

also that they will follow it with the utmost possible discrimination. And for the future we earnestly trust that Prof. Workman may be induced to reconsider the plan upon which he has pursued his investigations; and in a future edition will not shrink from cutting down his *Conspicuum* to one-third or one-fourth—the more, the better—of its present dimensions.

S. R. DRIVER.

*OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM IN THE LIGHT
OF NEW TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS.*

DURING the past half-century the attention of Hebrew scholars has been directed, perhaps more than at any former period, to the consideration of the text, and the structure of the books, of the Old Testament. The impulse to such studies had its rise a century earlier, but it was only here and there that a solitary student gave himself to the work. In our days the labourers have happily become more numerous. Their work too has been fruitful in results, and when what is certain in these inquiries becomes assured to the Church at large, we shall find that we have advanced greatly in our knowledge of these sacred books, and have gained clearer insight into the manner of God's revelation. But that time, though it be steadily approaching, has not yet arrived. Meanwhile the minds of many, who cannot examine the originals for themselves, grow sorely troubled by the questionings that are current, and not always couched in a reverent form, about matters which they have hitherto deemed unquestionable.

For much of this trouble no doubt the Churches themselves must be held responsible. All study and instruction concerning the origin and history of the Old Testament writings

has either been omitted by those who were responsible for imparting it, or else has been thrust very much into the background. It was no unnatural result of the Reformation that the authority of Scripture should be magnified. The reverence then generated grew in time to be somewhat superstitious. The instrument by which God had revealed Himself to His ancient people became regarded as partaking of the Divine perfection. The climax of letter-worship was reached when the reformed Churches of Switzerland, in 1675, declared that "the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, as we have received it from the Jews, is, as well in consonants as in vowels and other points, and in matter as well as in words, divinely inspired; and by it all versions, eastern or western, are to be examined, and where they vary, are to be conformed to it."¹

Such opinions were not confined to Switzerland, and of them we now reap the fruits. Being trained on such ideas, there are many devout minds which receive a severe shock if it be suggested that Moses may not have been the author of the Pentateuch; that Genesis bears evidence of being a compilation from various independent documents; that other books of the Old Testament are of a composite character; that the prophecies of Isaiah and Zechariah are not the work of one author throughout; that the whole of the Old Testament may have been brought into its present form in the days of Ezra, or even later, and that in the course of many transcriptions some errors of the scribes may have found their way into the text.

In our days criticism has pronounced these and similar judgements, and many of them are receiving constant confirmation. And they are seized upon by some, who have no love for revelation, and are glad of any means to disquiet the minds of the faithful, and are put forward in crude and exaggerated forms as helps toward undermining the

¹ See *Formula Consensus Helvetica* (Canon ii.), Niemeyer, p. 731.

authority of the sacred Scriptures. Devout criticism, and it abounds, has no such aim; and those who have given most earnest labour to these investigations feel more than others for the pain which godly people may suffer from the unwarranted representations which are sometimes made concerning the results of critical inquiry into the origin of the Old Testament. Hence they wax more earnest in their work, assured that the light will spread, and that a better understanding of what is, and what is not, at stake in these investigations will sooner or later dispel this alarm.

For it was not always thus. Devout men in former times accepted a great part of what is put forward by modern critics, and found the authority of the Bible in nowise impaired thereby. None will accuse Calvin of undervaluing the Scriptures, yet nowhere can one find more of what is now called "free handling" than in his commentaries. Examples, both in our own country and abroad, could easily be multiplied. One will serve the purpose. Dr. Whitaker, who was Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge from 1580 to 1596, and who was largely engaged in controversy with the Romanists on the authority of the Scriptures, writes: "It is very possible that the books [of the Old Testament], which may have been previously in some disorder, were corrected by Ezra, restored to their proper places, and disposed according to some fixed plan, as Hilary, in his prologue, affirms particularly of the Psalms."¹

The over-great superstition with respect to the sacred text had not arisen in the days of Calvin and Whitaker, and there was more widely diffused than at present a knowledge of its history. This enabled men to keep firm hold upon that which constitutes the true value of the Scriptures, to distinguish between the Divine purpose of revelation and the fallible human agency which God has employed for its

¹ See Whitaker's *Disputation on Scripture*, p. 116. (Parker Society.)

publication. It is with this latter that criticism of words and language deals, and clear knowledge on this point is all that is needed to allay any anxieties which are now raised by discussions concerning text and authorship.

The Old Testament bears witness unto Christ. He Himself has told us so. And His apostles teach us that it is able to make men wise unto salvation; that it is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness. To serve these objects it was given, and we cannot possibly turn to better authority than our Lord and His apostles for the way in which it may be employed to do so. They constantly appeal to the writings of the older covenant, but from the way they do this we have clear evidence that textual criticism would have given them no alarm; that their concern was not with the verbal exactness of the vehicle, not with niceties of text or with unity of authorship, but with that instruction which is in righteousness and which is conveyed to men in the sacred record.

The New Testament, written in Greek, represents our Lord and His apostles as employing, not the Hebrew Scriptures, but a Greek version of them, the Septuagint, which had been made at various times between the close of the Hebrew canon and the first or second century before Christ. The Greek version, though giving the general sense of the Hebrew fairly well, is by no means an exact translation; yet in it Jesus found that testimony and those lessons after which He earnestly exhorted men to seek as the way to life eternal.

One or two examples will make plain both what has been said about the character of the Septuagint version, and also show the way in which our Lord and His apostles made use of it. And first of Christ Himself. In St. Matthew xxi. 16 we find Him replying to the murmurings of the chief priests and scribes, who were offended at the hosannas

of the attendant children. Jesus says, "Have ye never read, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings *Thou hast perfected praise?*" Here He is quoting from the Septuagint of Psalm viii. 2. But that passage in the Hebrew, which is strictly represented by our English translations, ends with "*Thou hast ordained* [R.V., established] *strength.*" And this rendering is in entire harmony with the context of the psalm, which speaks of stilling the enemy and the avenger. For such a work *strength* and not *praise* would be needed. It in no way concerns us to inquire how the Septuagint rendering of this verse arose. It suffices that Jesus has accepted it as giving the spirit of David's psalm. He had enemies around Him of a different character from those contemplated by the psalmist. But the Divine economy is manifested in many ways, and it is part of that economy to use the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and it is suitably represented, whether the faithful lips of children be described as a bulwark against the folly of the adversaries, or their youthful praises as a confusion to the malice of opposing priests and scribes.

The same psalm supplies us with an example of the way in which, out of a somewhat inexact rendering in the Septuagint, the writers of the New Testament were able to derive needful lessons of Divine truth, and made no scruple about verbal preciseness. The psalmist is speaking of the dignity which God bestowed upon man at the creation. "Thou hast made him but little *lower than God*, and crownest him with glory and honour; Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands, Thou hast put all things under his feet." In the Septuagint, the first clause of this passage is rendered, "Thou hast made him a little *lower than the angels.*" And this translation was accepted, and made the basis of an argument, by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and in consequence of

that acceptance, the translators of the Authorized Version followed in the psalm the Septuagint rather than the Hebrew. The Revised Version has given the correct translation, and has made the passage refer, as it was meant to do, to the creation of the first Adam in God's image and after God's likeness.

Yet see how the apostles accept the rendering of the Seventy, and draw from it true instruction! St. Paul's lesson is found in 1 Corinthians xv. 27, where he uses the psalm as witness that in the first Adam there was a promise of the second. He quotes the words, "God hath put all things under his feet," and refers them not to Adam, but to Jesus Christ.

The other apostle (Heb. ii. 3-9), if indeed it be not St. Paul here also, is comparing the word that was of old time spoken by angels with that gospel which began from Christ and was continued by His disciples. The latter, he shows, was incomparably the grander message. The angels proclaimed the law, but since the incarnation men have been made fellow workers with the Lord of glory in publishing the message which speaks of life and immortality. This is the honour which God has bestowed upon man in the second Adam. By humiliated human nature, after its assumption by Christ, God has now manifested His glory, as it had never been manifested among, or by, the angels. The psalmist had celebrated the subjection of all nature to the first Adam. The apostle testifies that a greater exaltation than this shall be realized. To Christ, our Lord, the Son of man, in a far higher sense, all things shall be made subject. We see not indeed as yet all things put under Him. All the exaltation of which man is made capable through the incarnation has not yet been made manifest. But a foretaste of it there has been. We see Jesus the God-Man, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour.

In this way the comparison with the angels serves the apostle's purpose. The words of the psalm could most fitly be applied to Him, the Son of man, who was also the Son of God ; and His humiliation was followed by an exaltation, which is a pledge of the future crowning of those whom He has not been ashamed to call His brethren, though now they may here be suffering, as He did that He might be made a perfect Mediator.

It may have been a feeling of reverence which led the Septuagint translators to render by "angels" the word which is properly the name of God Himself. For the representatives and ministers of God are sometimes, in the Old Testament, called by this name *Elohim*. Thus the judges are so designated in Exodus xxi. 6, xxii. 8, where however the Revised Version has placed "God" in the text, and "the judges" on the margin. But satisfied with the version of the Seventy as conveying the Spirit of God's teaching, the apostles adopt it and expound it, to the great comfort of multitudes of godly souls in the generations that have come after them. And we may rest assured that those who did so would have paid little regard to the sort of questions which verbal criticism must raise, and which are of importance in their degree, but mainly for tracing out the various stages of the history of the sacred text.

The next example is different in character, and even more striking. In the council which (Acts xv.) was held at Jerusalem, about the terms of admission of the Gentiles into the Christian Church, we find St. James, after he has alluded to St. Peter's visit to Cornelius, whereby the door of the Church was opened to the Gentile world, continuing his remarks thus : " To this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written :

After this I will return,
 And I will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen ;
 And I will build again the ruins thereof,

And I will set it up :
 That the residue of men may seek after the Lord,
 And all the Gentiles, upon whom My name is called,
 Saith the Lord, who maketh these things known from the beginning
 of the world."

The quotation is made by St. James from the Septuagint translation of Amos ix. 11, 12. But instead of "that the residue of men may seek after the Lord," the Hebrew has, "that they (*i.e.* Israel) may possess the remnant of Edom." Now it is almost certain that the Seventy took the word אֲדוֹם = Edom, as if it were אָדָם = man. Thus "the remnant of Edom" would at once become "the residue of men." They must also have regarded this as the subject, and not the object, in the sentence, and read the verb יִרְשׁוּ = "they may inherit," or "possess," as if it were יִדְרְשׁוּ = "they may seek." Thus the change of the rendering in the Septuagint may be in some degree explained. But over this verbal change the apostle stumbles not. He feels that the later expression includes the earlier, that when the residue of men and all the Gentiles seek the Lord, the faith of Israel will have prevailed among the remnant of Edom. For the purpose of his argument he can, without demur, accept the language of the version; for in it is contained the same, yea, even fuller, testimony to the Divine scheme of salvation. The true up-building of the house of David shall be the up-building of all mankind beside.

Almost every book of the New Testament yields a supply of similar examples. Those which have been given are enough to show that, though the Septuagint varies from the Hebrew, now in its way of expressing the precise form of thought, now by a changed rendering of single words, and at times in the larger difference of a whole modified sentence, the speakers and writers in the New Testament did not regard this as a bar to its use, but accepted it as

expressing the substance of God's revealed word, and found in it what they knew the Old Testament writings were intended to teach.

Nor was it that they were ignorant of the existence of such difference from the original as we have been noting. When it is necessary, they can leave the Septuagint, and render the Hebrew closely for themselves. Perhaps one of the most interesting instances in proof of this is found in St. John xix. 37: "They shall look on Him whom they have pierced." In this quotation from Zechariah xii. 10, the Septuagint renders, "They have danced over in triumph," instead of "they have pierced." They appear to have read קקך=to dance, instead of קקך=to wound; but the evangelist gives the correct translation of the Hebrew.

Similarly in 1 Corinthians iii. 19, St. Paul leaves the Septuagint, to which in most cases he adheres faithfully. He is quoting from Job v. 13, "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness," and his words are, *ὁ δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφούς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν*. Instead of this, the Septuagint has *ὁ καταλαμβάνων σοφούς ἐν τῇ φρονήσει*. Everywhere else but in this passage the Seventy translate ערמה by *πανουργία*; and the apostle takes that word as the true sense here also, while for the verb he employs *δράσσομαι*, which they never use for this Hebrew word.

Instances of this kind are not numerous, for, as has been already said, the New Testament writers, as a rule, follow the Septuagint, but they are enough to show us that this following did not come about because these writers were unable to go to the original for themselves, if they found it best to do so; and their practice makes it quite manifest, that what they sought and found in the writings of the older covenant was something with which verbal and literal criticism does not and cannot interfere.

We may gather also that they would have been undisturbed by questions such as are now discussed concerning

the diversity of authorship in any books of the Old Testament. To them the whole volume was one, and all its parts of co-ordinate authority. Hence St. Matthew (chap. xii.), writing about our Lord's reproof to the Pharisees on the observance of the Sabbath, represents Jesus as citing from 1 Samuel the example of David, and immediately afterwards quoting the book of Numbers in support of His position, and completing His rebuke by pointing out the true principle of religious observance as set forth by Hosea, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." Each quotation is put forward as of equal authority, and as part of one and the same Divine revelation. To Christ it signified not whether for His purpose God has made use of three writers or one. In the same way, and in the same chapter, Jesus couples together the books of Jonah and of the Kings, in His witness against the evil generation who would see a sign. The men of Nineveh and the queen of the south shall each rise up in the judgment and condemn them.

And our Lord's manner in thus using the Old Testament is illustrated amply in¹ the other synoptists. St John does not record many details of Christ's conversations with other persons than His disciples, and to them He does not quote the Old Testament Scriptures. But where the evangelist himself has occasion to make use of Old Testament illustration, we find his practice exactly the same. The whole volume is but one Divine record. Thus, in chapter xii., he quotes from Zechariah, and twice over

¹ Modern investigation concerning the text of the New Testament supplies us with an interesting example in Mark i. 2. The *textus receptus* was correctly rendered in the A.V. "As it is written in the prophets." The quotations which follow are from Malachi and from Isaiah. But, as is now established, the earliest and best supported text would be rendered (as in R.V.) "As it is written in Isaiah the prophet." The evangelist, though citing Malachi first, speaks of the whole as "written in Isaiah." So entirely of one piece to his mind was the whole cycle of the Old Testament prophecy. Some later hand, finding two different prophets quoted, noted the fact, most probably on his margin, and in time the marginal note was substituted for the primitive text.

from Isaiah, as if they were all of one authority; while in chapter xix. he places side by side extracts from the Psalms, from Exodus, and from Zechariah: thus employing, in one single chapter, words from each part of the Old Testament as divided by the Jews, from the law, the prophets, and the Psalms.

The same use is found in St. Paul's epistles, and in other epistles also. He discusses, in chapters ix.-xi. of the Epistle to the Romans, the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles; and in the midst of an argument where almost every sentence contains some allusion to the Old Testament records, the apostle quotes directly from Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, several times over from the Psalms and from Isaiah, and from Nahum; and he uses the language of these various writers as though it were all of co-ordinate value and importance, all alike bearing evidence to the same revealed truth.

In the same way St. James in one chapter (ii.) employs for his argument the words of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Job, and treats them all as of the same cogency.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, as might be expected, quotations from the Old Testament are very numerous. Quite two-thirds of the books are either directly quoted or indirectly alluded to. Yet there is not a trace that one portion of the volume was of more esteem than another for that instruction in righteousness for which the whole was given.

We may be well assured, then, that our Lord and His apostles would have heard without concern the conclusions at which modern criticism has arrived, or is likely to arrive, concerning the mixed authorship of any or of all the Old Testament books. Familiar with the Septuagint, as we see they were, they must have known the tradition, which is recorded in 2 Esdras xiv., of Ezra's prayer that he might

receive the Holy Spirit in such measure as to enable him to rewrite the law which had been lost, and how tradition said the prayer was granted. They must have been acquainted with the more matter of fact statement made in 2 Maccabees ii. 13-15 about the gathering by Nehemiah of the acts of the kings, and the prophets, and of David, and about a similar collection made in later days by Judas Maccabæus. In times when such traditions were current, no such worship of the letter of the Old Testament could have prevailed as would check the use of reason and observation upon the documents as they stood, nor would there have been any hesitation in admitting that these sacred books had undergone some important revision in the days which succeeded the captivity. But the faithful in those times believed that the same Divine Spirit was guiding Ezra, Nehemiah, and Haggai which had guided Moses and Joshua and David : and so believing they were at peace in their minds, assured that the truths of revelation had been ever preserved, though the channels which conveyed had been changed ; assured that it was as ever the word of Him who testifies, "I am Jehovah, I change not." And like assurance would come, nay, will come, now of clearer knowledge. It is but the long silence on such topics which makes men think them perilous to be discussed ; whereas in truth the discussions, now happily growing to be more widely appreciated, deal only with the external presentment, with the casket in which God's truth is contained, seeking to find any indication of how the various pieces thereof were brought to form a part of the admirable work. From such a study reverently conducted we cannot but be gainers in the end, cannot but grow in admiration of the Wisdom which has preserved for the world this knowledge which by its own wisdom the world had never found.

In connexion with this absence¹ of concern about pre-

¹ It may be noted as an instance of disregard of verbal precision, though in

ciseness of text in the New Testament writers, there is another feature which deserves to be noted. Not only do the apostles quote from the Septuagint where it varies from the Hebrew, but they also not unfrequently allow themselves to make some alteration, to give some slight turn to the Greek which shall make it more completely suit their argument. Thus in I Corinthians iii., St. Paul is speaking against the wisdom of this world as being foolishness with God, and he continues, "For it is written, The Lord knoweth the thoughts *of the wise* that they are vain." The Old Testament passage to which he refers is Psalm xciv. 11. But there the words are, "The Lord knoweth the thoughts *of men* that they are vain." The original verse has reference to the whole human race, but the apostle does not hesitate to modify it, that it may the better fit into his argument. The modification impairs no whit the truth of what is said. If God has given sentence on all men's hearts, the hearts of the wise are included in the verdict. St. Paul's limited application does not exclude the wider truth of the psalm.

Once more, in Ephesians iv. 8, the apostle, speaking of the gifts which Christ since His ascension has bestowed through the Spirit, quotes thus: "Wherefore he saith, When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." In the psalm (lxviii. 18) the last phrase of this passage is, "*Thou hast received gifts for* (R.V., among) *men.*" The language there is a description of the glorious ascent of the ark into Mount Zion, and in prophetic vision the psalmist sees, and tells, how the long train of Jehovah's willing captives shall come thither to follow the ark, for God's might shall prevail and win submission among all men. The apostle applies the words to

quite another kind, that while all the four evangelists give an account of the inscription above Christ's cross, the words, in the original, are slightly different in each gospel (cf. Matt. xxvii. 37, Mark xv. 26, Luke xxiii. 38, John xix. 19). Had the gospels been merely a work of man's device, this discordance would have been removed.

Christ. He has ascended into heaven, of which Zion was but a poor figure. He has led and is leading His conquered ones into His blessed bondage. At this point St. Paul turns aside to illustrate some previous words, in which he had been speaking of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and knowing that what Christ has won (according to the psalmist's words) among men by His incarnation, He has won only to shed back upon men again in blessed showers, he is bold to modify the psalmist's expression, while retaining its substance and force; and so he says of Christ *that He gave gifts unto men.*

Of this kind these examples will suffice. They also show us that the New Testament writers were not careful about verbal preciseness, if only they could convey the full force of what they felt to be the true lessons of the older covenant. Niceties of language which come properly under the notice of the students of the sacred text would have seemed of little importance to St. Paul or St. James. They are of interest, but their interest is historic, not doctrinal. And there has never before been a time when an examination of such questions could be thoroughly undertaken. The opportunities and studies of the present time all tend to direct inquiry toward such points. The wider and more constant intercourse among nations, the discovery of new MSS., the comparison of texts, must raise questionings. But "search the Scriptures,"¹ was meant for this phase of inquiry also, and zealous labour in this newly opened field will yield good fruit. The ultimate result of searching may be to make men modify some opinions which they have long entertained about the structure and history of the

¹ For our argument it does not matter whether the verb in this verse (John v. 39) be taken as imperative or indicative. The Scriptures testify of Christ, and a rebuke of the devotion to a study of the book rather than of the life which it contains (which would be the force of the indicative) does not make less important or less needful the rightly directed search to find out Christ in His revelation.

Old Testament books. But if there be no good grounds for holding them, if they have grown up from want of light, if different opinions can be supported by trustworthy evidence, then it is well that, though hallowed by age, mistakes should be cleared out of the way. If we will but show our faith in Christ by obeying His command, He who bade us search will send us light, and make ever clearer His own saying, which is what gives their value to the Old Testament records, that they bear witness unto Him.

J. RAWSON LUMBY.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

IX. CHRIST NOT A SELF-ELECTED, BUT A GOD-APPOINTED PRIEST (CHAP. V. 1-10).

AT length the priesthood of Christ, already three times alluded to, is taken up in earnest, and made the subject of an elaborate discussion, extending from this point to chapter x. 18. The writer begins at the beginning, setting forth first of all that Christ is a legitimate priest, not a usurper: one solemnly called to the office by God, not self-elected. For this is the leading thought in this introductory statement. It seems indeed to be only one of two. *Prima facie* one gets the impression that the writer's object is to specify, as of equal and co-ordinate importance, two fundamental qualifications for the office of a high priest, and then to show that these were both possessed in a signal manner by Jesus. Every perfectly qualified high priest, he appears to say, must both sympathise with men, and have a call from God: accordingly Jesus had such a call, and was also eminently sympathetic. And he evidently does regard sympathy as, not less than a Divine call, indispensable, the terms in which he speaks of it being quite remarkable for emphasis and vividness. Nevertheless he does not put the