved erroneous? We really cannot see, what forbids the assumption that Christ here, as in Mark 9: 14, where Hengstenberg, as we shall presently see, concedes this, refers to an actual parallel in the past, which is here significantly repeated. Cf. Bedepennig's review of Hengstenberg's Authenticity of Daniel, Stud. and Krit., 1833, No. 3, p. 868. There are, furthermore, among the advocates of the genuineness of Daniel, those who, as Hoffmann lately does, refer the passage in Daniel to the desecration of the temple under Epiphanes.

The treatment of the Old Testament as typical is much more common with the Redeemer than is generally supposed. He regards the Old Testament, with its institutions, in its history, and in its single expressions, predominantly as typical. Precisely this organic typical mode of viewing the Old Testament, according to which modern theology, from different points of view, is ready to recognize a prophetic element in the structure of the Old Testament, is demonstrably that of the Redeemer. It is especially evident in the Gospel of John; and this fact has not been hitherto heeded. According to the context, we must, by the testimony of the Scriptures mentioned in John 5: 40, under-

stand, if not exclusively, yet chiefly, the whole spirit of the Old Testament, which, received into the heart of man, produces there prophetic longings for Christ; so in v. 46 (cf. my Comm. on these passages, and Baumgarten-Crusius on v. 46). From such a view as this of the character of Messianic prophecy as a whole, we are to explain general allusions to the prophets, like John 5: 46, 7: 38. John 3: 14 refers expressly to the prophetic nature of a type, and the institution of the Lord's Supper is connected with the meal commemorative of the typical deliverance from Egypt. Christ's expression in regard to John the Baptist is peculiarly suggestive in this particular, according to Mark 9: 13: *ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι καὶ Ἠλίας ἐλήλυθα, καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα δεύλασαν, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν.* We observe, first, that Christ seized upon the expression, Mal 4: 3, according to its idea, and, therefore, found the Elias there promised, ideally, in John the Baptist; the *εἰ θέλητε δεύλασθαι*, which is not yet adequately explained, seems designed to indicate distinctly that the fulfilment of the prophecy was properly not to be sought at all in an individual; if they would, they might, however, see it in John. But if it is there further declared that the violent conduct of men towards this John stands also recorded in the Scriptures, in what other than a typical sense can this be said? Hengstenberg speaks thus of the exact correspondence of the type with the antitype (Christology, III. 477): "Whatever opposition Elias encountered is so much the more to be regarded as a real prophecy of the experience of John the Baptist, in proportion as both come nearer the idea (of a preacher of repentance). Is John like Elias in the solemnity of his call to repentance, so must he be like him in suffering and persecution. Divine Providence so ordered it that the inherent, essential similarity was stamped, also, on the external form of their experience; that in Herod, Ahab, in Herodias, Jezebel appeared again." An exact parallel to this typical exposition of Christ is given by the Jewish Christian Hegesippus, in Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., II. 23. As has been remarked above, after recording the death of James, known as *ὁ δίκαιος*, he adds: thus has the word of Scripture, Isa. 3: 10, come into fulfilment: *ἄρωμεν τὸν δίκαιον.*

If Christ, to so great an extent, treats the Old Testament type as prophecy, it can no longer surprise us, if he often, especially with reference to his suffering and glory, refers to the whole Old Testament as prophecy of himself; Matt. 26: 24, 54, 56.

Luke 24: 27, 44. John 17: 12. When we observe how he, in expressions whose historical authenticity is undisputed, holds up the persecution and reward of the prophets, as a type, before his disciples as representatives of the same principle, Matt. 5: 12; how he regards the activity of his disciples in opposing the spirit of this world, as a continuation of the experience of the prophets, Matt. 23: 34, 35. Luke 11: 47, 48; and then in numerous instances predicts for his disciples, as defenders of their Master's principles, their Master's fate, the assumption seems surely warranted, that he in like manner regarded, as preëminently fulfilled in himself, whatever stands written of the suffering and victorious prophet and saint of the Old Testament. This contest of the Divine principle with the principle of the world, successful even in overthrow, he treats as the law of the Divine constitution of the world, and this seems to him embodied in the types of Scripture; cf. *κατὰ τὸ ἀριστέρον*, Luke 22: 22, with *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*, Matt. 26: 54. This parallelism must be especially obvious to him, the son of David and spiritual head of the kingdom of Israel, with reference to the head of the kingdom of God glorified through suffering, to David. From this point of view, we find an explanation for citations like John 13: 18. 15: 25. Matt. 27: 46. Luke 22: 37, which refer to the Old Testament in specific realizations of that law.

"That there are types in nature and history, follows from the general relation of *becoming* to *being*, of *history* to *spirit*." The type is not the image thrown back by a mirror into the past from the future as God intends it, but the future germinating in the past, as in nature every lower organic stage prefigures the higher, and the sports of the child, the activity of the man. But the truth of typical parallels is especially conspicuous, when, from the external emblematic stage of an historical sphere, an inward spiritual development of this organism proceeds, as the Christian kingdom of God from the Jewish; here the principle, apart from all the presuppositions of Christian dogmatics, must be recognized as finding a profound justification. According to the remarkable language of 1 Pet. 1: 11, it was the spirit of Christ already working beforehand in the prophets, that prophesied in them of Christ. De Wette (in his "Beitrag zur Charakteristik des Hebraismus," in the Studien of Daub and Creuzer, III. 244) says: "Already, long before the appearing of Christ, was the world in which he was to appear made ready; the whole Old

Testament is one great prophecy, one great type of him who was to come and is come. Who can deny that the holy seers had long beforehand seen in spirit the coming of Christ, and in prophetic presage more clearly or obscurely comprehended the doctrine? And this typological comparison of the Old Testament with the New was no mere idle play. It is, further, hardly pure accident that the evangelical history in the most important particulars runs parallel with the Mosaic." In so far as this mode of exposition rests on a view of history which sees only the spirit which reveals itself in the different stages of history in even greater intensity—the law of history—it may, with Beck, be called the *pneumatic*, and was, even in the ancient church, so called. Syrian typologists use for typical the expression $\Delta\iota\psi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (Wiseman's *Horae Syriacae*, I 55); the *γνώσις* and the *πνευματικὸς* of the Scriptures are equivalent expressions (Baur's *Gnosis*, p. 88); and in the Apocalypse, so rich in profound typology, it is said, 11: 8, that Jerusalem is *πνευματικῶς* called Egypt; namely, as antitype of that power so despotic towards God's people, as Babylon is type of the heathen secular power.

As Christ on the most various occasions has always ready the most pertinent, morally discriminating answers from the Old Testament, we must, at the outset, assume, that the common popular use of Old Testament expressions as substratum for one's own thoughts, will also occur in his discourses. The passages of the Old Testament found in the history of the temptation, as used by him, Deut. 8: 3. Ps. 91: 11. Deut. 6: 16, 13, can be classed here. They give, as it were, the motto for the series of ideas which the Redeemer opposes to the successive temptations. To this class belong, also, Matt. 13: 14, 15. 21: 13, 16, 42, 44. If the appeal to Ps. cxviii. in Matt. 21: 42, be said to denote a proper prophecy, this would be an erroneous exposition of the Psalm, the subject of which Hengstenberg also (*Psalms*, IV. 1, p. 307) regards, not the Messiah, but the spiritual Israel destined to dominion in the world; so does even Stier, according to the historical sense, although he holds to a threefold prophetic sense running parallel to this. But is it not intended by the formula of quotation here and in v. 16, *οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε*, to indicate merely, that, if they had read the Old Testament passage with reflection, they must also have drawn a conclusion with reference to the event before them?

We find, therefore, among all the instances in which the Old Testament is cited by the Redeemer, not one that can give occasion to the charge of Rabbinic artificial or historically erroneous exposition.

§ 4. *The Application of the Old Testament by Paul.*

The citations of the Old Testament by this Apostle have lately been criticized by several commentators, and, in some instances, with a decided partisan prejudice. While Rückert, assuming that Paul, as a general rule, in his citations, believes himself to be adducing prophecies, judges thus: "How it stands with the proofs of the Apostle from the Old Testament, we know well," and yet is considerate enough, at least in some instances (e. g. 1 Cor. 1: 19. Rom. 10: 6 seq., 18), to let the quotations pass as mere parallels, "that he might give his own thoughts a Biblical coloring;" Meyer, and still more decidedly, Fritzsche, attempts with iron consistency to prove in every instance a prophecy, i. e. as so regarded by the author, and thus encounter Calov's argument in controversy with Grotius.

Let us, then, show first, how unfounded is this consistency, running as it does into absurdity. The mere clothing of one's own thoughts in the consecrated words of Scripture should, in the first place, not have been mistaken, where the Apostle, as is uniformly the custom in the Apocalypse, incorporates in his own discourse as essential elements, expressions from the Old Testament parallel to the given fact of the New, as Rom. 10: 13, 18. 1 Cor. 15: 25 (cf. Rückert and Meyer on this passage). Eph. 4: 31. For he has in like manner woven immediately into his discourse admonitory and dogmatic sentences, as in Rom. 3: 4 (from Ps. 116: 11), Eph. 4: 26. There is but one exception, in 1 Cor. 15: 27, where *ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ* characterizes as prophetic the words introduced into his own discourse; but it is in all probability to be said here, that Paul has only clothed in words from the Old Testament the expression of his own faith, and merely in his subsequent argumentation treated this as prophecy. We are further to recognize mere accommodation in those passages in which the Apostle must modify the words of the text to make them pertinent to the case before him, as Rom. 10: 7, 8. Eph. 4: 8. 1 Cor. 2: 9. Had it been the Apostle's intention to adduce such expressions as prophecies for proof, would not his aim have

been at once frustrated, if arbitrary adaptation of the language could be proved against him? It will be replied: but was not such artifice demonstrably accepted in Jewish hermeneutics as allowable? Certainly, in the Haggada; and it is to just this department that these citations by Paul belong, i. e. *not to the department of strict proof*, but of free ascetic application.¹ Finally, in some places the mode of introduction shows that the Apostle did not think of prophecy. When in 2 Cor. viii. he is admonishing the church to bring about a certain equality by giving one to another, in v. 15 he refers to Ex. 16: 18, where the text in historical narration reads: *ὁ τὸ πολὺ οὐκ ἐπλεόνασε καὶ ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐκ ἠλαττόνησε*; the same case occurs in 9: 9, in adducing Ps. 112: 9. Again, in Paul's discourse, Acts 13: 40, the subjective character of the citation is indicated by the formula: *βλέπετε μὴ ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τὸ εἰρημέτρον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις*. In like manner, the formula used in another passage in Acts, points to the natural import of a citation from the Old Testament which occurs frequently in the New, in the interpretation of which modern rationalistic exposition indicates no less a lack of sound common sense than the old Rabbinical. Isa. 6: 9, 10 is in the New Testament several times applied to different persons. According to Fritzsche and Meyer this is always as prophecy. Matt. 13: 14, Christ is said, according to Fritzsche, to have seen in this passage of the Old Testament a prophecy of the intellectual stupidity of the Jews in regard to his parables.² According to Meyer, in John 12: 40, John refers the prophecy to a judicial act of Christ himself (not of God!) by which he had blinded his contemporaries with regard to himself. Paul, in Rom. 11: 8, as Fritzsche will have it, applies the expression to the Jews of his time (*ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας*). The question whether such a conflict in interpretation between Christ and his apostles, and of these among

¹ As evidence to the contrary, reference might, indeed, be made to Matt. 27: 9, where the Evangelist introduces the prophet's words with a formula of citation as prophecy, and yet conforms the words to the fulfilment. Yet we are not certain how much of the form in these citations belongs to the Greek translator. Further, the case is quite different from that in Eph. 4: 8. Rom. 10: 7, 8. There is here no violence at all done to the text; only the interpretation is combined with the quotation.

² Fritzsche on Matt. 13: 14: *interpretatio: iterum accidit Jesaiae tempore ipsi illa Wetstenio probata, quum tollit naturam verbi ἀναπληροῦσθαι, tum Jesu consilio repugnat, qui Jesaiae locum pro vaticinio tractat, quod per suos aequales ratum fiat.*

themselves, was to be admitted, would not have embarrassed these commentators. The answer would have been: this inconsistency, as it appears to our interpretation, is none from the Jewish point of view, which admits a plurality of senses in the words of Scripture. Acts 28: 25, however, points to the natural, unartificial conception of the matter, where this language from Isa. vi. is introduced with the words: *καλῶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησε διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν*. Now if Paul thought that, in all these passages, he was citing prophecies, he must have quoted altogether without regard to sense and connection, according to a merely accidental similarity in the language. This is contradicted by the fact, that, when the LXX., which he commonly follows, departs too far from the meaning of a text, he is wont to go back to the Hebrew text, just as Matthew or his translator does in Messianic passages (Koppe, in the Excursus to the Epistle to the Romans, Credner's Contrib. to Introd. to the New Testament, II.).

Besides the Pauline citations already mentioned, the following also belong to the class of mere accommodations, Rom. 2: 24. 3: 4, 10—18. 8: 36. 9: 13, 15, 33. 10: 11. 15: 3, 21. 1 Cor. 1: 19, 31. 3: 19, 20. 14: 21. 15: 54, 55 (in like manner if v. 55 is not reckoned with the citation). 2 Cor. 4: 13. 6: 2, 16—18. Gal. 4: 27.

In regard to the historical correctness of Paul's exposition, it cannot be denied, that he often derives more from a passage than is according to the historical sense contained in it, yet always with an accurate and profound conception of the fundamental idea. Thus, in the interpretation of the blessing of Abraham, Gal. 3: 8; in the argumentation in Rom. 4: 11, which he rests upon the circumstance that Abraham received circumcision as a seal of faith; in the argument in Rom. 4: 17, based on the expression "father of many nations;" in the proof of the calling of the heathen, Rom. 9: 25, 26, from passages which refer to Israel as become idolatrous; Acts 13: 35 seq., in the direct Messianic interpretation of Ps. xvi.;¹ Rom. 9: 33, in the direct reference of the stone of stumbling, Isa. 28: 16, to Christ, although it

¹ Whether τῆς is correctly translated by *despotes* is here of minor importance; the point is rather, whether the Psalmist used it in this sense. This Hengstenberg gives up, and attempts, on the contrary, to show that Peter, also, in the corresponding application of the passage, Acts ii., had in view only the signification *graze*. Further, Ewald's exposition, also, recognizes the ideal nature of the Psalmist's hope, reaching, as it does, beyond the range of the Old Testament.

more properly denotes the ideal theocracy established in Israel, and so elsewhere. These expressions are never seized upon arbitrarily, according to a mere apparent analogy; only their original sense is in the application restricted or extended. The Apostle proceeds like one, who, having seen a completed picture, and then cast a glance upon the outline sketch, believes that he sees more indicated there, than he who is familiar only with the sketch. If we may bring forward for comparison recent analogies, we would allude to the development of ancient philosophical systems by modern philosophers, according to their several points of view, as Platonism is represented, e. g. by Tennemann and by Hegel; or to Schweizer's exhibition of the earlier Reformed theology, in regard to which a reviewer says: "Without exactly altering the Reformed theory, the author brings to view, in its dark beginnings, a much higher development, and thus anticipates what belongs first to the theology of the Union."

By commentators who do not value formal correctness above truth to the idea, the same deep spiritual discernment has been recognized in Paul's expositions as in those of Christ. It has been hidden only to the pedants of the schools. A distinction will be found to exist only in this, that, with the disciple, this deep discernment prevails through the medium of the culture of the Jewish schools, while, with the master, *γράμματα μὴ μαμαθηώς* (John 7: 15), this is not so. With Christ, furthermore, regard to what is universal in humanity, is predominant, while, in the Apostle's application of the Old Testament, as well as in his dialectics, the Rabbinical school betrays itself; this medium exercises upon the form of Paul's exposition a determining influence, while it has not been able to pervert its spirit. Many have expressed a more unfavorable judgment, having particular regard to Gal. 3: 16. 4: 24 seq. 1 Cor. 9: 9, 10. 10: 5. It is said that here, at the expense of truth, Rabbinic culture has manifested itself in arbitrary allegorizing, in pressing the letter to the neglect of grammar, in the adoption of absurd legends. More thorough examination shows these accusations to be groundless.

The Apostle reasons in Gal. 4: 24, through an allegory, which he himself calls such: *ἀτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα*, i. e. which is of such a kind that it has another than the proper signification; Hesychius: *ἄλλο τι παρὰ τὸ ἀκουόμενον ἀποδεικνύουσα*. We have a remark to make, first, concerning the use of the word *allegory*. Mynster expresses the strange idea (on the author of the Epistle

to the Hebrews, Stud. and Krit. 1829, II. 334), that in the New Testament there is nothing at all of allegorising; in Gal. iv. and in Hebrews "only a slight approach to it." The author is thinking, however, of the allegory in Philo's style, which gives up altogether the literal sense where it is objectionable, and where not, declares it nonessential (Dähne, *Alexan. Religionsphilos.*, I. 63, 64). This style of allegory is unknown even to the Palestine Midrasch, much more, to the New Testament. Allegory in the New Testament, as Paul here employs it, is nothing but the *typical* sense; and the propriety of typical exposition cannot be denied here. In the relations of the descendants of Sarah and those of Hagar, the relations of the children, of the legal and the evangelical institutions, are shadowed forth. The children of Sarah are like the latter, for they are born *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, i. e. according to a promise, through Divine interposition in behalf of the dead Sarah, and are free, being born of a free woman; the children of Hagar are like those under the law, for they are born *κατὰ σάρκα*, i. e. in the course of nature (cf. *κατὰ σάρκα*, Rom. 4: 1), and of a slave. Paul had also distinguished in like manner in Rom. iv. a twofold posterity of Abraham, that of the children of faith, and those after the flesh, in v. 12. But, according to some, the typical exposition is here in fault (De Wette on this passage, Baur's *Apostle Paul*, p. 667), for it was Ishmael that had nothing to do with the law, while the descendants of Isaac were rather subject to the law. But an allegory, in the technical sense, a *sustained* analogy, we do not find here, but simply a *type*, which by no means requires correspondence in all points, as Rom. 5: 14 shows. There arises now the further inquiry: but did not Paul look upon this type as objective, designed by God? It certainly seems so.

The consciousness of the objective nature of the *ἐπίνοια* appears more decidedly with the Apostle in the citation, 1 Cor. 9: 9, 10. Here, even De Wette allows himself to be led into the error of assuming an allegory in Philo's sense, to the exclusion of the literal meaning; and if *πάντας* were to be explained with Meyer "altogether," then Paul would have definitely made prominent the exclusion of the literal sense. But how would even a Rabbi have dared to deny in terms the literal import of the law, Deut. 25: 4? Even Philo speaks only with displeasure of those who, for the sake of an allegory, dare to abrogate laws of Moses (see the well-known passage, *de migratione Abr.* p. 401,

Dähne's Alex. Religionsphil., I. 66. Gfrörer's Philo, I. 86, second edition). Especially, how could a disciple of him, according to whose word not a sparrow falls to the ground without the Father in heaven, expressly exclude beasts from the number of the objects of Divine providence? The same Rückert who says "we know well how it stands with the Apostle's proofs from Scripture," does not hesitate, as sound common sense requires, in the question μή τῶν βεῦν μέλει εἰ θεῶν, to supply μόνον after βεῦν. He who regards the first epistle to Timothy as Paul's, has a decisive argument for the literal sense of the commandment in 1 Tim. 5: 18. We are then, with Billroth, Rückert, Lachmann, to consider all as far as λέγει a question, and explain πάντας, as is common in answers, as an emphatic affirmation: doth God care for the oxen alone, or doth he say this certainly for our sakes? This "certainly," "by all means," presupposes the literal sense, and aims to show, notwithstanding, that it was also said for the sake of the apostles; in other words, that the application to the apostles is one intended by God.

We shall come back to discuss in § 5 the Divine intention in such expressions, but will first look at the legendary (so called) interpretation in 1 Cor. 10: 4. Following Semler, recent commentators, Rückert, Meyer, De Wette, say that the Apostle followed the Jewish legend, according to which the fountain springing from the rock attended the Israelites forty years long, and that he saw in this rock Christ's Shekinah. We will not here enter into other grounds, lying in the text itself, limiting ourselves to this remark, that the existence of such a legend is still unproved. The oldest passages adduced by Wetstein and Schöttgen, are from the Targums, and these all speak, not of the water from the rock, but of quite another thing, of the fountain raised from the earth by the staves of the princes and Moses, Num. 21: 18. Authors of later date allude only to this fountain. Only one *dictum* seems to include the rock with this, viz. in a passage from Jarchi in the commentary to the section of the Talmud, Thaanit, f. 19. 1, it is said: "Miriam's fountain (with whose healing, legend puts the fountain in connection) was the rock from which the waters flowed. In his exposition of Num. xxi., however, where he speaks at length of the matter, he follows exactly the form of the legend given above, and in ch. xx., where the rock is spoken of, adds nothing that could be applied here.

Concerning Gal. 3: 16, where the Apostle, in order to be able to prove a prophecy, is said to have done violence to grammar, see the Supplement.¹

† 5. Application of the Old Testament by the Evangelists.

As ἀγγέλματος the Evangelists have nothing of the subtlety that marks Paul's use of the Old Testament, and, furthermore, their applications of it fail to exhibit always Paul's profound discernment; parallelisms which rest so little on an internal connection of ideas, as Matt. 2: 16, 23. 8: 17. 13: 35. John 18: 9, are not to be found in Paul.

The assumption of mere adaptation to the words of the Old Testament, may seem more doubtful here, where, instead of the formula *καθὼς γέγραπται*, we usually find *ὡς κληρονομή* (with the exception of John 12: 14). True, it is not for that reason necessarily excluded, as appears from the fact that *σπογγώσεως*, which,

¹ [Of this long and elaborate discussion we can give only an abstract. To prepare the way for a just and generous estimate of the Apostle's argument, the author examines Acts 17: 23, 28. 1 Cor. 11: 15, as showing how profound and sagacious is the Apostle's interpretation of nature, and of heathenism. Can he err so greatly or reason so frivolously as many assume in regard to Gal. 3: 16? He is said to have falsely applied the collective *σπυρί* in the promise to Abraham, to one individual, Christ, and to prove this, urged the singular form *σπυρί* as applicable only to an individual, while in fact it is used in innumerable instances collectively, and the plural occurs only in another sense. If the Apostle reasoned so, he knew better, and accommodated his argument to his readers, who, he might assume, were stupid enough to accept it; or he, so long trained by Gamaliel, knew no better! Now the only logical and proper sense of *σπέρματα* is different species or classes of descendants, posterities. The promises, involving ultimately participation in the kingdom of Christ, were not given to the *σπέρματα*, but to the *σπέρμα*; to the *σπέρμα*, since a promise made of them, that the heathen should be blessed in them, is a promise to them. But who or what is this *σπέρμα*? We should think of Christ, and Paul says *ὅς ἐστι Χριστός*. And yet the promise is *τῷ σπέρματι*. And, again, if the Messiah is the *σπέρμα*, what is the reasoning? The question was, whether those who should become partakers of the kingdom only through faith, without the law, were genuine partakers? Verses 9, 19, 29, and Rom. iv. show that the *σπέρμα* cannot be exclusively the Messiah, but the spiritual posterity of Abraham, as distinguished from his posterity in every other sense. And this posterity is Christ. He is *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the Son of God, and believers are, in the full sense of the word, sons, one with Christ, and, so far forth, in faith, and as believers, Abraham's seed and heirs. They are one person (*εἷς*, v. 28) in Christ, his *πλήρωμα* (Eph.), cf. 1 Cor. 12: 12. The promise had, then, from the first, a definite spiritual posterity in view. — Tr.]

as we have seen, is used of a mere simile, is an expression equivalent to *ἀλλοεῖσθαι*. A simile occurs in Matt. 2: 18, where, however, it is not the intended fulfilment that is made prominent by a *ὡς ἀλλοεῖσθῆ*, but only the fact of a fulfilment, expressed by *εἶπε ἀλλοεῖσθῆ*. In those cases, on the contrary, in which, by *ὡς* or *ὅπως ἀλλοεῖσθῆ*, the occurrence of a fulfilment is represented as the result of a Divine intention, it is most probable that some sort of objective connection of the fact with the expression of the Old Testament is supposed, a direct prophecy or a *ἰσόρροια*. Thus in Matt. 1: 22. 2: 16, 32. 4: 14. 8: 17. 12: 18—21. 13: 35. 21: 4. 27: 9, 35. John 12: 15, 38—40. 19: 24. Now, where the Evangelist saw in passages of the Old Testament a prophecy, where a typical parallel, we can, as may be supposed, not always determine with certainty. In Matt. 1: 22, the unique character of the New Testament fact, and the *μαρτύριος* of the LXX., go to show that the Evangelist cites Isa. 7: 14 as a proper prophecy. The correctness of this conception of the passage is, however, not yet satisfactorily established from the context, which, it must be admitted, has not been explained in a way altogether decisive. The most thorough Messianic exposition, after Hengstenberg, is that of Drechsler (*Expos. of Isaiah*, 1844, Part 1). Yet this commentator does not conceal the fact, that the Messianic interpretation can be reconciled with vs. 15, 16 in the prophet only by a violent process, that which is seen independently of time (?), being confusedly mingled with the events whose time is defined. Ingenious, indeed, but more artificial, is the explanation given by Hoffmann (*Prophecy and Fulfilment*, 221; see on the other side Umbreit, *Stud. and Krit.* 1845, II.). Ewald, it is true, asserts confidently, "that explanation is likewise false, which does not observe that the prophet is here speaking of him who is to be Messiah," but assumes that the discourse treats of no supernatural conception, and that the prophet expected the birth and growing up of the Messiah within his own lifetime. Into the question which is usually discussed at length, whether *תְּמָנָה* can mean only an intact virgin (see Drechsler, and especially Kleinert in the *Litt. Anzeiger*, 1832, Nos. 25, 26), there is less need of entering; the point is, whether the prophet finds the *תְּמָנָה* in this, that she is to conceive supernaturally, and so far forth remain a virgin. If this is not the prophet's sense, then Matthew could not cite the expression even as a complete simile, and the typical parallel is limited to the name Immanuel.

Of proper prophecy, direct or typical, the Evangelist is thinking, furthermore, in Matt. 4: 14. 21: 4. 27: 9, 35. John 12: 15, 38—40. 19: 24, 37. In Matt. 21: 4. John 12: 15, a direct prophecy is generally conceded by modern exegesis; on Matt. 4: 14, cf. Umbreit on Isa. 8: 23. Ps. xxii. (Matt. 27: 35. John 19: 24) is, on account of its wonderful conclusion, v. 28 seq., a Messianic Psalm, if regarded merely in a historical light. What the singer, impelled by the Spirit of God, says of his sufferings and their fruit, has found its perfect truth only in Christ. As to the citations from Zechariah in Matt. 27: 9. John 19: 37, cf. Rev. 1: 7, exegesis must wait for yet more light upon this peculiarly important and obscure prophet; still, essential service has been rendered by Hengstenberg, and we cannot doubt that this prophet, who in chapters iii. and vi. has so undeniably proved his supernatural discernment as seer, in those passages also prophesied of the Messiah. The citation, John 12: 38, 39, we should be inclined to regard as a mere accommodation, did not v. 41 show in what way the Evangelist justified to himself the direct reference to the Messiah. The Logos, God as revealing himself, was also to the prophets the medium of revelation; consequently there also the prophet (it should properly be said God) had in view in that language the demeanor of obdurate Israel towards Christ; an exegetical inference whose correctness certainly must be denied, while yet this is perfectly true, that that Divine accusation, which represented the spiritual stupidity of the people as an universal characteristic, first found its most complete confirmation, in the conduct of the nation towards Christ. Here, again, then, we see truth in finite limits; incorrectness of form with truthfulness of the idea.

That these Evangelists with the formula *ἵνα πληρωθῆ* certainly did adduce, not merely direct prophecy, but types of the future assumed to be divinely intended, may be clearly proved in the following manner. If the Evangelist in John 18: 9, sees a fulfilment of Christ's words in 17: 12, he can have done this only on the supposition of a *ὑπόνοια*; for, that the Redeemer by *ἀπωλεία* intended a spiritual destruction, the Evangelist could not have failed to perceive for the very reason that Judas is made an exception. It might even seem doubtful, whether he assumes an intended *ὑπόνοια*, and would not merely make prominent the remarkable fact of a fulfilment of Christ's words in the physical deliverance of the disciples; yet we have a similar case in John:

11: 51, where, on account of the remarkable realization of the high priest's words in a higher sense than he humanly intended, a Divine *ἐπίνοια* is still assumed in the utterance of them. Among these typical parallels, Matt. 2: 15. 8: 17 also belong. Here the citation seems purely arbitrary, inasmuch as, in the former passage, no true parallelism between the calling of Israel out of Egypt and that of the Messiah seems demonstrable; in the latter, for the ethical sense of the prophet's language a physical sense is substituted. If, however, we may suppose in the Evangelist the idea, which has its warrant also in Isa. 49: 3, that the Messiah, as the absolute son and servant of God, had his type in Israel, might not this circumstance seem remarkable to him, having his Jewish readers in view, that this Son of God was also obliged to depart into Egypt; quite independently of regard to the different purpose of the departure? In respect to Matt. 8: 17, it is just as little to be assumed as in John xviii., that the Evangelist insisted upon the physical construction, to the exclusion of the moral; it seemed to him remarkable; he regarded it perhaps as designed, that the words should be fulfilled, also, in this sense; whether we are to suppose him prompted by the consciousness of the connection between sin and evil, as Olshausen holds, remaining an open question. One instance is yet to be mentioned, Matt. 2: 23, that *crux interpretum*, where the unlearned Evangelist seems to have employed the mystical quibbling of the Haggada, and to have found a prophetic intimation in the sound of the words. According to Meyer and De Wette, he finds something prophetic in this, that the predicate רִצְּנָה , "sprout," given to the Messiah in Isa. 11: 1, forms a paronomasia with רִצְּנָה . But the Evangelist writes in the plural, διὰ τῶν προφητῶν , and the interpreters above named recognize the ground of this in the fact, that he has reference as well to other passages where the Messiah is called צֶמַח . Zech. 6: 12, "and behold a man" who is called צֶמַח . It is, therefore, even doubtful whether ὄτι is a relative, and whether we have not rather to translate "that he shall be called a Nazarene" (Gersdorf's "Sprachchar. des N. T." I. 136). The Evangelist had, then, regard not merely to the sound but to the sense of the word. Now Nazareth had its very name, רִצְּנָה , from the fact that it was "a feeble twig," an insignificant place, and there was special contempt for it (Hengstenberg's Christology, II. 1 seq.). The thought of the Evangelist is, therefore, "in the fact that Jesus chose the despised place; there was

at the same time a fulfilment of the prophecy that he was to be a humble sprout from David's stem." There is a truth in this, only it seems to us a contracted religious view that seeks in such accidentals a Divine intention.

This brings us now to the question already touched upon, how it is with regard to this Divine intention in the types and parallels of the Old Testament, which is assumed by the Evangelists, and also by Paul, and probably by Christ. And first, we remark, that in some passages a consciousness opposed to this, that of the subjective character of such parallels, is expressed. When Paul in 1 Cor. 10: 6 writes *ταῦτα τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν*, De Wette admits that *τύπος* is here only "token;" we are to take warning from them when we draw a parallel. In Rom. 5: 14, also, *τύπος* may be only the type which to the view of the Apostle lies in the fact, not that designedly established as such by God. In Eph. 5: 32, by *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστόν* he expresses a consciousness of the subjective nature of his application. In Rom. 15: 3, he gives his own thought, that Christ had for God's sake suffered reproach, in his own words; when he justifies this by the remark, that all that is recorded in the Old Testament can serve for our *διδασκαλία*, he gives a general canon for the subjective use of Old Testament parallels. In other instances, like Gal. 4: 24. 1 Cor. 9: 9, 10. John 11: 51. 16: 9. Matt. 2: 15, 23. 8: 17. 13: 35, etc., this is certainly not the case, and these demand a dogmatic investigation into the Apostle's mode of reasoning. The natural mode of viewing things calls every coincidence of events and actions, which is brought about neither by an inward necessity nor by a free intention, *accident*. A man is struck down upon the road; a priest passes by; Christ says it occurred *κατὰ συγκυρίαν* (by a *happening* together). Ruth goes out to glean; the field upon which she happens, belongs to Boaz; an *accident* (התקרה, a meeting) would have it so. What is accident according to *natural* principles, is according to those of religion "a monarch by the grace of God, whose incognito we must respect." And with right. For, must not just this connection of events, this concurrence and with this the reciprocal influence, be referred to the highest causality, that rules the world? "The accidents," says Novalis, "are the separate facts; the concurrence of these accidents, their coincidence, is not again an accident, but law, the result of the profoundest, most systematic wisdom." And Rothe says (Ethik, I. 124): "How entirely

soever the several results may be, each by itself, the effects of the freedom of the creature, their aggregate result is the effect of their combination and concentration, and this, which we are wont to call accident, is alone God's work, the work of his government of the world: What appears to us accident, is just that kind of occurrence in the world which we are compelled to refer exclusively and directly to God's government of the world as its cause, inasmuch as we are unable to discover within the realm of creation an adequate causality." By Moses, the Son of God, the people of Israel, is led from Egypt; by the parents of Jesus, Jesus the Divine child; neither by human intention, nor by internal necessity, has this parallelism been brought about; its ultimate ground is in causal agency of God ruling the world. Caiaphas will let Jesus die for the good of the nation; Jesus dies, according to his own decision, in a higher sense for the good of the people; Caiaphas did not intend what Jesus does, nor does Jesus design to make true what Caiaphas says; it is the Divine causality, by which these facts, standing in no internal connection, are made to coincide. In referring such coincidence to a Divine influence, this religious view of the world cannot be pronounced erroneous; only that it commonly, and also in the citations of the apostles, follows a *particularistic* method, namely, in proportion to the importance of certain occurrences to the highest ends in the universe, or even merely for a subjective interest, *this* coincidence is distinguished above that in other cases, and designated as the special ordering of Providence, while the objective view refers every coincidence to Providence. As no individual thing can be conceived and willed by the highest causality as individual, but each only as a member in a universe, in which each is conditioned by all, and is again the condition of all, so a privileged participation in Providence cannot be maintained. The contrary seems to be involved in Matt. 10: 29—31, but the conclusion serves only to confirm the subjective confidence of man, that he, in consideration of the higher end assigned him, may more certainly regard himself as the object of Providence, than beasts.

So far modern speculation may go hand in hand with that of the New Testament. Only the types of the Old Testament are regarded as unintentionally fixed, these earlier expressions, which were realized in later occurrences, as uttered without special intention. The view of the New Testament, on the contrary,

finds here, for the most part, Divine intention, and in language a divinely intended *ὑπόθεσις*. The modern theological view stops with considering the efficient cause; the biblical stands on the ground (predominantly, at least, see above) of a regard to the final cause. With this it is as with all pragmatic teleology. The mutual fitness which we ascribe to the several data in nature and history, is never the only one (for all conditions all), often not the most immediate one, i. e. the immanent, sometimes even a purely subjective one which does not at all exist in them. This subjective character the teleology of the evangelists exhibits, when, in order to be able to assume a Divine intention, they presuppose a *ὑπόθεσις*, which has no connection with the historical sense, indeed, even contradicts it, as in John 18: 9. 11: 51. Matt. 8: 17. This is just as we should say, that those edifying feelings that are derived from the Scriptures, through an alteration of the historical sense of Scripture, cannot be regarded as a result intended by the author of Scripture, even though they may ever be subjectively profitable. Typology receives, therefore, from Augustine the warning: *est conjectura mentis humane, quæ aliquando ad veram pervenit, aliquando fallitur*. Where, however, a historical sphere is developed from a lower, as is the case in the New Testament economy, in such a way that the same laws spiritualised reappear in it, and leave their impress in its institutions, rules of life, expressions, the typological and parallelizing application will gain an objective character, and may be regarded as divinely intended.

§ 6. *Application of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

This Epistle has a writer for its author who shows himself not less versed in the Old Testament, and uses it not less frequently than Paul. But the defects in hermeneutics, which were striking in Paul and the evangelists, appear in this Epistle in a yet higher degree. While Paul's citations correspond, at least in idea, with the expressions of the Old Testament which are adduced, those in our Epistle seem in part, as in 1: 6, 10—12. 2: 13, to be altogether without warrant. The way in which the author applies the Old Testament for the end of his argument, is yet less to be pronounced free from subtlety (cf. the exposition of Ps. xciv. in 3: 7—4: 9, and the pressing of the letter of Ps. cx. in ch. vii), and his application still less grounded upon objective

truth than that of Paul, since he does not, like Paul, in case of important differences between the Greek translation and the Hebrew text, go back to the latter, but argues from the LXX. even where they translate incorrectly, as in 2: 7. 10: 5. By some critics the difference in the use of the Old Testament is esteemed so considerable, that it has been expressly employed to prove the origin of the Epistle not Pauline. "No one will be able," says Schulz, *Epis. to the Hebr.*, pp. 180 seq., "to show anything like this in the genuine Epistles of Paul; and the few passages where he also exhibits typically single points from the books of the old economy, and allegorizes, which we see brought up against us by the defenders of the Epistle (Gal. 4: 22—30. Eph. 5: 31), will by no means suffice, even should they not, on closer examination, be converted into proofs to the contrary."

Before we examine in detail the style of exposition in this Epistle, we ask, whether its peculiarity distinguishes it specifically from Paul's method. That, in expressions like that quoted from Schulz, the difference is rated too high, is admitted on various sides, by Böhme, Bleek, von Cölln,¹ and recently by Schwegler; and yet to some extent these same men have held the designated peculiarity of our Epistle as so singular, that they were disposed to trace it, not merely in general to the Alexandrian culture of the author, but to an immediate influence of Philo. As formerly by Grotius, Clericus, Mangey, so there was by Bleek, I 389 seq., and most recently by Schwegler (*Nachpost. Zeitalter*, II 314) a direct use of Philo assumed. An affinity in the substance of the doctrine we cannot concede; and in this agree with Neander² (*Planting and Training*, II 857 seq., fourth edition). But in what the so often assumed relationship between the mode of exposition in our Epistle and Philo consists, has been indicated neither by Bleek, nor by De Wette (*Introd. to the N. T.*, 290, fourth edition), nor by others. We must maintain that just those specific points of relationship are wanting, the philosophically figurative conception of the import

¹ In the review of Böhme's Commentary in the *Halle Litt. Zeit.*, 1826, No. 131: "On the contrary, it is quite to be commended that Böhme declares against the opinion of those who, from the Epistle and the allegorizing, conclude, without further ceremony, that the Epistle was written by an Alexandrian Christian."

² The significant fact, that by our author nothing at all is said of the *lóyos*, the idea predominant with Philo, Schwegler knows how to explain only from a definite intention, because "the author was conscious of the novelty of this mode of teaching."

of words, the appeal to the *κρίσεις τῆς ἀλληγορίας*, the extension of allegory to the physical department, and especially the equivalence or the subordination of the historical sense to the mystical. As proof to the contrary in the last particular, 6: 12—6: 3 has been adduced, yet this has been disputed as well by Bleek as De Wette. Following Dähne and Gfrörer, the Tübingen school indeed goes so far as to suppose allegory with the Jewish theosophy in general to have proceeded from Alexandria, and especially from Philo into Palestine. This view has, however, so little claim to truth, that the most weighty facts indicate the contrary. We call attention only to the following, that Philo himself supports his explanations by an allegorical tradition (Dähne, I. 69, 74), the division into physical and ethical allegory, quite in accordance with the so characteristic Midrasch of Palestine, the *הקטשה ברבךה* and *הקטשה ברבךה*, and the intermixture of Jewish Haggadae even in the LXX. (Frankel, Vorstudien zur LXX, 1841, 185 seq.).¹

True, our Epistle has an Alexandrian coloring, distinguishing it from the Pauline, as well in the *genus dicendi* as especially in the use of the Old Testament, only it is not peculiarly Philo's method of interpretation. While the literary character of Paul is the Talmudic-dialectic, that of our Epistle is the Hellenistic-rhetorical. As the homiletic-rhetorical use of the Bible is always less severely exact, and often, especially in early times, lacks a clear consciousness of the relation of the sense put into the Scriptures from that drawn from them (see above Sachs's language), so with our author, upon whom, furthermore, in all probability, the greater arbitrariness in interpretation prevalent at Alexandria also had an influence. This distinguishes him from Paul.

The influence of the homiletic character of the Epistle upon the citations, we perceive in the very first chapter. From the beginning the author designated the Son as the summit of all revelation, as the heir of all, as the Creator of the world, and the image of God. From this results his superiority to the angels, in which connection reference is made to passages where he is called Son of God, which is said of no angels; where he is

¹ However thoroughly Georgii "die neuesten Auffassungen der Alex. Religionsphil." in the Journal for Historical Theology, 1839, has in other respects illustrated Philo's allegorical exposition, what is said of its relation to that of Palestine is very unsatisfactory. The author supports himself only upon Eichhorn and one passage in Jost's History of the Israelites, where besides the Masorah is the subject.

called God, Creator, Ruler, at the right hand of God; while, on the other hand, it is said of the angels, that they were to worship him, that they were servants of God. Subsequently, 2: 6 seq. shows that the earthly humiliation of Christ has not impaired his exalted dignity. Four of the citations used require, even in a historical exposition, a recognition of their Messianic character. In the direct Messianic conception of Ps. ii. and cx. expositors of the most diverse dogmatic schools coincide, Hengstenberg, Sack, Stier, Rosenmüller, Köster, Umbreit, von Lengerke, while others, like Bleek, maintain at least the typically Messianic import. A judgment on the words adduced in 1: 6 from 2 Sam. 7: 14 may be more doubtful. The promise of the building of the temple, in v. 13, we can apply only to Solomon, and thus agree with Bleek, in opposition to Sack. On the other hand, Sack is right, as Bleek also admits, in this, that the expression refers to the whole posterity of the king, and that the promise of an eternal kingdom presupposes the Messiah. What the first half of v. 14 specially promises, and the author here cites, has been verified in other descendants of David in a subordinate sense, preëminently in Christ's relation to God. The question, whether there is anything Messianic in that promise, depends essentially on the view taken of the last song of David, 2 Sam. 23: 1 seq. Undeniably a Messianic hope is expressed in this song; by Ewald, who translates v. 3 as conditional and refers it to David, this prospect is reduced to the most perfect possible minimum, to a posterity ideally described (*History of Israel*, II 671): "Once more before his death, rousing himself to a poetic strain, David clearly feels himself to be a prophet of Jahve, and proclaims, in review of his now completed life, as well as in free survey of the future, the Divine presentiment in him, that the dominion of his house, being firmly established in God, will survive his death." It is, however, very questionable, whether, as Maurer, De Wette and others understand and translate the expression, the one ideal ruler of David's house is not depicted; if this be so, then the song points back to former promises, and to what other than 2 Sam. vii.? So, then, David also referred the promises given to his posterity preëminently to the Messiah. The enigmatically concise and highly poetic character of this remarkable song speaks for its genuineness; it is also acknowledged by Thenius on this passage, and Ewald (*Dichter des A. B.*, I 99). Ps. xlv., which is cited in v. 8, can for decisive rea-

sons be regarded only as an allegorical Messianic song; cf. my exposition of the Psalms, Stier, Hengstenberg, Sack, recently also von Lengerke.

Most striking of all, however, are the appeals to Pa. 97: 7. 103: 26 in vs. 6, 10. On account of the application given to these Psalms in our Epistle, the majority of commentators, it is true, down to A. Cramer (1756) have regarded the Messiah as their subject (cf. the controversy of Calov with Grotius); yet Michaelis, in his exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, concedes, on v. 10: "I should say that it was inconceivable how expositors have been able to persuade themselves of this, had I not made a similar vain attempt in the 31st note to Peirce." At least, with reference to v. 6, this expedient was resorted to by Storr, that the author had, as in Rom. 10: 6—8, used the words of the Old Testament as a substratum for his own thoughts, "in order to express himself elegantly." Still, these expressions are used as *proofs*! De Wette speaks of a typical application of them (On the Symbolic typical method of the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 16): "The theocratic king and the Messiah are related to each other as image and original; again Jehovah and the Messiah as original and image, and what is true of one is true also of the other. Therefore, it is clear, that what is said of Jehovah, so far as he is the God of revelation and mediation, is true of the Messiah." If a typical exposition is to be thought of, the author must have recognized the primary reference of the Psalms to Jehovah; but is this probable, since he still uses them in his proof? We are, then, brought back to the conjecture, that, among the Jews, the Messiah was regarded as the subject of those two Psalms, and that the author could depend on the assent of his readers. But this has, from the outset, no probability, as it would hardly fall in with the dogmatic notions then prevalent concerning the Messiah. "Only from the idea of the incarnation of the *lóyos*," says Bleek, "could such a construction of the Psalm proceed."¹ It seems, then, that we must regard the

¹ It is, indeed, alleged by Grotius that the renowned Saadias interpreted Ps. cii. of the Messiah; this seems, however, to be founded in error. From this accomplished, rationalizing Arabic interpreter, this might at least be expected, inasmuch as he does not even explain Ps. cx. of the Messiah, but (as some did in Chrysostom's time, see his Comm. on Ps. cx.) of Abraham; cf. the communication on Saadias's translation of the Psalms, by Schnurrer, in Eichhorn's Bibl. III., and Haneberg on Saadias's translation, as preserved in a MS. at Munich. 1841. p. 29.

Messianic application of those Psalms as the peculiar possession of our author, and this can be best explained from the rhetorical homiletic character of the Epistle. If the author could expect from his readers assent to the Christological propositions in vs. 2, 3, it followed that all passages in the Old Testament relating to the adoration of God and the creation, had their truth also in Christ, with reference to his Divine nature. This view of the passages in question seems to have suggested itself to Limborg, when he, on v. 6, lays stress on the fact, that the author had to do, not with unbelieving Jews, but Jews become believers.

Without regard to the historical sense, the author further cites Ps. 8: 6 in 2: 6. Ps. 22: 23 in 2: 12. Isa. 8: 17, 18 in 2: 13. Ps. 40: 7 seq. in 10: 5 seq. Hag. 2: 6 in 12: 26. That the author in 2: 6. 3: 16. 11: 13. 12: 26 applies the passages of the Old Testament homiletically, can hardly be disputed; in 10: 5 De Wette leaves it doubtful, whether he uses the words of the Psalm only as a substratum, as Schleiermacher also, in the sermon "The perfecting Sacrifice," on Heb. 10: 12 (seventh collection), says: "Our author starts with this, that he is citing, as referable to the appearing of the Redeemer in this world, words of the Old Testament which the Redeemer, as it were, must have spoken on his entrance into the world." But admitting this, we still cannot assume in the author a distinct consciousness of the relation of the sense put into the passage to that derived from it; if a text was pertinent for Christian application, he certainly found in the text itself a warrant for this, accordingly a Divine intention, as he in 11: 15, 16. 4: 8, seeks expressly to make out an objective justification for his explanations; the question, whether it was direct prophecy, whether typical, whether a mere subjective application, did not suggest itself for consideration; as little as with those Midraschists of old (see above). But if, in the passages mentioned above, he may have distinguished between his application and the proper sense of the passages, in others, which he, in like manner, cites without regard to the historical sense, no such discrimination can be thought of. In ch. ii. he seems to have conceived of Ps. 22: 23. Isa. 8: 17, 18, only as directly Messianic; not even merely typical, for the point is, that *Christ* calls the redeemed his brethren and children.¹ How full of significance every word of the text is to him, and, therefore, also even

¹ Paul would hardly, says Bleek, II. 380, have applied these passages in this way.

that which is not said in the text, 7: 6, shows. According to him, the text designedly omitted to give the genealogy of Melchisedek, that he might, in this respect, also, become a type of the Son of God (cf. the commentary on this passage). As the words of the Old Testament, so also the facts narrated in it, are to him full of import; even the names of Melchisedek and Salem are significant to him; the fact that the patriarchs dwelt only in tabernacles, he applies in ch. xi., as afterward the expression *strangers*; that the high priest went only once a year into the holy of holies, proves to him the absolute redemption once for all through Christ, 9: 7. 10: 10. Incidentally, these expositions by our author are to be distinguished from those of Paul also in this, that these bear more the character of the studied, the scholastic, while those show rather the free grasp of an original and profound spirit, just as our author, furthermore, seems always to have consulted the Greek translation which is uniformly cited literally, while Paul quotes from memory, now, according to the original, again, according to the LXX., as the instant suggests. But, if not an original and powerful, certainly a thoughtful and delicate spirit is discernible in our author's expositions of texts. How rich, notwithstanding all the subtlety of the argument, is the thought, that the invitation to God's rest, Ps. xcv., is properly an invitation to the rest which God himself enjoys since the end of the work of creation (ch. iv.)! So the explanation of the type in Melchisedek, ch. vii., of the holiest of all in the tabernacle, and the sacrifice of atonement in ch. ix., of the word *stranger* in 11: 13, and the application of Ps. xl. in 10: 5—9. How beautifully are many expressions of Scripture woven into the text, as 12: 5, 15. 13: 6, 15! The depth of these expositions is distinguished from Philo's theosophic acuteness by a practical religious interest.

By the universal use of the LXX., instead of the Hebrew text, the objective truthfulness of the interpretations has in some instances suffered more seriously than through the hermeneutical structure. This is not so fully true of 10: 6—9 (see the commentary), but of 2: 9. 10: 38. 11: 21. 12: 26. 14: 3. Yet his application of the Old Testament rests on the strictest view of inspiration, since passages where God is not the speaker, are cited as words of God, or of the Holy Ghost (1: 6, 7, 8. 4: 4, 7. 7: 21. 3: 7. 10: 15), so that the author seems to have shared in the conviction of the Alexandrians of the inspiration of their

translators. By Paul, on the other hand, as has been before remarked, the sense of the original is always given when the deviations from it are considerable, especially when such exist in the point for which he cites the passage (Bleek, II. 351).

If we, then, in conclusion, glance at the results derived from these investigations to the doctrines of inspiration and revelation, a view of inspiration according to which a universal accuracy is ascribed to the words of Scripture, cannot be maintained in accordance with these results; nor a theory of revelation, which assumes this of all the words of the apostles. Yet, what "God by his Spirit hath revealed to the apostles" (1 Cor. 2: 10), was not means of proof for their faith, but the substance of that faith itself. Paul emphatically scorns to convince by *λόγοι σοφίας*, and, in general, by any other *ἀπόδειξις* than the power of the Holy Ghost, involved in simple preaching (1 Cor. 2: 4, 5). The question arises, what he means by the *λόγοι σοφίας*. The most recent interpreters, disagreeing in regard to Christ's party, yet agree in this (having Acts 18: 24 in view), that the *ἀπόδειξις λόγων σοφίας*, which was despised by the Apostle, refers to the manner and argumentation of Apollos (Neander, Baur's Paulus, p. 323, Rábiger, Critical inquiries concerning the Epistles to the Corinthians, 1847, p. 89); if then, according to the present state of criticism, Apollos or an Alexandrian Christian like him is to be regarded author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, have we not in this Epistle a specimen of what Paul meant by the *σοφία ἀνθρώπων* in the Epistles to the Corinthians, and of which in founding the Corinthian church he would keep his preaching free? Can the Apostle have ascribed infallibility to these *λόγοι σοφίας*? And when he, in his own Epistles, uses here and there proofs from Scripture, arguments from nature and customs (1 Cor. 15: 36—38. 11: 14), would he have judged these from any other point of view than the human *γνώμη* (1 Cor. 7: 12, 25, 40)? But, though that which "God hath revealed by his Spirit to the apostles," is immediate substantial truth, is it not implied in 1 Cor. 13: 9—12 that this is none the less susceptible of formal development? As, therefore, even in the apostles' type of doctrine, as well peculiarity of constitution, endowment and cultivation as of religious profoundness manifests itself, so it is also in their argumentation and mode of proof from Scripture. We have found greater hermeneutical imperfection in the Evangelists than in Paul, and still greater in the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who is

not an Apostle. The Epistle of Barnabas, again, stands below the Epistle to the Hebrews. The want of taste, law and method in its expositions, as they occur in ch. 5—17, is one of the reasons, why the Epistle is denied to be from the apostolical comrade of Paul. That taste and method may be demanded of an apostolical man, must *in abstracto* certainly be denied after what has been said above; yet there are points in which a sound primitive Christian life does preclude a certain sort of want of taste. A Christian soul, filled with the sublimity of the objects of the Gospels, will be immediately touched by the impropriety of such expressions as occur in the Gospel of the Hebrews: of the rich young man, it is said, "he went away and scratched his head;" as words of Christ we read: "My mother, the Holy Spirit, seized me by one hair, and took me to the great Mount Tabor." Nowhere, with all their other literary imperfections, is there an expression like this in the Canonical Gospels. The practical sense of a primitive Christian, penetrated by the predominantly practical tendency of Scripture, will not readily be betrayed into digging out from it such mysteries as these in the Epistle of Barnabas, that the number (318) of the servants circumcised by Abraham, written in numerals, contains an intimation of Christ and his cross; that the prohibition to eat hyena's flesh allegorically forbids adultery and pederasty, because this animal yearly changes its sex, is now male, now female, etc. But should this be, it certainly is in direct contrast with the spirit of the genuine products of primitive Christianity, when the author takes credit to himself with reference to just such insipid applications, when he adds: "Never has any one heard from me a more uncorrupted truth; I know, furthermore, that ye are worthy of it" (ch. ix., cf. end of ch. x., xvii.). A sound Biblical Christian sense will, to a certain extent, set limits to hermeneutical irregularity. It will not stray into expositions which stand in contradiction to the universal character of the interpretations given in the New Testament; the *analogia fidei* will form itself in him as a guiding tact. With full right, then, is that sort of want of taste in hermeneutics which this Epistle exhibits, held to be evidence against its originating with an apostolical man, and it regarded as contemporary with the writings of Justin Martyr, whose typology often corresponds with that of our Epistle (see Hefele's notes in the Opera Patrum Apostolicorum). To see how wide the difference is in spirit and method of interpretation

between the Epistle to the Hebrews and that of Barnabas, consult the opinion even of a theologian like Eichhorn, in my commentary on the Epistle, p. 63. However Alexandrian culture may have made the author predisposed to a barren method of exegesis, he is by nature a profound, and through his faith a practical Christian man; by both he is kept back from an arbitrariness deficient both of ideas and taste.

The use of the Old Testament in the discourses of Christ, has in no point given offence through its hermeneutics; if the result of our inquiry is to be a judgment on the Redeemer's freedom from all error, though he should really have erred, room is left for maintaining his freedom from all error in the sphere of interpretation. But, if not independent of exegetical results, still such a judgment must rather develop itself dogmatically as a result of one's Christological views. Now at present the Christology of the orthodox church has unfolded the doctrine of Christ's humiliation in such a form (König, Thomasius, Schmie-der) that nothing else is given in his appearance, his actual existence, than a pure humanity standing under the universal law of human development. If omniscience is given up, the question arises, where limits to knowledge cease; whether correct views in exegesis lie within or without these. Human knowledge is twofold in its nature; that which, under greater or less excitement from without, is developed purely within, in thought or intuition, and that which can only be humanly learned and stamped on the memory. If the Redeemer's development was that of universal humanity, then knowledge within the religious moral sphere, especially that needful to exegesis, which is only to be learned outright, can have been accessible and familiar to him only according to the state of culture in his age, and the means of culture in his education and intercourse. Proofs might be brought to show, that, even in questions pertaining to learned exegesis, such as those concerning the historical connection of a passage, the author and age of a book, an original spiritual discernment without the culture of the schools may often divine the truth; the highest degree of this divining power may be ascribed to the Redeemer, yet this can never supply the place of proper scientific study. The Redeemer did not come to reveal to the world science, even theological, but to teach humanity and exhibit to humanity religious moral truth. If, in the discourses of the Redeemer now extant, there may be no

formal hermeneutical error, the impossibility of this cannot be maintained beforehand, any more than of a grammatical fault, or a chronological inaccuracy. If the period of critical Rationalism subjected the earlier theology to an ordeal by which many general principles and assumptions were swept away, this gain should at least have been left us, a consciousness of the distinction between the Christian religious knowledge that belongs to humanity, and the Christian theological, that belongs to the schools.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

I. SEPTEM CONTRA THEBAS.¹

It is with much pleasure that we welcome this excellent edition of the "Seven against Thebes" of Aeschylus. Filling, as it does, an important place in that series of specimens of Greek poetry, which has been begun by President Woolsey and Professor Felton, and which we hope to see as ably completed, it is a valuable contribution to our aids for the knowledge of classical antiquity. The plays of Aeschylus are the chief extant monuments by which we can represent to ourselves the transition from the epic to the dramatic poetry of the Greeks. They have been appropriately called "Lyrico-dramatic Spectacles." They combine, in a peculiar degree, epic description with lyrical expression of the feelings awakened by the scenes thus described, and dramatic portraiture of the characters and conflicting interests it presents; and the two former elements, the epic and lyric, when compared with the dramatic, form a much larger proportion than in the plays of Sophocles or Euripides.

The "Septem contra Thebas" is especially marked by these characteristics. The main events of the play are not represented, but narrated in heroic recitation. The approaching conflict and crisis are hardly *seen* at all. We are warned of them by hurrying messengers and the sound of distant

¹ Septem contra Thebas, a Tragedy of Aeschylus. Edited, with English Notes, for the use of Colleges, by Augustus Sachtleben, Principal of a Classical School in Charleston, S. C. Boston and Cambridge: James Munroe and Company. 1853. 12mo. pp. 156.