

“ On the Mount of Crucifixion  
 Fountains opened deep and wide ;  
 Through the flood-gates of God's mercy  
 Flowed a vast and gracious tide ;  
 Grace and love, like mighty rivers,  
 Poured incessant from above,  
 And Heaven's peace and perfect justice  
 Kissed a guilty world in love.”

E. W. MOORE.



### OUR LORD'S QUOTATIONS.

I DESIRE to inquire, as far as may be in the present state of our knowledge, how our Lord quoted the Scriptures, and whether any light, however oblique, can be thrown on our work, as ministers of the Word, from the methods of quotation sanctioned by His usage. This inquiry is, therefore, limited to those references to the Old Testament which we find in the mouth of our Lord in the New. And in adopting this limit, I would not infer that such quotations carry any higher authority than those which the evangelists give as their own. Stier gives currency to a theory which I believe to be erroneous—that those Scriptures which our Lord honoured by special use are, like all His own words, on a higher platform of revelation than the rest ; or, to use his own phrase, “ These *λόγοι* are in a peculiar manner the express outbeamings of the *λόγος*.” Not so. The Holy Spirit, to whose coming our Lord deferred as the Interpreter and Inspirer of all the record, was the Author of those, no less than of these. I adopt this limitation, not because the quoted passages are more inspired than others, but because what He used ministerially must ever be of paramount interest to His ministers, and because this narrows the wide subject of quotations within manageable limits, as well as because there is nothing so well worth careful observation as the Lord Jesus Himself—what He quoted, as well as what He said and did.

The degree in which our Lord's example can guide us in our use of Scripture must depend on what I suppose is the insoluble question of how far the Divine nature in Him lifted the human nature above the sphere of our imitation. Into the “ great deep ” of the hypostatic union I do not venture, but would simply regard our Lord, for the purposes of this inquiry, reverently, but solely as a sinless man. That He did study the Scriptures with laborious and absorbing care we have proof enough ; but whether the recorded results of His study are such as to enable us to gather guidance from them

depends on our theory of inspiration. If, on the one hand, we suppose that any element of chance pervades the evangelical narrative, that the writers put into it what they happened to remember or thought worth recording, and dropped out of it what they considered trifling or beside the mark; if, that is, any large influence of human idiosyncrasy ruled their compilations, as is implied by certain writers, then, of course, *cadit questio*. But if, on the other hand, we suppose that a Divine providential oversight by the third Person in the Blessed Trinity guided the writers, with ends in view and meanings to express far beyond those of which they themselves were conscious, so that the "things" which they ministered to us (1 Pet. i. 12) were revealed in form and matter, not for themselves only, but for us and others after us, and that those things they said were not more overruled than those they left unsaid; if, in short, we admit the supposition that their writings were truly *θεόπνευστοι*, plenerily, if not verbally inspired, then we shall expect a significance altogether different in kind, as well as in degree, from that which belongs to any other writings.

We cannot doubt that our Lord studied the Scriptures with devoted care in the spirit of Ps. cxix., nor that all the leisure of the years of retirement at Nazareth was chiefly spent in this preparatory diligence. But did He also study commentaries? It seems doubtful whether the accumulating interpretations and glosses of the Rabbis had before His time been committed to writing. Allegorizing stuff abounded, and passed from mouth to mouth. Rabbinism was then a living power, in the zenith of its influence over the devout part of the nation. The Rabbis had already won from the priestly order the suffrages of the religious world; and we are told that, since politics had been made a proscribed topic under the strong rule of Herod, religion, which meant the interpretation of the law, was the common talk of every household. It is said that the possession of some manuscript of Scriptures in the Hebrew character to study and retain as a domestic treasure was the desire and pride of every Jewish family. The rich had a papyrus or parchment roll. The middle class would possess, at least, a torah or hagiographa. The poorest had some old mynyoth or phylactery; and even the little children had small rolls of the Hallel or the first eight chapters of Leviticus. But there seems to have been no written commentary in circulation. Every Jewish child was required by the Rabbis to begin to learn the law when five years old, and as soon as he could articulate he had to repeat the Shema, consisting of Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21, and Num. xv. 37, 41; so these must have been the very first

words uttered by Him who spake as never man spake. A child would also be expected to ask the meaning of the rites He witnessed; and in the house of "a just man" (which perhaps means merely a strict person) like Joseph no opportunity would be lost of imprinting the letter of the law upon His mind (see Geikie's "Life of Christ," vol. i., p. 172).

Schools had been already opened in the synagogues, where, under the rule of the hazan, or ὑπηρετής, the law was taught to all children above the age of six, not only as delivered by Moses, but as orally "explained" in endless detail by the vexatious traditions of the elders. The instructions of the village minister prepared our Lord for the wider sphere of the Jerusalem Rabbis; and we know how keenly He entered into their discussions on the occasion of His first visit, "both hearing them and asking them questions," only to find how superficial or erroneous were their replies, and to send Him back to His village home to ponder in secret on those mysteries of the inspired word which their poor pedantries darkened by words without knowledge. One may be allowed to imagine Him seated before His manuscript, His dawning intellect grasping, by the power of its purity, the inmost sense of words of which we, perhaps, can yet see only the more obvious meanings; applying to Himself those Messianic psalms, the venerable words He was to utter and fulfil in the sharp cries of His extremest agony, and tracing for the first time those hoary prophecies or mysterious types, so familiar to us, of which He was Himself the subject and the antitype.

Intervals of labour were in those times frequent and sufficient, if, as Ginsberg says ("Bib. Cyclo.," Lit. b., 727), there were in the aggregate two whole months of every year in which labour was unlawful. Time enough to enable Him to obtain that insight by which He shook Himself clear of the *difficiles nugæ* of the scribes, cleaving "to the law and to the testimony" as the only living oracles, the sole source of that wisdom in which He grew, the armoury of those weapons with which He went forth "to smite the lies that vex this groaning earth."

Did He, we may ask, treat with indiscriminating Jewish contempt the classical philosophies of which He must have often heard? If, as is believed, He spoke Greek, though He thought in Aramaic, while He merely understood Hebrew (which had been for centuries a dead language), can we suppose that all the religious theories of heathendom were entirely excluded from His mind, as was commanded by the more narrow of the Pharisees, who forbade a man to learn or teach the Greek tongue? His familiar use of the Greek version seems to imply some regard to Greek thought, cloudy

fragments of which were blowing about hither and thither in His day. As a contemporary of Philo, one would think He must have heard of him, if He never conversed with him or his disciples, and so become acquainted with the schools of Alexandria. If He was acquainted with them, we see no sign of it in the Gospel narrative. Meyer has contended, from the presence of a few Latin words, that He had read Terence. But this may be dismissed as trifling. No influence whatever from classical thought is to be discovered in His ministry. The Bible alone seems to have been His study, and whatever be the reason for it, the Saviour of the world is represented as a man of one book; from this only He quoted, as the all-sufficient guide to the religious conscience, the exclusive medium of Divine communications.

In examining the quotations one by one, the only book I have found of much use is Gough's collation, published in 1855. The value of it is that it gives at one view the Hebrew, the Greek of the LXX., the Greek of the Textus Receptus, and the English of all New Testament quotations, so that the reader can readily sift out those of our Lord which are of inferential value from mere verbal coincidences, proverbial sayings, idiomatic phrases, or Hebraisms, as to many of which it is impossible to say whether any reference to the Old Testament was intentional or not. The lists of Horne, Greenfield, and Stephens contain a multitude of mere casual parallelisms of expression, from which nothing to the purpose can be obtained. Turpie's two volumes are favourably mentioned; and Drs. Randolph and Davidson have treated the subject with an apologetic view, and given lists. I have not omitted to examine any quotation of importance, and I find that about ninety so-called quotations from the Old Testament are mentioned as made by our Lord, many of which, however, are mere catchwords or allusive glances, and, of the rest, some were spoken either at the same time or for the same purpose; so that the number of different recorded occasions on which our Lord enforced His own teaching by direct reference to the Old Testament is reduced to about thirty-three. Of these, twenty-two are found in St. Matthew, twelve in St. Mark, thirteen in St. Luke, and eight in St. John. The twelve in St. Mark are all the same, and on the same occasions (with very trifling differences) as those in St. Matthew, and those also which are found in St. Luke, with two exceptions peculiar to his Gospel, one of these being the passage from Isa. lxi., read by our Lord at Nazareth; the other being a reference to Isa. liii. 12, to be fulfilled by the circumstance that he was to be crucified between two malefactors. But of the seven or eight found in St. John, only one is found in any other evangelist—*i.e.*, the

quotation from Deut. xix. 15, which gives Divine sanction to human testimony (the testimony of two men is true). The Synoptics may therefore be regarded as one; and the fact is noticeable that, with so large a field from which quotation might have been made, these three narrators, so widely separated, all give substantially the same passages. It will be found that our Lord distinctly quoted only twelve books of the Old Testament (one-third of the whole)—*i.e.*, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Zechariah, Malachi—and that twenty-four (two-thirds of the whole) are not recorded as having been used by Him at all—*i.e.*, Numbers, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai. Of these thirty occasions of reference to the Old Testament, the first three, as given in St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, are the most significant as illustrating our Lord's usage. They show Him to us wielding the sword of the Spirit against His great adversary and ours—the evil inspirer of error in all the enemies of the truth. Satan was met in each of his three assaults by quotations from the same book of Deuteronomy; and in each retort, brief as it was, our Lord adopted a variation from the Hebrew text as we have it, which he found in His Septuagint. In the first case, the word *ῥήματι* had been—justifiably perhaps—inserted by the LXX., though the original passage has reference, not to a word (except typically), but to a thing—the manna which came down from God (Deut. viii. 3). In the second case (Deut. vi. 16), taking as the true order that of St. Matthew, the LXX. had put “thou” for “ye,” and our Lord adopts this variation of theirs also—a fact on which Stier bases some interesting exegesis. In the third case (Deut. vi. 13) the LXX. had inserted the word “only,” the word on which the stress of our Lord's rebuke lies; and on the testimony of St. Matthew and St. Luke He did not scruple to adopt the interpolation, and used it in this controversy without remonstrance. So that in each case of this crucial threefold occasion we find our Lord giving the sanction of His authority to a version which, however strictly in accordance with other Scriptures, is not accurately that of our Hebrew text. He rebuts the temptation as a perfect man, leaning solely on the authority of God, and basing that authority upon a version of the Scriptures differing materially from the original now in our hands. The next occasion on which our Lord distinctly refers to the Old Testament was to teach, from Hos. vi. 6, the pre-eminence of character over ritual, or

“mercy” over “sacrifice.” “Go ye and learn what that meaneth,” says He, when defending His disciples for plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath, and Himself for consorting with sinners. And this quotation is one of eight or nine others in which our Lord keeps rather nearer to our present Hebrew text than to the LXX., though, as the meaning is unaltered, it seems difficult to give any reason why He did so, unless He had been consulting a different text from that which the Alexandrian translators used; different also from that in our possession as fixed for us by the labours of the Masorites. How shall we account for the verbal differences which close comparison of these and other quotations reveal on any other hypothesis than that of at least three, perhaps four, independent Hebrew texts, which are now lost, or rather merged, during the critical labours of a thousand years, in that of the Masorites which we possess. Would *the* original of these originals have been Nehushtan? Perhaps it would. With the exception of eight or nine instances, the invariable rule of our Lord seems to have been to quote freely, and almost paraphrastically, from the LXX.; in one case, if our text is correct, even adopting, as is said by Aldis Wright (“Dictionary of the Bible,” vol. iii., 1821), an erroneous gloss—*i.e.*, when Zechariah, who was slain between the sanctuary and the altar, is said to have been the son of Berechias, instead of Jehoiada: a matter of trifling consequence except from a critical point of view.

But in the quotation announcing John the Baptist, given in all three evangelists and twice in St. Luke, from Mal. iii. 1, the form is the same, and in each case adheres to our Hebrew text against the LXX., which gives ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδόν; whereas in three places out of four Gospels it is κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἐμπροσθεν σου, which more correctly translates the piel of the verb פָּנָה (Gen. xxiv. 31; Lev. xiv. 36; Isa. xl. 3; Ps. lxxx. 10), as also does the second word used by St. Luke in i. 76—ἐτοιμασαι. And it is noticeable that the words “before thy face,” which appear in three out of the four New Testament passages, are neither to be found in our Hebrew text nor in the LXX. The largest fragment of the Old Testament to be found in the New is that accounting for the rejection of Christ by the prejudice of His countrymen, from Isa. vi. 9, 10. All four evangelists, and St. Paul in Acts xxviii. 25-27, give it, and in every case follow the LXX. in differing from our Hebrew. The difference is not unimportant, for whereas the Hebrew prophet used the imperative (“make their heart,” etc.; “shut their eyes, lest”), the LXX. throws the moral guilt of their unbelief upon themselves, saying, “Their eyes have *they* shut, lest,” etc.; while St. John xii. 39 gives it, “He hath blinded,” etc.

These are specimens of quotation, the general result of which would be this—that a large freedom is allowed; and the LXX. version is that more generally followed, as it was by the Apostles and by Clement and Barnabas. Literal exactness is scarcely to be found; but we know that quotations may be literally exact as far as they go, but malignantly erroneous in their application, as was Satan's quotation of Ps. xci., omitting one inconvenient clause, "to keep Thee in all Thy ways," illustrating the way in which some modern controversialists cite divines and Fathers (see Harrison's "Whose are the Fathers?"). The other chief occasions of our Lord's use of the Old Testament were briefly these, as given in the Synoptical Gospels: To denounce lip-service, from Isa. xxix. 13; to vindicate the praises of the children, from Ps. viii. 3; to establish the resurrection against the Sadducees, from Exod. iii. 6; to establish the primitive institution of marriage, from Gen. i. 27; to denounce the avarice which defiled the courts of the Temple, from Isa. lvi. 7 and Jer. vii. 11 combined; to press the law home on a conceited lawyer, from Exod. xx., Deut. v., and Lev. xix. 18 combined; to answer the question as to the great commandment, from Deut. vi. 5; to show that David's Son was David's Lord, from Ps. cx. 1; to identify Himself with the shepherd of Israel, from Zech. xiii. 7; to show His prophesied rejection and future triumph as the corner-stone, from Ps. cxviii. 22; to establish the Fifth Commandment by a synthetical quotation of Exod. xx. 12, Deut. v. 16, and Exod. xxi. 17; to preach a sermon, from Isa. lxi. 1; to show that He was to be reckoned among transgressors, from Isa. liii. 12; and to express His desolation on the cross, from Ps. xxii. 1.

To these St. John adds seven peculiar to his Gospel: (1) From Isa. liv. 13: "They shall all be taught of God," from John vi. 45. (2) St. John vii. 38: "Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water"—a doubtful quotation from Isa. xliv. 3, or lviii. 11, but perhaps from some lost Hebrew text, as the Lord distinctly says of it, "As the Scripture hath said." (3) St. John vii. 42: "Hath not the Scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?" from five or six places combined, no one of which says exactly that. (4) St. John x. 34: "I said, ye are gods"; prefaced by, "Is it not written in your law?" and accompanied by the words, "The Scripture cannot be broken," from Ps. lxxxii. 6. (5) St. John xiii. 18: "He that eateth bread with Me," etc., from Ps. xli. 9. (6) St. John x. 16: "One fold and one shepherd," from probably Ezek. xxxvii. 22-24, but not exactly. (7) St. John xv. 25: "They hated me without a cause," from

Ps. xxxv. 19, xxxiv., xxxviii. 20, lxix. 5, cix. 3. Besides these, there are references in our Lord's discourses to the salted sacrifices; to Jonah as a type of the resurrection; to the brazen serpent; to the abomination of desolation; to Abel, Noah, Abraham, Lot, David, Solomon, Moses, Naaman, Elijah and Elisha, Daniel and Jonah, which cannot be treated as quotations, but may avail to show how pervaded throughout was our Saviour's teaching by what He Himself called (John x. 35) "the word of God."

These are the facts; but when we attempt to draw inferences from them we come into deep waters. It is difficult to see how some of these quotations referred to the occasions to which they are applied in the New Testament. Tholuck's rule is ("Geik. quo Herzog.," xvii. 39): "Where parallels are adduced in the New Testament from the Old, whether in the words of the prophets or in institutions or events, it is to be taken for granted, in general, that the intention was we should regard them as Divinely designed." But *per contra*—*e.g.*, Matt. ii. 17—the writer can only be regarded as expressing his own inspired thoughts in the words of Scripture, "remembering," as Alford, *in loco*, well says, "how little even now we understand of the full bearing of prophetic and typical words and acts."

Secondly, we may infer the continuity of revelation and the essential unity of Judaism and Christianity; and we may plead the example of Christ where we use a popular version, like our Authorized Version and Revised Version, if it be only honest and without bias, which cannot be said of Romish versions. Even in its present state our Authorized Version is probably as good as the Septuagint, and by the labours of the revising companies has been made, not absolutely faultless, but much better.

Thirdly, may we not infer that, as our Lord can be presumed to have had some acquaintance with heathen philosophy, yet never quoted or referred to any book but the Bible in His public ministry, we need use no other? And as our Lord never condescended to the region of what we call "evidences," or gave any concession to heathen or infidel theories, or used His Bible with that halting allegiance with which we are painfully familiar, as if He were not quite sure that it expressed the mind and authority of God, we should use our fuller revelation unhesitatingly as He did.

Fourthly, in these days, when men are for compiling a *catena patrum*, animated by the very genius of the Talmud, ought we not to notice that, though our Lord was doubtless familiar with the mass of oral exegetical material circulated in His day, He never refers to it but to condemn it, and



appeals, as does our Church in her sixth article, with absolute submission, to the supreme authority of the Scriptures alone?

Lastly, as to types. Six instances out of thirty-three are all I can discover in which our Lord makes distinct use of types as media for His teaching—*i.e.*, (1) His reference to the living water in the desert, and (2) to the manna; (3) to Jonah's three days and nights in the fish's belly; (4) to the salt of the sacrifices; (5) to the serpent in the wilderness; (6) to the flood as typical of the end of this age. Sufficient, perhaps, to allow this growing method of interpretation to be used with moderation and care, not sufficient to give full play to the fancies of Origen and his followers in our day. But had there been no truth in this method of handling the word of God, as is sometimes alleged, we might have expected He would denounce its prevalence, and, at least, that He would not have adopted it, even to this limited degree.

I do not pretend to have solved the old-standing problems which have gathered round some of these quotations, or to be satisfied with the solutions of them I have met with elsewhere; but He who lays stones in Zion to catch the foot of pride has said, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter."

Let me add, after careful, and I hope impartial, examination of these quotations, my undoubted conviction that our Lord entirely believed in the historical veracity of the Old Testament—that is, in the actual occurrence of the events, and in the actual existence of the persons to whom He referred. It seems impossible to suppose He ever gave any sanction to pious fraud, or pretended a book was written by one man when He knew it was written by another, the very thought of which is like blasphemy against Him who was at once the *Verax*, the *Verus*, and the *Veritas*.

FRANCIS GELL.

---

## THE CHURCH AND SOCIETIES.

WHAT would most amaze an English monk of the fifteenth century, could he come from Hades and see his native land at the present day? He would, of course, be bewildered by a whole world of new things, which have come into our national life since he and his brother monks walked their old cloisters and repeated their daily offices. He would be confused by the foreignness of it all. There would be little or nothing in our public or private ways as English people to