relation with God, revealed in Christ as "Three in One." It was inevitable that the words should come in time to be used as a formula expressive of the intention of the Church in ministering baptism: but there is no evidence that they were so used when St. Luke wrote the Acts. On the other hand, St. Luke's phrases, "baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus" and the like are in no way inconsistent with his knowledge of the words in Matthew xxviii. 19; and therefore we cannot argue from the language of the Acts, as some writers have done, that the concluding words of the first Gospel are a later addition to the evangelical tradition of our Lord's commission to His Church.

J. H. BERNARD.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND JEWISH LITERATURE.¹

PART I.

Just as Christianity is a development of Judaism, so the books of the New Testament start from Jewish thought and Jewish literature. Our subject therefore is a study in the method of Divine Revelation; of the way in which the new heavens and the new earth of the kingdom of God arose out of that ancient dispensation which, as the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, was becoming old and waxing aged, and was nigh unto vanishing away. We shall not, however, deal with the whole of this great process of the Divine working; we leave on one side abstruse questions of history, of doctrine, of sacred metaphysics, and confine ourselves to the humbler, simpler, and more concrete branch of the subject—the relation of the sacred books of the New Covenant to the literature of the Chosen People. We may say in passing that the influence of Pagan literature

¹ The inaugural lecture at New College, London, 1901.
on the New Testament is of the slightest. Here and there a sentence comes directly or indirectly from a Pagan author. The study of monuments and newly discovered papyri by Deissmann, Rendel Harris, J. H. Moulton and others has shown that some of the phrases of the Epistles are conventional formulae found in the letters of devout Pagans or in their religious inscriptions. But when all this is taken into account, it is still true that the writers of the New Testament owe hardly anything to profane literature compared to their great debt to their Jewish predecessors, and perhaps we should also say their Jewish contemporaries. Let us consider for a moment what Jewish works were accessible in the period during which the New Testament was written. First and foremost there were the books which we Protestants know as the Old Testament, the books from Genesis to Malachi; secondly, there were the books which the Roman and other Churches, the majority I fancy of Christendom, include in their Old Testament, but which we call Apocrypha, viz. Esdras, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, Books of the Maccabees, etc. The third class is the strange apocalyptic literature. There are of course apocalypses in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, viz. the Book of Daniel and the Fourth Book of Esdras. But besides these there is a numerous collection of books, written in the names of ancient worthies, describing history thinly veiled as prophecy; the history is mingled with marvellous visions of heaven and hell, and leads up to accounts of the last things and the Day of Judgment. Such are the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Books of Enoch, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Book of Jubilees, the Assumption of Moses, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Psalms of Solomon, the Sibylline Oracles. These are often known as the Pseudepigrapha, or books written in the names of persons who were not their authors. These
books are not now included in the Bible of any Church, but in the first century of the Christian era many regarded them as of almost equal authority with the Old Testament.

The fourth class comprises Jewish writings which were never regarded as canonical. There are the numerous commentaries of Philo, which are mainly devoted to allegorizing the laws and history of the Pentateuch. Moreover, the works of Josephus, his history of Israel, his history of the Jewish War, and his autobiography were in existence before the last of the New Testament books was written.

The fifth class consisted of what we may call, somewhat paradoxically, oral literature. The discussions, opinions, and decisions of the Rabbis concerning the Law, the observance of the Sabbath, the washing of pots and pans, the tithing of mint and anise and cummin and so forth, based on a curious exegesis of the Pentateuch, the whole combined with grotesque legends about the patriarchs. These were handed down from one teacher to another, and when years afterwards they were committed to writing with all the later additions they filled many large volumes. In the first century they were not yet written down, but there must have been a large collection of traditions known to different Rabbis.

The total amount of this literature was comparatively small. The average length of the books was much less than that of the books of modern times. In the Old Testament, for instance, Obadiah is not as long as a leading article in the Times, and many of the books are shorter than an article in a quarterly review, so that there were, even according to the Jewish reckoning, twenty-four books in the Old Testament; we make thirty-nine. Omitting the unwritten traditions, I should think that all the works I have referred to could be contained in a dozen
volumes the size of our Bible; at any rate a very moderate bookshelf would hold them all. Of course there were books known to the Apostles that have since perished; they sometimes quote works which are not now extant, but I imagine that if we had all the Jewish literature accessible to our Lord and His Apostles the whole of it would go into two or three shelves. Of this small collection only a part would be known to any one of the writers; no one of them, probably, had seen all the works now extant, even omitting Josephus. Books were rare and expensive. Our Bible dictionaries, both new and old, do not even devote an article to the word "Book," but refer to the subject under "Writing." Apart from references to quotations as "in the book of Isaiah," etc., books and reading are rarely mentioned in the New Testament.

We hear of a book in the synagogue,\(^1\) of the book of Isaiah which the Ethiopian eunuch was reading,\(^2\) of the books and parchments which St. Paul left at Troas,\(^3\) and of the books of magic which his converts burnt at Ephesus,\(^4\) hardly anything else. Nevertheless the pious Jew was familiar with the Old Testament; Timothy\(^5\) had known the sacred writings from a babe. The books that St. Paul left at Troas no doubt included copies of parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, and other Apostles would possess similar treasures. But the Jews of our Lord's time were not dependent upon books alone for their knowledge of the Old Testament. During their childhood they learnt many passages by heart, and they were constantly hearing it read and expounded in the synagogues; thus their memories were stored with Scripture texts. We do not know how far the ordinary Jew knew Hebrew; many of the Jews of Palestine who spoke Aramaic knew their Bibles through the Aramaic oral translation given in the synagogues;

\(^{1}\) Luke iv. 17–20. \(^{2}\) Acts viii. 28–32. \(^{3}\) 2 Tim. iv. 13. \\
\(^{4}\) Acts xix. 19. \(^{5}\) 2 Tim. iii. 15.
the Greek-speaking Jews knew it through the Septuagint or Greek translation, which included the Apocrypha.

Notice, too, the form in which the Bible came to the Jews. Our Bible is a book with contents clearly defined by being nearly always bound up in one volume or set of volumes. If a single book, Psalms, or a Gospel, or the New Testament, is published separately, we regard it as a part of a whole. But the Old Testament of our Lord’s days was a library; each portion, written on a separate roll or rolls, had a distinct individuality of its own. Probably none of the Apostles had ever seen, almost certainly had never possessed, a complete set of these rolls. An Old Testament would have been a chest of rolls; there can have been few if any chests which contained all our Old Testament books and no more. There must have been many chests containing some of the books, and often other rolls as well. Our Bible too is usually marked off from other books by a special binding and arrangement. It has a special appearance which makes it an ostentatious display of religion to carry a Bible. Perhaps this was the case with the Pentateuch in our Lord’s time; it was certainly not the case with all the other books. Popular feeling as to the uniqueness of just that collection of books which we call the Bible is largely due to familiarity with volumes which contain all these and no others, and which differ outwardly and visibly from all other books. The books of the Hebrew Old Testament were not marked off in this way.

Let us now consider for a moment, in the light of what we have been saying, the nature of our subject, which is the use of Jewish literature by the New Testament. The use by the New Testament means use by the authors of the books, and by the speakers whose utterances they record. We may forget the controversies as to the authorship of some of these books; such questions do not affect what I
have to say. These authors and speakers fall into three classes. One at least, St. Luke, was a Gentile, a professional man, a doctor, with literary tastes and gifts, who knew the Old Testament by reading it in the Greek translation. Others were Jews of the Dispersion, whose vernacular was Greek, and whose Bible again was the Greek translation of the Old Testament. Thus the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was a Hellenist of Alexandria, a disciple of Philo. The other Hellenist was St. Paul, of the Greek city Tarsus. He however had received what we may call a University training in Jewish theology at Jerusalem under Gamaliel. He was a Hellenist by birth and association, but he had come under the influence of the Judaism of Palestine and the Rabbis; he had a student's knowledge of the Scriptures in the original Hebrew, and delighted to call himself a "Hebrew of the Hebrews." The third class was composed of Jews of Palestine, St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. John, St. James, St. Peter, and St. Jude, with whom we should include our Lord Himself. They were mostly Jews of Galilee, master carpenters, master fishermen, a tax collector; in a sense they were working men, but they correspond more truly to what we call the lower middle class. Their language was Aramaic, but they probably knew some Greek, just as, I believe, most people in Wales know some English. It is doubtful how far they knew Hebrew; there was no written Aramaic translation, and it is possible that their written Bible again was the Greek translation of the Old Testament; but they also knew the Aramaic translation, or perhaps the Hebrew, of many passages which they had learnt by heart as children, or heard translated by word of mouth in the synagogues. Both the last two classes, the Hellenists and the Palestinian Jews, had been taught portions of the Bible from childhood; they had heard it read and discussed from week to week at public
worship, and they daily recited passages from it in their private devotion and family worship.

Then, too, use by the New Testament means use in sermons or religious exhortations, of the discourses of our Lord, the speeches of James and Peter, Paul and Stephen; in histories of our Lord and of the founding of the Church; in letters to Christian churches and teachers as to life and doctrine; and in that magnificent symbolic picture of Divine things, the Book of Revelation.

The Jewish literature of which we have already spoken enjoyed various degrees of authority; the Pentateuch had a special and unique position; the Psalms and the Prophets, excluding Daniel and including Joshua, Samuel and Kings, were read in the public services, and came next to the Pentateuch; the other works were less reverenced. Thus our subject is the use made by these Greeks, Hellenists and Palestinian Jews, in their narratives and letters, of the various religious writings of Judaism.

You are already familiar with much that can be said on this topic, and I need only remind you of it very briefly. You may read a striking restatement of the general facts in Prof. G. A. Smith's *Modern Criticism and the Old Testament*. No one can read the New Testament without noticing that the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the Psalms especially, and in a less degree some other Old Testament books, are used even more frequently than in modern sermons and religious works, and that they are used in every possible way. Sometimes passages are quoted with the title of the book from which they are taken; sometimes expressly as Scripture; sometimes sentences and phrases are interwoven with the context without anything to show that they are quotations. Often a verse is appealed to as an authority; sometimes however an ordinance from the Old Testament is cited only to be set on one side; "It is said by them of old time... but I say unto you."
Very frequently phrases and sentences are used simply to express what the words of the Greek translation suggested to the inspired writer, without the least reference to their original meaning in the Hebrew Scriptures. An earnest and devout deacon once said to me that the authors of the New Testament used the Old “just as they liked.”

Naturally the methods of different authors vary. Most of them follow the Greek translation even when it differs from the Hebrew, but the Gospels, including quotations contained in our Lord’s discourses, St. Paul, and 1 Peter, very occasionally seem to correct the Greek by the Hebrew. Again, the direct use of the Old Testament is much less in Colossians than in most of the Pauline Epistles, much less, for instance, than in Ephesians. Then as to the Johannine books: large portions of the Apocalypse are almost a mosaic of phrases from the Old Testament; but comparatively little direct use of the older Scriptures is made in the Gospel, and perhaps none at all in the Epistles. Then as to literature outside of our Old Testament, the influence of the Apocrypha can be traced in almost all the books. Our Lord’s discourses are said to show that he had studied the non-canonical Apocalypses. Thus Dr. J. E. Thomson, the author of perhaps the best defence of the authorship of the Book of Daniel by Daniel, and therefore not a revolutionary critic, has published a work on the apocalypses, which he entitles “Books which influenced our Lord.” In a recent number of the Church of England Ecclesiastical Review, Prof. Henslow maintains that our Lord’s teaching has been influenced by the Book of Enoch, from which book the short Epistle of St. Jude has borrowed many of its phrases and ideas; and indeed St. Jude expressly quotes Enoch as Scripture: “Enoch . . . prophesied . . . saying.” Similarly the Epistle to the Hebrews is full of the phrases and ideas of Philo; possibly, though it is disputed, Luke, Acts and 2 Peter, or one or more of them,
make use of Josephus; and here and there we come upon traditions found elsewhere in Josephus or the later rabbinical writings; these traditions, no doubt, were derived from the oral teaching current in the schools and amongst the people.

Such details are interesting in themselves, and they have a bearing on the criticism of the New Testament, but the one outstanding fact is that the books in which God's Revelation to Israel reached its climax, the Pentateuch, Psalms, Isaiah, and the Prophets, occupy a position of unique authority for the writers of the New Testament. They have indeed only a few casual utterances as to the character of the ancient Scriptures; they do not formulate any dogma as to inspired writings; they neither state nor imply that their methods of quotation and exegesis are an authoritative standard for the Church throughout all time; but their example does commend the Old Testament as a supreme source of spiritual enlightenment and an unique means of grace. Their language and ideas were moulded by it, their doctrines took its teaching as their starting point, the history it records is recognized by Christ and His Apostles as a preparation for His coming; no one can understand the New Testament who has not some intelligent knowledge of the Sacred Books of Israel.

But more than this, the Old Testament has an independent position of its own, side by side with the New Testament. Portions of the more ancient Scriptures may record the elementary lessons which God taught the world in its childhood; but, even so, there will always be with us those who are babes in the things of God, and who need to be taught the alphabet and one-syllable words of the language of His kingdom. But the pages of the Old Testament have also ministered to souls in which the life of the Spirit was complete and mature; St. Paul and St. John, nay, even our Lord Himself, found life and light,
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comfort and inspiration in prophets, psalms, and sacred story; we therefore have not reached and cannot attain to any height of spiritual experience where we can afford to neglect the Old Testament.

Turning to details: let us consider the relation of the New Testament to such technical questions as the Canon, the principles of exegesis, the criticism of the text, history, and of the date and authorship of the various books of the Old Testament. Providence has preserved for us in the New Testament much valuable information which we must use in the discussion of these subjects; but it gives no decisions on these critical problems, still less does it furnish an authoritative endorsement of traditional views. Our Lord and His disciples speak of Scriptures, but they nowhere provide a list of the books which make up these Scriptures; they do not tell us in which of our MSS. we shall find the correct text, for the very obvious reason that none of the extant MSS. of the Old Testament, whether in Hebrew or in Greek, had then been written. Their exegesis, on the face of it, seems to imply conflicting views as to the interpretation of the Old Testament; they do not try to combine them into any consistent system. They draw their illustrations from the narratives of Moses, David and Elijah, Jonah and Job; they do not tell us how far we are to regard these as literal history. They use all the more important books of the Old Testament, but they seldom connect an author's name with their quotations, and they never give the date of their authorities. Thus the Holy Spirit clearly indicates that the New Testament is not intended to give any inspired dictum on such matters, they lie within the scope of the ordinary powers of the human intellect, and they are left to be decided by devout and reverent research. It will be convenient to begin with a word or two about the text of the Old Testament used by the writers of the New. The documents in which the Old
Testament has been preserved to us fall into two main classes.¹ There are the MSS. of the original Hebrew, the oldest of which was written not earlier than 800 years after Christ, and there are the much older MSS. of the LXX. or Greek translation of the Old Testament, some of them written before A.D. 400. The differences between these two groups of MSS. are considerable, but they do not affect the substance of the Revelation. Now in the great majority of instances the New Testament writers and speakers, including our Lord Himself, follow the Greek translation; that was their Bible, not the Hebrew text. Sometimes they differ from both the Hebrew and the Greek MSS.; very occasionally they agree with the Hebrew against the Greek; but they constantly follow the Greek even where it differs from the Hebrew; and often the whole point of the quotation lies in something in the Greek translation which is not found in the Hebrew. For instance the Epistle to the Hebrews (x. 5), in speaking of the Incarnation, quotes Psalm xl. 6, as saying, “A body didst thou prepare for me”; this is from the Greek translation. The Hebrew has “Mine ears hast thou opened.” If the usage of the New Testament were an example which we were bound to follow, we should be obliged to make the Greek translation our chief authority for the text of the Old Testament. None of us, I imagine, will accept this conclusion; we shall rather maintain that in such matters the inspired writers merely followed the conventional practice of their times, without the least intention of erecting the custom into a binding law for the Church in all ages.

Then as to the Canon, the question as to exactly what books are to be included in the Old Testament. Christians are not now and never have been agreed on this matter. The Church of Rome and other churches include a number of books which we exclude. We at any rate have the

¹ Space prevents our discussing the MSS. of the Samaritan Pentateuch.
satisfaction of knowing that those which we accept are unanimously recognized by all Christendom. But the New Testament does not decide this controversy between us and the Romanists. The Church took over its Canon of the Old Testament from the Jews; but in the time of Christ and the Apostles there was no agreement, either official or popular, among the Jews as to this Canon, i.e. as to the books, to be included in their Bible. Some, like the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Psalms, etc., were universally accepted, but there were many, including the Old Testament Apocrypha, Esther, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and the Book of Enoch, which were accepted by some Jews and not by others. This diversity of opinion and practice amongst the Jews is reflected in the New Testament, and has continued in the Christian Church ever since. It has been pointed out that there were two differing texts of the Old Testament, that of the Hebrew MSS. and that of the Greek translation, and that Christ and His disciples mostly use the latter; now the Greek translation included the Apocrypha; so that their usage, if it is an authoritative example, would seem to endorse the Greek canon and these Apocrypha. It is true that our Lord does not quote any of these Apocrypha as Scripture; but neither does He thus quote other books as to which the Jews were doubtful, viz., Esther, Canticles, Ecclesiastes; if His silence excludes the Apocrypha, it excludes these also. When we turn from our Lord’s utterances to the New Testament as a whole, we still find that neither the Apocrypha nor Esther, Canticles and Ecclesiastes are quoted as Scripture; but St. Jude quotes the Book of Enoch as Scripture; and there are eight or nine other passages quoted by the New Testament as Scripture—some of them by our Lord—which are not found in our Old Testament. For instance, Matthew ii. 23, “He should be called a Nazarene”; Matthew v. 43, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy”; Mark ix. 13, “Elijah is come, and they have
also done unto him whatsoever they listed, even as it is written of him"; John vii. 38, "As the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water"; 1 Corinthians, ii. 9:

As it is written,

Things which eye saw not and ear heard not,
And which entered not into the heart of man,
Whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him.

These lines contain phrases from the Old Testament, and phrases which are not found there; and according to Origen the passage as a whole is from the Apocalypse of Elijah, a work not now extant. Thus the passages expressly quoted by the New Testament as inspired utterances are not confined to our Old Testament.

Further, Prof. Lumby in an interesting article on this subject in the Expositor for May, 1889, argues that because quotations from the different sections of the Jewish Canon, from the Law, the Prophets, the Hagiographa are combined in one passage, that therefore they were regarded as of equal authority. The same argument would show that works outside our Old Testament were also regarded as equally authoritative with its contents. The celebrated eleventh chapter of Hebrews gives us a review of the heroes of faith, in which incidents taken from our historical books are referred to in the same breath with the martyrdom of the Seven in 2 Maccabees and the sawing asunder of Isaiah in the Ascension of Isaiah; and the speech of Stephen, Acts vii., constantly follows the Septuagint or Jewish tradition when they differ from or supplement the Hebrew text.

Hence if the usage of our Lord and of the writers of the New Testament is to be taken as giving an authoritative decision as to the Canon, our Old Testament would have to include some or all the Apocrypha of the Greek Bible, together with the Book of Enoch and other known and
unknown works. Such a canon never has been and never would be accepted by any Christian Church. Our Lord and His disciples simply followed the customs of the times when they wrote and the societies to which they belonged; their usage was never intended either by themselves or by the Holy Spirit to be binding on us.

W. H. BENNETT.

SOME PROPER NAMES.


The chapter which contains these names, and a great number more just as lifeless and unsuggestive as these, is in our Bible. It is sometimes read to us as the second lesson upon Sunday morning. When you hear them read, what thought do they suggest to you? Do you even take the trouble to think, Why are we asked to listen to these names which are only noises, which tell us no more than an auctioneer’s old catalogue might tell? Or do you fail even of this, even to miss from your lesson its usual teaching or inspiration? Is it much the same to you whether the clergyman reads out “Philologos, Julias, Nereus and his sister,” or, “The God of all comforts comfort you”?

For if so, this is a lesson which the catalogue teaches; a very serious and alarming lesson.

But if you have noticed this apparent waste of force, you may have gone on to see that it is part of a much greater question: Why is the Bible written as it is? Even the Gospels, even the four Lives of Christ—how much would we prefer some more of His own wonderful teaching; as, for example, how upon the road to Emmaus He opened the minds of the two disciples concerning the Old Testament and Himself, until their hearts burned within them. Ah, tell us that, we might say, instead of the long wrangle...