3. As to the truth of the Christian Gospel. The consciousness of union with Christ—a fact as real as the consciousness of right and wrong—is the greatest apologetic asset of the Church. It is unaffected by controversies as to the date or authorship of documents, though it has a very direct bearing on the question of the truth of their message. It is unaffected by differences of doctrinal interpretation. And as we look around us, in the society of believers in Jesus, and mark the beauty and devotion of character displayed in thousands of His people, it is the mere instinct of truth to say, "We know that He is alive from the dead, for He lives in them."

H. R. Mackintosh.
one particular book or tract, the reason must lie in the paleographical fortunes of the book itself, and in its pre-canonical life, before it came to be part of a recognized collection and treated like the rest of the books of which the collection is composed.

In the present brief article I want to discuss the original form and meaning of the closing words of 1 Peter ii. 8, which stand in our Authorized Version in the form, "Whereunto also they were appointed"; the Revised Version does not suggest any change in the rendering of the original text εἰς δὲ καὶ ἐτέθησαν, nor does it decorate its margin with an alternative either to text or translation; from which it may be inferred that they had no fault to find either with the one or with the other. Whether they liked the doctrine, as in all probability the Revisers of 1611 did, will not, of course, appear, as we have no printed reports of the proceedings in the Jerusalem chamber. If they did not like it (and it is one of the strongest pieces of Predestinarian doctrine in the New Testament), they had no way of expressing it, for no one has any right, in editing a text, to say whether he likes the text when he has edited it, or, to put it more exactly, to edit the text because he likes it. We have no control over the thoughts or expressions of Peter and Paul, because we may agree or disagree with them in the matter of the Freedom of the Will, for the Freedom of the Will in a critic or a translator is a very limited Free Will, inside the circle of Free Will generally and very near the centre. So we must be cautious in saying that the text is wrong, merely because we may not like the statement that the unbelievers stumble at the Stone of Offence, and were appointed so to do. The harshness may be the inevitable concomitant of the writer's theology, and in that case what right have we to suggest a change? On the other hand, it is not impossible that the harshness may be an importation or a
misunderstanding, and if we can find any evidence that bears upon that point, it is not improper to produce it.

But, first of all, let us examine the passage at length to which the words under consideration are a pendant. It is well known that this famous statement about the place of the Stone Rejected of the Builders in the Divine Architecture is one of the passages which are held to prove the dependence of Peter upon Paul. The argument is as follows: here in Peter we have the statement, "Behold I lay in Sion a stone, elect, a corner-stone, a precious stone, and he that believeth in Him shall not be confounded. To you, then, that believe He is precious; but to the unbelieving the stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence; who stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also they were appointed."

Now in this passage we have a combination of two passages from Isaiah with a passage from the Psalms, the latter being also quoted in the Gospel of Matthew (xxi. 42), the two passages being Isaiah xxviii. 16 and Isaiah viii. 14. And in the quotation from Isaiah xxviii. 16 the writer is not working, as we should expect, from the text of the LXX; if he had been, he would have begun his quotation with ίδον ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σίων instead of ίδον τίθημι ἐν Σίων, to say nothing of some other changes; so we have here either an independent translation or a reformed rendering of the LXX by reference to the original Hebrew.

Then it is further noted that the same two passages of Isaiah are found combined in Romans ix. 32, 33; "they stumbled at the Stumbling Stone, even as it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence, and he that believeth on him shall not be ashamed," where we see the same modified rendering of Isaiah xxviii. 16. And from thence it has been inferred that Pauline
material has been worked over by Peter, for which opinion confirmation has been suggested in other quarters.

The same divergence from the LXX to the Hebrew will be found in the other quotation from Isaiah (viii. 14), for here the LXX have wrongly ὁν χά ως λίθον προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ ὡν ὅς πέτρας πτώματι: and it is this repeated coincidence between Peter and Paul in the selection and use of material that furnishes the ground for a belief in a connexion between the two writers. Dr. Hort states the case thus: "St. Paul substitutes a literal rendering of the Hebrew and St. Peter follows him."

But then Dr. Hort goes further and points out that the single word σκανθαλον, as used in this connexion by St. Paul and St. Peter, pointed back to characteristic language of our Lord Himself as well as of the Evangelists on His being a "stumbling-block" to the Jews who refused Him; as St. Paul elsewhere pronounced a crucified Christ to be to the Jews distinctly a "stumbling-block."

But if this idea of stumbling at the stone of scandal is so widely diffused in the Gospels and Epistles, the question arises in our minds as to whether the teaching is not a part of the earliest Christian tradition, and whether the agreement between the two Apostles cannot be explained by the use of this tradition, without the necessity of quoting one another. The use of the same passages of Isaiah in the same translation, and that an independent translation, points at once to the use of a Book of Testimonies antijudaic in character; if we can show reason for such a hypothesis, we can liberate Peter from the control of Paul, at least as far as this passage is concerned, and make them independent channels for the propagation of a primitive Christian argument. Now it is well known from the surviving collections of Testimonies against the Jews, and from quotations which may fairly be traced to such collections, that one of the
earliest arguments embodied in them was based upon the statement that Christ is in the Old Testament known as the Stone. To establish this at length would take far too much space, and I will only refer to the matter very briefly; if we look at Cyprian’s Testimonies, we shall find in the second book three sections devoted to the establishment of the following points:—

(a) That Christ is called the Stone;
(b) That then the same stone should become a mountain and fill the whole earth;
(c) That in the last times that mountain should be made manifest, on which the Gentiles should come and into which all the Just should ascend.

The proof-texts in Cyprian are Isaiah xxviii. 16 followed by the passage from the Psalm (cxviii. 22). Cyprian does not, however, quote the second passage from Isaiah, and in the first passage he appears to follow the LXX rather than the Hebrew (or is it a Latin text based upon the LXX?); for he reads:—

“Apud Isaiam prophetam sic dicit Dominus: Ecce ego immitto in fundamenta Sion lapidem pretiosum, electum, summum angularem, honoratum: et qui crediderit in eum non confundetur. Item in Psalmo cxvii., etc.”

Cyprian may then be taken as evidence for (1) the doctrine that Christ is the Stone, and (2) for the line of proof; although it does not run back demonstrably into the ancestry of the Peter-Paul quotations. Still the substance of the argument against the Jews is there, and we shall find presently the same variation in the Epistle of Barnabas. So we suggest that the agreement between Peter and Paul is due to the use of a Book of Testimonies. The following further passage from Dr. Hort will now require modification. Comm. in 1 Pet., p. 116.

1 The two words summum angularem are a translation of ἀξιωματικός.
It is morally certain that St. Peter borrowed from St. Paul those peculiarities in his mode of quoting the passage which he has in common with him; and hardly less so that St. Paul was not following any antecedent version other than the LXX, but freely adapting the LXX itself. Neither he nor St. Peter had occasion to cite the reference, twice repeated in the Hebrew and the LXX, to the laying of foundations. The first sentence in this passage needs now the expansion, "or quoting from some collection of prophetical testimonies available to them both."

And now I want to draw attention to a curious passage in the Epistle of Barnabas, where we shall again come across traces of a similar gnosis with some striking variations; the text is as follows:—

καὶ πάλιν λέγει ὁ προφήτης, ἐπεὶ ὡς λίθος ἱσχυρὸς ἐτέθη εἰς συντριβὴν· ἱδοὺ ἐμβαλὼ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιὼν λίθον πολυτελῆ, ἐκλεκτὸν, ἀκρογωνιαίον, ἑντιμον. εἶτα τί λέγει; καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν ζητεῖαι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Ἑπὶ λίθον οὖν ἡμῶν ἡ ἔλπις; Μὴ γένοιτο· ἄλλο ἐπεὶ ἐν ἱσχύι τέθεικεν τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος· λέγει γάρ· καὶ ἔθηκέν με ὡς στερεὰν πέτραν. λέγει δὲ πάλιν ὁ προφήτης· Δίδον δὲ ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας.

The variations in the text are curious, and the argument obscure; but it will at once be noticed that Barnabas is quoting the same passages from Isaiah and the Psalms that we found in Cyprian, and quoting Isaiah xxviii. 16 as Cyprian does from the LXX. There can, then, be no doubt that Barnabas is using familiar matter from the Testimony Book.

Upon looking more closely at his statement we find him saying that Christ was set as a strong stone for breaking (εἰς συντριβὴν); and here we have an echo of the other passage from Isaiah concerning the Stone of Stumbling and

1 Isaiah xxviii. 16. 2 Isaiah i. 7. 3 Ps. cxviii. 22.
Rock of Offence. Accordingly Funk adds a note on this clause to the effect that Barnabas here seems to have in mind Isaiah viii. 14 in the Hebrew text. If this be so, we have the same Testimonies in Barnabas as in 1 Peter, and Barnabas becomes the connecting link between Cyprian and Peter-Paul. In this respect, then, the reference to Barnabas is important; but there is more to come from it. Not only does he hold the doctrine that Christ in the Old Testament is represented as Stone and Rock (λίθος and πέτρα), but he plays on the word τίθημι (which Peter and Paul employ in quoting from Isaiah) in such a way as to suggest that he knew the other rendering from the Hebrew, in spite of the fact that he quotes the LXX. The proof of this lies in the Greek of Barnabas which is before us:

\[\text{κρέας τέθηκεν τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ οὔ κύριος} \]

And the importance of this observation is that it at once suggests to us, from the repeated statements about Christ, that the words in 1 Peter with which we started refer to Christ and not to the disobedient or unbelievers, and that the text should be corrected from \(\text{ἐς δὲ τέθησαν}\) to \(\text{ἐς δὲ τέθη}.\)

When this is done, the passage becomes quite clear, for just as Peter takes up the various terms in Isaiah and comments on them, playing on the word ἐντιμῶν by a following ἡ τιμή and reflecting the λίθος ἐκλεκτός in γένος ἐκλεκτόν, so he carries on the thought of the laying of the foundation stone ("Behold, I lay, etc."), and sums up the results of the laying of the stone in the words, "For which cause also the stone was laid," (ἐς δὲ καὶ τέθη). It is curious how near
Dr. Hort came to this explanation of the obscure clause in Peter: he remarks as follows:—

"'Ετέθησαν, a somewhat vague word in itself, expresses simply the ordinance of God, perhaps with the idea of place added, that is place in a far-reaching order of things. The coincidence with 'Ιδοῦ τιθημὶ ἐν Σιὼν λίθον in verse 6 can hardly be accidental" (italics ours).

Certainly the coincidence is not accidental, and the reference to Barnabas enables us, by a simple conjecture, to make it exact. It is a case of deliberate repetition from the opening words of the passage quoted and commented on.

Assuming this to be correct, the exegesis of the passage is much simplified. As long as it was a case of the dependence of Peter upon Paul's quotations, it was almost inevitable that his argument should follow the Pauline direction. From this point of view Dr. Hort said very properly that "all attempts to explain away the statement [εἰς δὲ καὶ ἔτεθησαν] as if e.g., it meant only that they were appointed to this by the just and natural consequences of their own acts, are futile." When, however, we see that it is the Stone that is the ordinance of God, and not the stumblers, the statement which Dr. Hort takes exception to ceases to be futile, and exactly expresses St. Peter's mind. Something of the same kind is true with regard to the following sentences: "These four mysterious words become clearer when we carry them back to what is doubtless their real source, those three central chapters of Romans of which the apostasy of Israel is the fundamental theme." The words are no longer unduly mysterious, and they are to be understood without any reference to St. Paul. I do not, of course, forget that this still leaves St. Paul's argument against the Jews, by way of prophetic testimonies, to be dealt with, and it may be difficult to extract from them any interpre-
tation that must not be described as Predestinarian. All that we have urged is that the difficult words in Peter are to be interpreted without aid from Paul and in a different sense. In conclusion I may remark that the corrections and interpretations here offered have come to me gradually: the recognition that we were dealing with extracts from the Testimony Book came first; but here one was held up by the fact that the agreement with Cyprian was inexact. After that I came to suspect the genuineness of ἐνθέδησαν and made the necessary marginal correction; it was only recently, however, that I saw that Barnabas had been on the same track, that he agreed with Cyprian on the one hand, and probably with Peter on the other, and that he furnished a remarkable confirmation to the emendation which I had made. So we may leave the matter to be further tested, and cover the final judgment with the words, "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

J. Rendel Harris.

JUSTIN MARTYR AND THE TEXT OF HEBREWS XI.

Πίστευ πληλονα θυσίαν "Αβελ παρά Καὶν προσήνεκεν τῷ θεῷ δ' ἦς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἰναι δίκαιος, μαρτυρούντος ἐπὶ τῶν δύσως αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ δ' αὐτής ἀποθανὼν εἶναι λαλεῖ:

There are two difficulties in this verse, (1) the interpretation of the words πληλονα θυσίαν, which in their most obvious sense, a "larger" or "greater" sacrifice, do not suit the context; (2) the text of the words given by Westcott and Hort as αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, but of which they say in their appendix that Clement of Alexandria, who quotes the passage in Stromata ii. 4, 12, has probably preserved the true text (αὐτῷ, as above), while all the MSS. have become corrupt. This article is concerned principally with the first point;