



The New Testament Witness to the Authorship of Old Testament Books

Author(s): Francis Brown

Source: *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Dec., 1882), pp. 95-121

Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268652>

Accessed: 07/03/2010 15:01

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society of Biblical Literature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Journal, December, 1882.*

The New Testament Witness to the Author-
ship of Old Testament Books.

BY PROF. FRANCIS BROWN.

A careful examination of this subject seems to be demanded by the conflicting and equally positive statements current in regard to it.
E. g. :

Turpie, (*The New Testament View of the Old*, London, 1872), who has given the matter the fullest consecutive treatment, assumes, almost without argument, that the language of the New Testament is decisive of questions of authorship, in the case of many important books of the Old Testament. Thus, (p. 124), when speaking of Rom. x. 20, 21,—“Isaiah is very bold and saith”—the citation being from Is. lxx. 1, 2,—he remarks: “Paul thus lets us know the source whence the quotations are drawn. They are taken from Isaiah. Isaiah spake them.” On p. 130, he says: “The formula *Δαυεὶδ λέγει*, ‘David says,’ followed by quotations from several Psalms, *viz.*, xvi., xxxii., lxix, and cx., shows us that he was the writer of them.” On p. 158, we read: “From our Lord’s words, then, ‘Have ye not read in the Book of Moses at the bush,’ [Ma. xii. 26], I infer that Moses is set forth as the author of the Pentateuch.” Similar remarks occur elsewhere in Turpie’s book.

Prof. W. H. Green, D. D., says, (*Moses and the Prophets*, p. 345): “The history and legislation of the Pentateuch lies at the basis of all the subsequent history of the Old Testament. It is presupposed in

* The paper of the Rev. Dr. Craven has not been received.

the Psalms. It is presupposed in the prophets. Moses' authorship has the explicit sanction of our blessed Lord himself."

In our popular religious literature, this argument is dwelt on with great emphasis.

On the other hand, there are other persons, of excellent Christian reputation, who are committed to the opinion that these questions are not settled by New Testament evidence. One of the most emphatic statements to this effect is from the pen of Prof. E. Benj. Andrews, of Brown University, (*Hebrew Student*, Dec., 1882, p. 100): "Let even Wellhausen's view be adopted: there are several ways in which, we are happy to think, every recorded utterance of Christ touching the Pentateuch might be explained in accord with the perfect truthfulness and supernatural character of his teachings."

The existence of opposite views on such an important matter may fairly justify a careful examination of the New Testament writings, with a view to deciding, if possible, which opinion is correct.

The examination proposes no further end than the simple testing of a particular argument. It is not an inquiry into the actual authorship of Old Testament books. Nor does it necessarily involve an answer to such an inquiry. For while it is true that if the New Testament argument is shown to be conclusive, the result will be to establish the authorship of the books in question, it is not true that the opposite decision would involve a denial of particular authorship. It would involve simply a denial that such particular authorship can be proved from the New Testament. For it is agreed on all hands, that the New Testament does not directly, and in terms, deny the particular authorship of any Old Testament book. It is perfectly conceivable, therefore, that the argument might be shown to be unavailable for the purpose for which it is employed, at the same time that the conclusions sought to be established by the argument were impregnable on other grounds. It is not the more general question as to the *facts* of authorship, but the more limited question as to the bearing of the New Testament argument, which now concerns us.

The inquiry is carefully to be distinguished from certain other more or less kindred questions with which it has been at times unfortunately confounded.

(a.) From questions as to the historical character of the Old Testament books, or any parts of them, and as to the New Testament witness to such character. For the purposes of our inquiry it might or might not be that such character is the fact, or that the New Testament proves it. That is a question by itself, and not involved in

the present discussion. So far as it may be necessary to take any position in the matter, the historical character of such Old Testament writings as claim to be history is here assumed.

(*b.*) From questions as to the inspiration, authority and canonicity of the Old Testament books, and as to the New Testament witness to these characteristics. These matters are fully and entirely assumed, at the outset of the discussion, and cannot, therefore, be raised in the progress of it.

(*c.*) From questions as to the inspiration, authority and canonicity of the New Testament books, and as to the binding force of teachings uttered by our Lord Jesus Christ, or by inspired men, and contained in the New Testament books. These matters, also, are fully and entirely assumed at the outset, so that whatever, on thorough examination, shall prove to rest on the authority of our Lord, or of the Holy Spirit speaking in and through inspired men, is thereby and at once raised out of the sphere of this discussion.

(*d.*) From all questions as to the meaning, interpretation, application, etc., of the Old Testament passages which are cited in the New.

We have simply to ask: What kind and degree of evidence is furnished by the New Testament as to the authorship of Old Testament books? It is plain that one may conceive of the evidence as being either conclusive, or non-conclusive; and if the latter, then as either purely negative evidence, or as presumptive evidence. If it is presumptive evidence, then the question as to authorship is not settled thereby, but must be finally decided in view of other testimony. This paper does not occupy itself, however, as has been already said, with other testimony, and it concerns us only to notice that it is perfectly conceivable that testimony from other sources may be such as to confirm any presumptive evidence which the New Testament may furnish, or, on the other hand, such as to destroy the weight of the presumption, and prove the opposite.

It remains only to add, as a last preliminary remark, that in the examination of passages in detail, while the importance of distinguishing between the language of Christ and that of the inspired New Testament men may easily be exaggerated, there is still some advantage in treating them separately.

The question before us is essentially one of exegesis, and we shall be prepared, in a few moments, to inquire as to the meaning of particular passages. The fact, however, that the number of passages is so small, may be regarded as one among several indications that it was not a prime object of the New Testament speakers and writers,

or of the Holy Spirit, presiding over its composition, to teach the authorship of Old Testament books.*

Assistance has been derived, in making the above table, from Böhl's *Alltestamentliche Citate*, and Turpie's *Old Testament in the New*. The number of citations is difficult to fix with accuracy. It is believed that the table is approximately correct.

On the other hand, it is not to be wondered at, that, living as we do in the midst of a venerable tradition in regard to the authorship of Old Testament books, the citations under the names of particular persons which the New Testament makes from the Old should lead us, antecedently to all detailed examination, to the inference that the writers and speakers who thus cite regarded the persons named as the authors of the books in which the words cited stand. The chief condition to the validity of this inference is the absence of evidence to the contrary. For it must be clear that the natural deduction from New Testament language, in the absence of contrary evidence, does not necessarily determine the question as to the natural deduction *in the face* of such evidence.

These considerations to some extent balance each other, and we leave them for the present behind, in order to inquire into the New Testament facts.

* The following table will show how the case stands:

Book	is cited	Under Moses'	name,	o time.
Genesis	28 times.			
Exodus	“ “ 33 “	“ “	“	2 times.
Leviticus	“ “ 12 “	“ “	“	1 time.
Deuteronomy	“ “ 41 “	“ “	“	7 times.
1 and 2 Samuel	“ “ 3 (?)“	“ Samuel's	“	1 (?) ti'e.
1 Kings	“ “ 2 “	“ Author's	“	o “
Job	“ “ 1 time.	“ “	“	o “
Psalms	“ “ 68 times.	“ David's	“	10 times.
Proverbs	“ “ 6 “	“ Author's	“	o time.
Ecclesiastes	“ “ 1 time.	“ “	“	o “
Isaiah	“ “ 61 times.	“ Isaiah's	“	17 times.
Jeremiah	“ “ 7(?) “	“ Jeremiah's	“	2 “
Hosea	“ “ 6 “	“ Hosea's	“	1 time.
Joel	“ “ 2 “	“ Joel's	“	1 “
Amos	“ “ 2 “	“ Amos'	“	o “
Micah	“ “ 1 time.	“ Micah's	“	o “
Habbakuk	“ “ 4 times.	“ Habbakuk's	“	o “
Haggai	“ “ 1 time.	“ Haggai's	“	o “
Zechariah's	“ “ 6 times.	“ Zechariah's	“	o “
Malachi	“ “ 5 “	“ Malachi's	“	o “

The following books of the Old Testament are, by citation or otherwise, connected in the New Testament with the names of particular men: Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy (name of Moses), Samuel (?), Psalms (name of David), Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel. Of these, Jeremiah's name occurs in such a connection but twice; those of Samuel (if at all), Daniel, Hosea and Joel, only once each. It will be convenient to begin with this group, following the order of the names in our English Bibles.

SAMUEL. Acts iii. 24: "All the prophets from Samuel and them that followed after, as many as have spoken they also told of these days." No Messianic prophecy is attributed to Samuel in the Old Testament, and it has accordingly been doubted whether there is reference here to any word or writing connected with his name. It might mean "from the days of Samuel," so that the first of the prophets referred to must have lived at or about the time of Samuel. But the earliest recorded prophecy from near that time is Nathan's, (2 Sam. vii. 12-16), and, when that was uttered, Samuel had been many years dead, (1 Sam. xxv. 1). The reference cannot be to the prophecies of David in the Psalms, for in that case we can hardly doubt that David himself, and not Samuel, would have been named. Further, although it may be said that Samuel was the founder of the *order* of prophets, it does not need an investigation of this matter to convince us that the words as they stand, on their most natural interpretation, include Samuel among those who testified of the Messianic times. The expression is a peculiar one: *καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς οἱ ἐλάλησαν καὶ κατήγγειλαν τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας*. If the phrase *καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς* is to be taken literally, the whole expression means, "the prophets from Samuel and [from] those who followed [him]"; for "Samuel" and "those who followed him" are in the same construction. More than this, they form one group, for the preposition is not repeated. An interpretation must therefore be found which will suit them both. If *ἀπὸ* denotes simply a prior limit of the time within which *οἱ προφῆται* prophesied, then *οἱ καθεξῆς* are not represented as prophesying, any more than Samuel is. But *οἱ καθεξῆς* must certainly include Nathan and David. Nathan's prophecy (referred to above) is quite explicit, and David is repeatedly cited by Peter himself (who utters Acts iii. 24) as a prophet of the Messiah, so that it is utterly improbable that these should be ignored. But if *οἱ καθεξῆς* are regarded as prophesying, then there is no exegetical ground for excluding Samuel from the same category. We may compare Luke xxiv. 27: *ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ*

Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν,—where the construction of the genitives is the same, and where the preposition is repeated, as it is not in Acts iii. 24; in this case there can be no doubt that the use made of Moses is identical in kind with the use made of all the prophets.

And if we regard the phrase as an inexact one, in which two constructions are mingled: (1.) “All the prophets, from Samuel on, as many as spoke,” and (2.) “All the prophets, Samuel and the following, as many as spoke,”—still it is plain that (in 2) Samuel is included under the prophets who spoke, and the fact that such a mingling of the two constructions was possible, shows that Peter, or whoever is responsible for the precise form of the utterance as we have it, did not discriminate between “Samuel” and “the prophets,” or between “Samuel” and “those who followed,” in their respective functions.

It must be further observed *ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν* does not, on the most natural interpretation, *limit* the πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται, (so that, *e. g.*, Samuel might not be included), but rather emphasizes πάντες. For *ἐλάλησαν* must be taken in a general sense, to denote the utterance of prophecy, or perhaps, more exactly, of predictive prophecy. The meaning then is: “All the prophets—as many as exercised their prophetic functions in (predictive) utterance—told of these days.” If we attempt to limit the meaning of *ἐλάλησαν* to Messianic prediction, then a tautology results; and no one will maintain that *ἐλάλησαν* can be used in mere contrast with prophets who wrote, or prophets who were silent. Those, then, who “told of these days” are the same persons who “spoke,” and these are the same with “all the prophets,” including “Samuel and those who followed.” Doubtless the statement of the verse, thus understood, is hyperbolic, because there were some persons, *e. g.*, Elijah, Elisha, Nahum, and many besides, who were prophets, and who “spoke,” but who did not, so far as we are aware, “tell of these days.” But this does not warrant us in supposing that the one prophet whose name is expressly mentioned, is to be classed among those who are thus, in the use of hyperbole, ignored.

But if Samuel uttered no Messianic prophecy, and is yet included among those who did utter such prophecies, there is no reasonable explanation of this, except that he is so included because the book which goes by his name contains such a prophecy, and we should understand the reference to Samuel to be at bottom a reference to the words of Nathan, 2 Sam. vii. 12–16,—the one great Messianic proph-

ecy of the book. Now, just as little as Peter, on this interpretation, would intend to say that Samuel was the original speaker of the words which Nathan actually spoke, would he necessarily imply, or be understood to imply, that Samuel wrote the book which bears his name. For the object of using the name of Samuel would be to identify the prophecy. And whatever cause, independent of his actual authorship of it, might lead to the connection of Samuel's name with this book, that cause, or the resulting habit of so connecting book and name, would suffice to explain Peter's use of the name to designate the book. If, *e. g.*, it were commonly called "Book of Samuel," or "Samuel," because Samuel was a prominent figure in it, then Peter would not imply that Samuel wrote it, when he used this name for it. As a matter of fact, intelligent Bible-students, who now use the name do not mean by it "the book which Samuel wrote," but simply "the book which goes by Samuel's name." It is as a mere title that the term is employed, as in the case of "the Books of Kings" and other anonymous writings of the Old Testament. There cannot, therefore, be even a fair presumption in favor of the view that if Peter here refers, as he probably does, to the "Book of Samuel," under the name of "Samuel," he thereby implies that Samuel wrote the book to which he refers.

JEREMIAH. Matt. ii. 17 and xxvii. 9. The introductory formula is the same in each case: *Τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος.* It is true that there are some variant readings to Matt. xxvii. 9, but these, it is well known, are of insignificant authority. (See Westcott and Hort, *Notes on Select Readings*, p. 18.)

We are all familiar with the efforts of commentators to reconcile this undoubted reading with the equally indubitable fact that in the prophecies attributed to Jeremiah, in the Old Testament, no such passage occurs,—the citation is manifestly from Zech. xi. 12, 13. Such efforts are the attempts to show, *e. g.*, that Zechariah is simply repeating and enlarging prophecies of Jeremiah (xviii., xix.), (Hengstenberg); that Matthew cites from some lost writing of Jeremiah (so from Origen, various Comm.); or an orally transmitted prophecy uttered by Jeremiah (Calovius); or that Jeremiah headed the collection of prophets, and the whole collection was therefore called by his name (Lightfoot and others); or that a mistake in *writing* occurred when the Gospel was first issued (Morrison). The recognition of the baseless character of all these attempts leads Turpie to the thoroughly consistent (if not original) view, "that Jeremiah really

did write that portion of Zechariah's book whence the quotation is made," (*i. e.* chap. ix.-xi.). Now this involves, not only the dismembership of the book of Zechariah, but also one of two other things: *either* there was a genuine and trustworthy tradition connecting these prophecies with Jeremiah's name,—a tradition which has strangely vanished from all other testimony which we possess, and appears only in this incidental mention in Matthew,—in which case it is impossible to understand why these prophecies were not from an early time attributed to Jeremiah, and united with his other prophecies; *or* the true authorship was expressly revealed to Matthew, and to him alone, in which case there would be an apparently purposeless and useless breaking through of the general principle already noticed, namely, that questions of authorship were not prominent concerns of revelation;—purposeless and useless, unless it can be shown to be of great consequence to the bearing of the prophecy on the case to which it is applied, that it should have been from Jeremiah and no other. The hypothesis is thus not to be entertained unless we are prepared to deny the rights of exegetical science and the efficacy of exegetical methods in interpreting the Scriptures. And yet this appears to be the most nearly tenable view of all those that have been mentioned. For if the words τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος are of sufficient importance to occasion any difficulty, they must be taken in their real meaning, *i. e.*, "that which was spoken through Jeremiah the prophet, saying" (= "who said" or "when he said"). The views of Hengstenberg and Lightfoot do not satisfy these words; the view of Morrison would destroy all confidence in the New Testament text; and the views of Origen and Calovius are even less likely to be right than that which Turpie maintains, since it is easier to suppose that Jeremiah wrote Zech. ix.-xi. than to suppose that words which occur with such an approximate accuracy in Zech. xi. 12, 13 occurred also, and originally, in some otherwise unknown written or spoken utterance of Jeremiah. But the only reason for adopting either of these views is the supposed necessity of giving a literal force and binding authority to the words τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος. Before we decide that this supposed necessity is a sufficient reason for resorting to such frail explanations, it is well to remind ourselves that the case before us does not stand quite alone in the New Testament. Whether the reference to Isaiah, in Mark i. 2, is at all similar, need not now be decided; that passage will be considered in another connection. But there is a nearly parallel instance in the Epistle of Jude. Jude 14, 15, we read:

“And to these also Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying, Behold, the Lord came with ten thousands of his holy ones, [Gr. ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ], to execute judgment upon all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their works of ungodliness which they have ungodly wrought, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.” The introductory formula of quotation is here: Ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τοῦτοις ἑβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ Ἐνώχ λέγων, in which, although the divine origin of the prophecy is not brought out as it is in τὸ βῆθῆν διὰ Ἱερεμίου, the human authorship is even more distinctly asserted. The demand to either accept or explain away the statement as to Jeremiah involves, *à fortiori*, the same demand as to Enoch. But in the latter case none of the explanations attempted in the former case can by any means apply. One of the alternatives would here be still more violent. We should have to say that either Enoch, seventh from Adam, did actually utter this prophecy which Jude records, or Jude’s book is not authoritative, and ought to go out of the canon. Now the canonicity of Jude is firmly established, so that interpreters have been pressed toward the first alternative. But in fact we find the passage which Jude cites in the pseudepigraphical Book of Enoch I. 9. We append three translations of that original passage:

De Sacy.—(Cf. *Magasin Encyclopédique*, VI., i. 382), cited in Huther’s *Comm. on Jude*, 4th Germ. ed., 1877, Eng. trans., 1881: “Et venit cum myriadibus sanctorum, ut faciat iudicium super eos, et perdat impios et litigat cum omnibus carnalibus pro omnibus quae fecerunt et operati sunt contra eum peccatores et impii.”

Dillmann.—(Das Buch Henoch, 1853): “Und siehe er kommt mit Myriaden von Heiligen, um Gericht über sie zu halten, und wird die Gottlosen vermichten und rechten mit allem Fleisch über Alles, was die Sünder und die Gottlosen gagen ihn gethan und begangen haben.”

Schodde.—(Book of Enoch, 1882): “And behold he comes with myriads of the holy to pass judgment upon them, and will destroy the impious, and will call to account all flesh for everything the sinners and the impious have done and committed against him.”

Now, if these words, which are thus referred to a period antedating the Christian era by only a little, are cited by Jude, as they are, under the name of Enoch, and if the alternative forced upon us is, either to consider them an actual utterance of Enoch, the ancient patriarch, or to look upon Jude as an untruthful—and hence uncanonical—book, probably no sober scholar would hesitate to decide

in favor of the latter. But if we are not willing to accept this alternative, then we must be willing to take the position that the formula of quotation in Jude 14 does not oblige us to consider the patriarch Enoch the actual author of the words there quoted. But then neither does the formula of quotation in Matt. xxvii. 9 oblige us to consider the prophet Jeremiah the actual author of the words there quoted.*

Some may perhaps claim that while Jude quotes from the Book of Enoch, and gives it a certain authority, he yet writes in the full consciousness of the pseudonymic character of its title, and that his hearers are aware of this also, so that he is not mistaken in the matter, and they are not misled. To this it might be replied: (1.) Such a thing is indeed not inconceivable, and as one among several possibilities it might be allowed to stand; but as the only ground upon which a defence of Jude could be based, it is insufficient. There is no evidence in favor of it except the supposed necessity of having it true. And little as *we* can believe that the Book of Enoch contained prophecies 3,000 years older than itself, just as little can we affirm that men in the first Christian century, even if they knew of the comparatively recent origin of the book, were sure that it did *not* contain such prophecies. If Jude himself thought this might be the case, then his words express this opinion; if his readers thought so, then his words would confirm them in their belief. In the absence of testimony on this point, we cannot make the possibility of their greater enlightenment into the corner-stone of our own faith. (2.) The straightforwardness and the precise shape of the citation-formula are opposed to the view that the book cited was believed to be pseudepigraphical with no genuine contents. (3.) It is difficult to see on what ground Jude could regard the book as authoritative, and therefore fit to be cited, if he held it to be a pseudepigraph, of which no part was genuine, since it certainly was not regarded as one of the sacred, canonical books. (4.) That he did so, or even may have done so, ought least of all to be claimed by those who are strenuous

* The composition and date of the Book of Enoch present questions too complicated, and requiring too elaborate discussion, for an examination here. It is sufficient for our purposes to say that the book seems to be a Jewish work, put together from several distinct documents of the second and first centuries B. C., with some Christian interpolations. The absence of any allusion to the menacing armies of Rome indicates that the latest portions cannot be put far down in the first century A. D.

for the conclusiveness of New Testament statements as to the authorship of Old Testament books, for the same arguments can be used upon the other side, under far more favorable conditions, as we shall presently see.

It would therefore be unsafe to rest any important interest upon the possibility of such a distinction between the use of the citation-formulas in Jude 14 and Matt. xxvii. 9, as that just suggested. Another distinction is of more consequence, but it bears in the opposite direction. If, as is altogether probable, Jude supposes himself to be citing words of Enoch, we should have to regard him as holding a wrong opinion. But if that may be, then much more may it be that the Evangelist, by a momentary oversight, attributed to Jeremiah words which, as a little reflection or reading would have shown him, belonged to Zechariah.

The result of the foregoing considerations should be to convince us that we need not hesitate to follow Augustine and Calvin, and the great body of candid, thorough modern commentators (De Wette, Meyer, Alford, Weiss, Keil, Plumptre, C. H. H. Wright (Comm. on Zechariah, p. 336), etc., etc.), in holding that there is here a slight error in the gospel, on a point which in no respect, even the most distant, affects the important teachings to be conveyed.

Now the introductory formula is just the same in Matt. ii. 17 as in Matt. xxvii. 9. It follows therefore: that if there were important evidence from other sources, tending to show that the words cited in the former passage were not spoken or written by Jeremiah, the presence of the formula of quotation would not oblige us to hold that they were. We find the words, in fact, in Jer. xxxi. 15, and there is no reason to believe that they are not genuine words of Jeremiah. If there were such a reason, however, the presence of the citation formula in Matt. ii. 17 would not destroy its force, for the general nature of the conclusion already reached as to the non-decisive character of the formula is as little affected by the presence or absence of positive evidence from other sources, as it is by the possible necessity of modifying our view as to the nature of the inaccuracy, in order to make it apply to both cases.*

DANIEL. Matt. xxiv. 15. τὸ ρηθῆν διὰ Δαυὶδ τοῦ προφήτου, followed by words which occur in Dan. xi. 31, xii. 11, cf. ix. 27. A

*It is evident that if, in two (or more) instances, a writer wrongly attributed a citation to Jeremiah, his inaccuracy could hardly be attributed to a momentary oversight. The parallel would then be Jude's citation from Enoch.

new element is introduced in this passage, if the words of citation are really an utterance of Christ himself.* Now, the assumption that Jesus might have been here in error would not satisfy those who argue most strenuously for the authenticity of Old Testament books on the ground of New Testament statements, nor ought it to satisfy them. For while we have indications in more than one place that Jesus did not know all things at all times (Ma. v. 30-32; xiii. 32, cf. Matt. xxiv. 36, etc.), still, we do not find him affirming that which he does not know, and we may confidently say—slightly modifying a fine remark of Rothe's (*Zur Dogmatik*. 2te Aufl. 1869, p. 175), "that Jesus never extended the sphere of his desire to know, and his belief that he knew, beyond the limits of what was actually known by him." But the question still remains, whether Jesus does here commit himself to the authorship of the book of Daniel by a prophet of that name. It will be remembered that the passage cited in Matt. xxiv. 15 is from the second division of the book, a division which, with the exception of certain brief introductory notes, contains prophecies exclusively, and that this division is distinctly marked off from the preceding by the nature of its contents, and by the brief introduction, Dan. vii. 1. Now suppose evidence were to be presented from other quarters to show that while the book as a whole was not written by Daniel, the last six chapters contained prophecies of Daniel, which the later author had incorporated in his book. On that supposition, the words of Jesus, taken in their most rigid, literal meaning, would be perfectly satisfied.

We may go yet further. If other evidence should be adduced, tending to show that "Daniel, the prophet" was a pseudonym, still, there would be nothing in Jesus' use of the expression to commit him to any other view. For the words were certainly written, and written in the form of a prophecy, and were a prophecy, and the book containing them was an inspired, canonical, and authoritative book; the citation was therefore suitable and forcible, for Jesus' purposes, whoever the author may have been, and the use of a current pseudonym to designate the author no more committed Jesus to a

*It is very possible that these words, which are lacking in the parallel Ma. xiii. 14, are inserted here by the evangelist. (See, particularly, Weiss, *Matthäusevangelium*, 1876, p. 508.) In that case the formula would be susceptible of the same treatment as the foregoing, in the event of the disproof, on the ground of other evidence, of Daniel's authorship. But it will be more satisfactory to treat it here as if it were certainly uttered by Jesus.

declaration that that was the author's real name, than our use of the expression "Junius says" would commit us to a declaration that the "Letters of Junius" were composed by a person of that name; or than, on the supposition already discussed, that "Enoch" was regarded as a pseudonym, Jude 14 would indicate the belief of the author that Enoch himself actually uttered the words which he quotes.*

But it may be replied that the opinion held by the people of Jesus' time must be taken into account. That opinion must have been either contended or contradicted by him. Now the prevailing belief of the time was that Daniel was the author of the book which bears his name. Jesus did not contradict this belief; he thereby countenanced and lent his authority to it. In reply, it may be observed: (1.) In the absence of precise knowledge as to the belief of the time in regard to the authorship of the Book of Daniel, it is rash to affirm that those to whom Jesus spoke (it was, be it remembered, his disciples, who "came unto him privately," Matt. xxiv. 3), believed that Daniel was its author. The assertion is not sufficiently established to serve as the foundation for an argument. (2.) But even if it were shown to be true, it is an unwarranted inference that would commit Jesus to this belief. For we cannot venture to condition Jesus' own understanding of the words he employed, by the understanding of limited, prejudiced, ignorant hearers. If, however, we attempt to do so, we must be thoroughgoing. We must blot out John ii. 19, because Jesus speaks of destroying the temple, meaning thereby his body (ver. 21), while the Jews understand it of the temple of Herod. We must blot out Mark v. 39, and John xi. 11, because Jesus speaks of persons as sleeping, when they are really dead, and his words are literally understood, occasioning scornful laughter in one case, and relief in the other. We must expunge most of John viii. We must consent to lose all those parables of Jesus whose

* To assume that "Enoch" is used in Jude 14 as a pseudonym, affords a ground for assuming that "Daniel" may be so used, (if evidence from other quarters is adverse to his real authorship of the book which goes by his name), in Matt. xxiv. 15. But the fact that *Daniel* is a canonical and *Enoch* an uncanonical book, far from making it more difficult to suppose that the former is pseudonymic, makes it easier. For *Daniel* is canonical and authoritative because it is inspired,—whether Daniel wrote it or not,—while *Enoch*, being uncanonical, and lacking strong internal marks of inspiration, must have been considerably dependent for its authority upon the personal weight of its author.

moral lesson was not understood by the hearers. If Jesus, in these deeply significant utterances, exposed himself to utter misapprehension, and was in fact utterly misapprehended, and we take no offense, then there is no reason for seeing in the passage before us any violation of the law of truth, even if the words which Jesus employed to introduce the prophecy were understood by the listeners in a different sense from that in which he understood them. Indeed, there is far less reason in this case than in the others; for the subject of misunderstanding was of unspeakably less consequence,—the inspiration and authority of the citation being secure,—than the profound spiritual teachings referred to above.

We may go farther yet. Let us suppose that the belief of his hearers was to the effect that Daniel wrote the book which bears his name, and that this belief was wrong, and that Jesus knew it was wrong. If he had combatted deeply rooted opinion on this point, it might easily have raised a violent opposition, which would have embarrassed and perhaps thwarted him in his work, and would certainly have diverted thought from the main truths which he was concerned to teach. His work itself obliged him to combat deeply rooted opinions at many points; all the less was he called upon to arouse antagonism in regard to non-essentials. Certain cases of acquiescence in popular belief must indeed be regarded as countenancing that belief. We say, and say rightly, that Jesus could not have acquiesced in the belief about demoniacal possessions, unless that belief were well founded; otherwise his treatment of demoniacs was charlatanry, and his teaching in connection with such treatment was deceptive. But the reference to Daniel does not in the least give peculiar support to the teachings connected with this reference, as long as we admit that a book may be inspired and authoritative, even if its author be unknown; and this we cannot deny without casting a goodly number of Old Testament books out of the canon. Since, therefore, there was no important issue connected with the matter before us, we shall hardly dare to hedge Jesus about with a restriction not set by an imperative moral judgment.

The conclusion is, that if other arguments should make it probable that Daniel was not the real author of the book bearing his name, or of the latter section of it, and even allowing that the words "through Daniel the prophet" are words of Jesus, Jesus is not thereby committed to an opposition to such other arguments.

HOSEA.—Rom. ix. 25, where the introductory words, ἐν τῷ ᾠσηᾷ λέγει, are followed by a citation from Hos. ii. 23, i. 10. God is represented as speaking “in Hosea” (not διὰ τοῦ ᾠσηᾷ), *i. e.*, in all probability, in the book known as “Hosea,” just as we have “in David” (Heb. iv. 7), and “Moses is read” (Acts xv. 21, 2 Cor. iii. 15). The name is nothing but the title or designation of the book, by which it is, or may be, commonly known. From this there is no necessary inference as to the writer’s position about the authorship of the book. (Cf. what said on this subject under SAMUEL.)

JOEL.—Acts ii. 16: τοῦτό ἐστιν τῷ εἰρημίζον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ, followed by a citation from Joel ii. 28–32, (Heb., LXX., iii. 1–5). The case is here similar to that of “Jeremiah” in Matt. ii. 17. Here, as there, we shall have to say, in view of considerations already advanced, that while, as a matter of fact, there is no reason for doubting that these words were uttered by Joel, yet, if there were, the citation formula of Acts ii. 16 could not decide the matter in the face of such reason.

We pass to consider those New Testament passages which connect citations from the Old Testament with the names of David, Isaiah, and Moses.

DAVID.—The following passages fall into the same category with those which cite Jeremiah and Joel, (see above):*

Acts i. 16. διὰ στόματος Δαυεὶδ, followed in v. 20 by citations from Ps. lxix. 26, cix. 8.

Acts iv. 25. διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυεὶδ, followed by a citation from Ps. ii. 1, ff.

Rom. iv. 6. Δαυεὶδ λέγει, with citation from Ps. xxxii. 1, ff.

Rom. xi. 9. Δαυεὶδ λέγει, with citation from Ps. lxix. 23.

The following resembles the citation from Hosea, given above: Heb. iv. 7: ἐν Δαυεὶδ λέγων, with citation from Ps. xcv. 8.

Somewhat different is Acts ii. 25: Δαυεὶδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν, with citation from Ps. xvi. 8–11; here, v. 29 seems to make the person of David important, and to throw emphasis upon his authorship of the words cited. So also:

Acts ii. 34: λέγει δὲ αὐτός, with citation from Ps. cx. 1, where the preceding words, οὐ γὰρ Δαυεὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, make David’s person important to the argument.

* See, also, foot-note to p. 106.

Peter seems to be thus committed to the Davidic authorship of the Psalms which he here quotes,—Ps. xvi, and cx.

There is some likeness between the cases just noted and the single citation which Jesus connects with David's name. It is from Ps. cx. 1, and is recorded by all the Synoptists:

Matt. xxii. 43. *πῶς οὖν Δ. ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, λέγων,*
etc.

Ver. 45. *εἰ οὖν Δ. καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον,* etc.

Mark xii. 36. *αὐτὸς Δ. εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ,* etc.

Ver. 37. *αὐτὸς Δ. λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον,* etc.

Luke xx. 42. *αὐτὸς γὰρ Δ. λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ Ψαλμῶν,* etc.

Ver. 44. *Δ. οὖν αὐτὸν κύριον καλεῖ,* etc.

In these passages the argument turns upon the assumption that David, and none other, uttered the words cited, so that, by a literal and rigid interpretation we should reach the conclusion that Jesus countenanced the Davidic authorship of Ps. cx. The question, however, has been raised more than once, and is a fair one, whether Jesus may not here have been employing the belief of his opponents for the purpose of convicting them of an imperfect understanding of their own sacred books, or an imperfect conception of the Messiah. If so, then there is here no commitment of Jesus to the Davidic authorship of Ps. cx.; and while the same argument cannot be used in regard to Acts ii. 34, the number of passages which authoritatively connect David's name with Ps. cx. would be reduced from four to one.

ISAIAH. The following passages fall into the same category with those which cite Jeremiah and Joel:*

Matt. iii. 3. *διὰ Ἑσαίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος,* with citation from Is. xl. 3.

Matt. iv. 14. *id.,* with citation from Is. ix. 1 ff.

Matt. viii. 17. *id.,* with citation from Is. liii. 4.

Matt. xii. 17. *id.,* with citation from Is. xlii. 1-4.

Luke iii. 4. *ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων Ἑσαίου τοῦ προφήτου,* with citation from Is. xl. 3-5.

Luke iv. 17. *βίβλιον τοῦ προφήτου Ἑσαίου.* with citation from Is. lxi. 1 ff. This and the preceding seem to belong here rather than in the category of "Hosea" (see above).

John i. 23. *καθὼς εἶπεν Ἑσαίας ὁ προφήτης,* with citation from Is. xliii. 3.

*See also foot note to page 106.

John xii. 38. *Ἰνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῆ* ὃν εἶπεν, with citation from Is. liii. 1.

John xii. 39, 41. *εἶπεν Ἡσαίας*, with citation from Is. vi. 9 ff.

Acts viii. 28, 30. *ἀνεγίνωσκεν τὸν προφήτην Ἡσαίαν*, with citation from Is. liii. 7. This probably belongs here, rather than with "Hosea" (see above).

Acts xxviii. 25. *διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου*, with citation from Is. vi. 9 ff.

Rom. ix. 27. *Ἡσαίας δὲ χρᾶζει*, with citation from Is. x. 22 ff.

Rom. ix. 29. *προεῖρηκεν Ἡσαίας*, with citation from Is. i. 9.

Rom. x. 16. *Ἡσαίας γὰρ λέγει*, with citation from Is. liii. 1.

Rom. x. 20. *Ἡσαίας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει*, with citation from Is. lxv. 1 ff.

Rom. xv. 12. *Ἡσαίας λέγει*, with citation from Is. xi. 10.

The following are utterances of Jesus, and belong to the same category with the passage which cites Daniel (see above):

Matt. xiii. 14.* *ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαίου ἣ λέγουσα*, with citation from Is. vi. 9 ff.

Matt. xv. 7. *ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἡσαίας λέγων*, with citation from Is. xxix. 13.

Mark vii. 6. *ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἡσαίας . . . ὡς γέγραπται ὅτι*, followed by a citation from Is. xxix. 13.

Thus far, there is nothing which determines the question for us, whether Isaiah was the author of the book which bears his name, or of this or that portion of it.

But a passage yet to be examined, not only fails to reverse this decision, but strengthens the argument upon which it is in large part based.

This passage is Mark i. 2: *γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ*, followed *first*, by a citation from Mal. iii. 1, and then by a citation from Is. xl. 3. If the citation from Malachi were not present, the clause would offer no difficulty, but might be classed, either with "Jeremiah" and "Joel" or with "Hosea." But as the text stands, —and there is no sufficient reason for questioning it, †—the author apparently cites words of Malachi as words of Isaiah. There are

*It is quite likely, however, that the parallel, Mark iv. 12, where no prophet is named, reports Jesus' words more accurately. (See, especially, Weiss, *Marcusevangelium*, p. 145, and *Matthäusevangelium*, p. 341). In that case *Ἡσαίου* belongs here to the Evangelist, and the passage falls into the category of Jeremiah and Joel.

† ⚡ BDL Vulg. Orig. and all critical edd.

three classes of attempts to explain this difficulty away. One seeks to do so by dwelling on the appropriateness of including the whole range of prophecy, "from Isaiah to Malachi," in the prediction about Christ's Forerunner. But surely that is a design which would need to be expressed with some clearness, if it were to accomplish its result. Another tries to account for the insertion of the citation from Malachi on the ground that it prepared the way for the right understanding of the passage from Isaiah. But Isaiah's prophecy is more concrete and intelligible in its application to John, than the other. Neither does a commentary generally precede the text it is designed to explain. This cannot be the relation of the two cited passages. Another tries a mechanical explanation; Turpie (p. 52) gives a crude form of this: "ἐν τῷ Ἑσάτῳ τῶν προφητῶν would thus be *the name of the book* from which Mark quotes, which might contain more writings than Isaiah's only. Now, may we not suppose, then, that Isaiah's name was given to a division of the sacred writings, because his name was placed first in it, or for some other reason, and that Mark consequently described the division by its usual well-known name?" We might refute Turpie by Turpie, for he says elsewhere (p. 158), that "the four last books of the Pentateuch were named 'the book of Moses,' not because they tell the story of his life [or 'for some other reason?'] but because he wrote them." But we may be permitted, further, to wonder what has become of all the (doubtless) abundant testimony which must, on Turpie's theory, have once been extant, to the effect that of "a division of the sacred writings" which contained Isaiah and Malachi, Isaiah was the "usual and well-known name?" So every supposition as to a possible explanation from the heading of the MSS. of the Minor Prophets is devoid of proof. The substitution of *ישעיה* for *הושע*, or *ἩΣΑΙΑΣ* for *ΩΣΗΕ* needs some evidence if it is to be accepted.

Neither is it possible to ignore the difficulty altogether. If Mark had been, as he wrote, conscious of the fact that Isaiah was not the author of the first citation, he could not have expressed himself as if Isaiah were the author. No Englishman or American with a clear remembrance of what were Shakespeare's words and what Milton's, could write:

"As Milton says:

" 'Mark you this, Bassanio,——

The devil can quote Scripture for his purpose.'"

" 'But all was false and hollow, though his tongue

Dropped manna; and could make the worse appear

The better reason, to perplex and dash
 Maturest counsels.'—(Parad. Lost, ii. 112, ff.)

We conclude that the citation-formula is here not an authoritative guide to the real authorship of the words which immediately follow, and it is thus all the more evident that the argument in the case of "Jeremiah" was correct, and that there is no conclusive evidence from the New Testament as to the authorship of the book which bears Isaiah's name.*

We have now, in the last place, to turn our attention to the Pentateuch. The name of MOSES occurs some eighty times in the New Testament, but the number of passages to be considered does not exactly coincide with this, since the name of Moses is sometimes repeated in the same immediate connection. We have fifty-eight New Testament passages to examine, and these may be classified as follows, using the words of the Revised Version for convenience sake, on account of the length of some of the citations:

(1.)—WORDS OF JESUS.

(a.) Referring to acts of Moses:

1. John iii. 14. As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness.
2. John vi. 32. It was not Moses that gave you the bread out of heaven.

(b.) Referring to Moses as lawgiver, in general:

1. Matt. xxiii. 2. The scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat.

* The question as to how the mistake occurred need not here be elaborately discussed. Meyer attributes it to an error of memory on Mark's part, resulting from the similarity in contents of the two passages, their frequent employment in the same connection, and the more prominent place and richer contents of Isaiah's prophecies. If Mark wrote on the basis of earlier documents, then we might suppose that Matthew, who gives the two citations in different places (Is. xl. 3, attributed to Isaiah, Matt. iii. 3, and Mal. iii. 1, attributed to no one, Matt. xi. 10), shows us their original connection, and that Mark, who does not elsewhere cite Old Testament prophecies, has combined them. It would then be intelligible, that in writing, where there is always the possibility of a more or less mechanical error, when the words of older documents are combined, both citations should be attributed to the famous prophet, to whom the second was attributed by Matthew, and presumably in the document which Mark had before him.

2. John vii. 19. Did not Moses give you the law?
Or as giver of particular laws:
3. Matt. viii. 4. Offer the gift that Moses commanded.
(Law for purification of leper, Lev. xiv.)
4. Mark i. 44. *Id.*
5. Luke v. 14. *Id.*
6. Matt. xix. 8. Moses . . . suffered you to put away
your wives. (Ref. to Deut. xxiv., iff.)
7. Mark vii. 10. Moses said, Honor thy father and thy
mother. (Ref. to Ex. xx. 12, or Deut. v. 16.)
8. John vii. 22, 23. For this cause hath Moses given you
circumcision (not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers).
. . . If a man receives circumcision on the Sabbath,
that the law of Moses may not be broken. (Ref. to
Levit. xii. 3.)

(c.) Speaking of the Book of Moses, Law of Moses, or "Moses"
(=Book of Moses):

1. Mark xii. 26. Have ye not read in the book of Moses,
in *the place concerning* the Bush? (Ref. to Ex. iii. 6.)
2. Luke xvi. 29, 31. Moses and the prophets.
3. Luke xxiv. 44. All things . . . which are written in
the law of Moses.

(d.) Citing words on the (oral or written) authority of Moses:

1. Mark x. 3, 5. What did Moses command you? . . .
For your hardness of heart he wrote you this command-
ment. (Parallel with Matt. xix. 8.)
2. Luke xx. 37. Moses shewed, in *the place concerning* the
Bush, when he calleth the Lord God the God of Abra-
ham. (Parallel with Mark xii. 26.)
3. John v. 45-47. There is one that accuseth you, *even*
Moses, on whom ye have set your hope. For if ye be-
lieved Moses ye would believe me; for he wrote of me.
But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe
my words?

Here are sixteen passages. The two under (a.) have no bearing on our question. Neither have the eight under (b.). For to say that Moses gave the law, or certain laws, is not to say that he himself wrote down the law, or these laws, still less that he wrote the Pentateuch, which contains the laws and much besides. The three passages under (c.) are inconclusive for the same reason that "Hosea"

(Rom. ix. 25) is inconclusive as to the authorship of the Old Testament book which goes by the name of that prophet. (See above, under HOSEA.) Under (*d.*), Mark x. 3, 5 is satisfied by the supposition that Moses wrote what Deut. xxxi. 9 (cf. v. 24) says he wrote; but this is not even equivalent to the whole book of Deuteronomy, still less to the whole Pentateuch. Luke xx. 37 need not express anything more than that Moses was authority for the account of the scene at the Bush, without involving his authorship of the book or document containing the account, still less of the Pentateuch as a whole.* In John v. 45-47, we find mention of Moses as having written, and of writings of Moses, familiar, as such, to the Jews. These writings are considered under the aspect of prophecy concerning Christ. Now whether we regard the expressions, "he wrote of me," and "his writings," as referring to a single prophecy contained in the writings, or to several single prophecies, or to the whole prophetic tenor or the writings, the passage does not teach the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. If it were highly probable, on other grounds, that Moses wrote Genesis, and nothing more, we could not from this passage prove that he wrote anything more, except by denying the Messianic character of Gen. iii. 15, or xii. 3. If it were highly probable, on other grounds, that Moses wrote Deuteronomy and nothing more, we could not from this passage prove that he wrote anything more, except by denying the Messianic character of Deut. xviii. 15-19. If it were highly probable, on other grounds, that Moses wrote only some part of the middle books of the Pentateuch, our passage would not stand in the way, unless the part so attributed to him should contain nothing which could be regarded as prophecy, whether direct or typical, of the Messiah.

The language of Jesus is therefore inconclusive.

(2).—WORDS OF INSPIRED MEN.

- (a.) Referring to acts of Moses, or Moses as a historical character:
1. Matt. xvii. 3, 4. Transfiguration.
 2. Mark ix. 4, 5. *Id.*
 3. Luke ix. 30, 33. *Id.*
 4. Rom. v. 14. †Death reigned from Adam until Moses.

*Neither ought the probability to be overlooked, that Mark has given the more accurate form of Jesus' words. (See Weiss, *Marcusevangelium*, p. 399.)

† This passage might possibly fall under (*b.*).

5. Rom. ix. 15. For he saith to Moses. (Ref. to Ex. xxxiii. 19.)
6. 1 Cor. x. 2. Baptized unto Moses.
7. 2 Cor. iii. 7, 13. Could not look steadfastly upon the face of Moses. . . . And are not as Moses, *who* put a veil upon his face. (Ref. to Ex. xxxiv. 29, ff.)
8. 2 Tim. iii. 8. As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses.
9. Heb. iii. 2-5. Faithful . . . as also was Moses . . . Worthy of more glory than Moses. . . . And Moses indeed was faithful.
10. Heb. iii. 16. They that came out of Egypt by Moses.
11. Heb. viii. 5. Moses is warned of God. (Ref. to Ex. xxv. 40, and xxvi. 30.)
12. Heb. xi. 23-28. By faith Moses, when he was born, etc. (Ref. to Ex. ii. 2, 11 ff.; xii. 21, etc.)
13. Heb. xii. 21. Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake.
14. Jude 9. Disputed about the body of Moses.

Some of these passages are difficult to explain, historically, (*e. g.*, 2 Tim. iii. 8; Heb. xii. 21; Jude 9), but it is not at all difficult to see that they have no bearing on the authorship of the Pentateuch.

(*b.*) Referring to Moses as lawgiver:

1. Luke ii. 22. Purification according to the law of Moses. (Ref. to Levit. xii. 2.)
2. John i. 17. The law was given by Moses.
3. Acts xiii. 39. Could not be justified by the law of Moses.
4. Acts xxi. 21.* Thou teachest all the Jews . . . to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.
5. Heb. vii. 14. Judah, as to which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests.
6. Heb. x. 28. A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth. (Ref. to Deut. xvii. 2-7.)
7. Heb. ix. 19, 20.† When every commandment had been spoken by Moses unto all the people according to the law, he took the blood of the calves and the goats, . . . saying, This is the blood of the covenant, etc.

(*c.*) Referring to the Law of Moses, and "Moses" (=Book of Moses):

1. Luke xxiv. 27. Beginning from Moses and all the prophets.
2. Acts xv. 21. Moses . . . hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues.

* We do not raise the question whether this utterance should be regarded as inspired.

† Ver. 19b might be classed under (*a.*), and ver. 20.

3. Acts xxviii. 23. Persuading them concerning Jesus, both from the law of Moses, etc.
4. 1 Cor. ix. 9. It is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox, etc. (Ref. to Deut. xxv. 4.)
5. 2 Cor. iii. 15. Whensoever Moses is read.

The seven passages under (*b.*), and the five under (*c.*) are thus all inconclusive. (See above.)

(*d.*) Citing words on the (oral or written) authority of Moses:

1. Acts iii. 22, 23. Moses indeed said. (Ref. to Deut. xviii. 15, ff.)
2. Acts vii. 37. This is that Moses which said. (*Id.*)
3. Acts xxvi. 22. What the prophets and Moses did say should come.
4. Rom. x. 5. Moses writeth that the man that doeth the righteousness. (Ref. to Levit. xviii. 5.)
5. Rom. x. 19. Moses saith. (Ref. to Deut. xxxii. 21.)

1, 2 and 5 under (*d.*) affirm that Moses said what Deuteronomy says he said; 3 belongs with John v. 45-47, (see above); 4 may be classed with the citations from Jeremiah and Joel, already discussed, or *may* refer to some document or portion of the Pentateuch.

(*e.*) Coming under none of the previous heads is Rev. xv. 3. They sing the song of Moses,—*i. e.*, a *new* song, of which Moses is author, or joint-author.

The thirty-two passages thus considered are all inconclusive.

But it may be said that the current belief of the time was that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Jesus and his apostles used words *susceptible* of that interpretation, and must have been understood as countenancing that view. But this they could not have permitted, if the view was wrong.

The reply, as in the case of Daniel (see above), is twofold:

First. It is by no means absolutely certain that the current belief of the time, in Palestine, made Moses the author of the Pentateuch. The Pentateuch itself certainly makes no direct assertion of this,* neither is there anything, from Joshua to Malachi, which tends to show that Moses wrote anything more than the Pentateuch says he wrote.† The case is the same with the Apocryphal Books of the Old

* The passages in which it is said or clearly implied that Moses wrote something are these Ex. xvii. 14, xxiv. 4, xxxiv. 27, 28; Num. xxxiii. 2; Deut. xxxi. 9, 19, 22, 24.

† There are references in plenty to Moses as lawgiver, to the "Law of Moses," "Book of the Law of Moses," and "Book of Moses," but we have already seen how entirely inconclusive these expressions are as to the authorship of the Pentateuch.

Testament. Down to the very time of Christ there is no evidence that the Jews believed Moses to have written the Pentateuch as a whole. The view comes first to light with Philo and Josephus, in the first Christian century.* But Philo does not stand in the line of *Palestinian* tradition, and it may be doubted whether Josephus does. At all events, it is difficult to understand how, if the Palestinian Jews believed that Moses gave the Pentateuch the literary form which it had in their time, the Palestinian author of IV. Ezra (xiv. 9 ff.) could—also in the first century—represent Ezra as putting the Pentateuch, by his restoration of it, into the literary form in which the author and his contemporaries knew it,—without a single mention of Moses, or allusion to him as the original author. The often-cited passage of the Bababathrâ; 14^b, where Moses is said to have written “his book” (=Pentateuch), except the last eight verses,—differing in this important exception from Philo and Josephus—is too late to determine the question as to the belief of Christ’s time.†

In the New Testament itself there are twelve passages in which the name of Moses is employed by uninspired persons:

(a.) Moses as lawgiver:

1. Matt. xix. 5. Why did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement? (Ref. to Deut. xxiv. 1.)
1. Matt. xxii. 24. Moses said, If a man die, etc. (Ref. to Deut. xxv. 5.)
3. Mark x. 4.=Matt. xix. 5.
4. John [viii. 5]. In the law, Moses commanded us to stone such. (Ref. to Levit. xx. 10.)
5. Acts vi. 1. Change the customs which Moses delivered unto us.
6. Acts xv. 1. Be circumcised after the custom of Moses. (Ref. to Levit. xii. 3, etc.)
7. Acts xv. 5. Keep the law of Moses.

(b.) Moses as object of personal veneration:

1. John ix. 28, 29. We are disciples of Moses . . . we know that God hath spoken unto Moses.
2. Acts vi. 11. Blasphemous words against Moses.

(c.) Moses as a writer:

*E. g., Philo, *Vita Mos.* ii. 8, iii. 39, etc. Josephus *Pref. Antiq.*; *Antiq.* i. 1, 1; iv. 8, 48; xvii. 6, 3; *Cont. Ap.* i. 8, etc.

† For a fuller discussion of these points, see an article, “The New Testament and the Pentateuch, IV.”, in the *Independent*, Mar. 29, 1883, where also some other kindred matters are treated.

1. Mark xii. 19. Moses wrote unto us (Ref. to Deut. xxv. 5, and for the writing, cf. Deut. xxxi. 9, 24.)
2. Luke xx. 28. *Id.*
3. John i. 45. Him, of whom Moses in the law . . . did write. (Similar to John v. 45-47, *q. v.*)

Not only do not these twelve passages prove the popular belief in Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch as a whole, but the omission of Moses' name in every one of the twenty-three instances where Genesis is cited in the New Testament,—particularly with the citation of Gen. ii. 24, in Matt. xix. 4 ff., (notice, on the other hand, the emphatic position of "Moses" in ver. 7,—*τί οὖν Μωυσῆς ἐνετείλατο*), and Mark x. 6,—suggests the inquiry whether he can be thought to have written that book.*

It may be freely admitted that the foregoing considerations do not *disprove* the existence in Palestine, at Christ's time, of a belief in Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch;† they do, however, show that this belief is not so fully and clearly demonstrated as is commonly assumed, and that there are some difficulties in the way of supposing it to have existed, and in favor of different traditions on the subject.

But, *secondly*, even if it did exist, and the people to whom Christ and his inspired followers spoke understood their language in that sense, the question is not thereby determined. It must be remembered that the opinion of Philo and Josephus—which alone can be supposed to represent the opinion of contemporary Palestine,—included the Mosaic authorship of Deut. xxxiv. 5-12. If Jesus and the inspired men, then, by their language, authorized any such view, it must have been precisely this view. Those, therefore, who are not willing to attribute these eight verses to Moses, cannot claim that the authorship of the Pentateuch is settled by the popular belief of Christ's time. But it must be remembered, also, that we have no right to demand of revealed truth, whether delivered by Jesus or through his followers, that it shall set right all the false opinions of the men to whom it comes, when these do not affect the substance or the sanctions of the revelation. It is never, in a single instance, of consequence to the purposes of their teaching, that when Jesus and his

* See *Independent*, Mar. 29, 1883.

† If Rom. x. 5 falls into the category of the passages which cite Jeremiah (cf. Enoch) and Joel, then it would tend to prove that Paul had this belief. Luke xx. 37 would *perhaps* come under the same head, if it is the Evangelist who, by the form of his sentence, connects Moses so closely with Ex. iii. 6.

followers speak of Moses, they should be understood as saying or implying that he wrote the Pentateuch. They make great use of his authority as lawgiver and prophet, but that is unimpaired, if the Pentateuch *contains* his laws and prophecy,—whether he, or somebody centuries later, put the Pentateuch into its present form. In other cases we never think of criticizing men who quote, as an author's words, what he really did say, and what those whom they address believe him to have said, merely because the audience holds the mistaken belief that he said certain other things which have no necessary bearing on the matter in hand. There is no reason why we should apply any other standard to Jesus and his followers. If they could let the wrong physics and astronomy of their time pass unquestioned, then there was no obligation on them to correct the popular belief about the authorship of the Pentateuch, if that, too, was incorrect. (See further under DANIEL.)

The case in regard to Moses, and the authorship of the Pentateuch, is, then, as follows:

(1.) Words of Jesus,	-	-	-	-	16 passages, inconclusive.
(2.) Words of inspired men,	-	-	-	-	32 passages, inconclusive.
(3.) Words of uninspired men,	-	-	-	-	12 passages, inconclusive.
					60 passages, inconclusive.
Counted twice,	-	-	-	-	2
Total,	-	-	-	-	58

From these passages we may deduce:

That Moses was a great lawgiver;

That, in particular, he ordained the Sabbath-law, uttered the fifth commandment, prescribed circumcision, a purification-offering for a cleansed leper, and the brother's marriage of his deceased brother's wife; that he allowed divorce, under certain conditions; and that he wrote of Christ. Further than this, the New Testament does not allow us to go. His laws and his writings may have been preserved in separate documents, written by different hands. They may have been edited, combined with other documents of various authorship and date, and our Pentateuch have been so constituted, generations or centuries after Moses' time. When, or by whom, the Pentateuch was put into the form in which we have it, is not determined by the words of Christ.

The following summary will conclude this paper:

The Old Testament Books number	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39
Not cited in the New Testament,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
									<hr/>
Cited in the New Testament,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26
Cited with no mention of a person's name,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
									<hr/>
Cited in connection with a person's name,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10

These ten are Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Samuel (?), Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel. In connection with the persons mentioned with the citations from these books, we have examined all the passages which concerned our subject:

Samuel,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Daniel,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Hosea,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Joel,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Jeremiah,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
David,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
Isaiah,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20
Moses,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58

Except in the case of Ps. xvi. and cx., which the argument of the context where they are cited necessarily assigns to David, and except in the case of certain parts of the Pentateuch, which the Pentateuch and the New Testament alike assign to Moses, the questions of authorship which arise in studying the Old Testament receive no conclusive answer from the New.