

as an example of humility, grace which blends faith and surrender.

The angel (who came down to earth
 With tidings of the peace so many years
 Wept for in vain, that oped the heavenly gates
 From their long interdict) before us seemed,
 In the sweet act, so sculptured to the life,
 He looked no silent image. One had sworn
 He had said "Hail!" for she was imaged there,
 By whom the key did open to God's love,
 And in her act as sensibly imprest
 That word, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord,"
 As figure sealed on wax.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND JEWISH
 LITERATURE.¹

PART II.

TURNING to the question of the authorship of the books of the Old Testament—this was a subject in which the inspired authors of the New took little interest. Apart from the numerous phrases embedded in the text, there are about 286 express quotations from the Old Testament, only in about 51 cases, less than a fifth, is a personal name connected with a quotation.² *James* and *1 Peter* contain several, but never give the author's name; *Jude* is chiefly made up of references to the Old Testament, and to apocalyptic literature, but the only quotation it connects with a personal name is a passage from the Book of Enoch as spoken by Enoch. Often, especially in *Hebrews*, passages are quoted simply as the utterance of God or of the Spirit—"He saith," "the Holy Ghost saith"—the name of the human author is immaterial.

¹ The inaugural lecture at New Coll., London, October, 1901.

² Hühn, *A. T. Citate*, p. 269; the "about" is necessitated by uncertainties as to text, etc.

Even in the comparatively few cases in which the title of a book is given we cannot be absolutely sure that the author's name was actually mentioned by our Lord in His discourses, or written by the author of a book. It is, of course, a perfectly innocent thing to add to a quotation a reference to the book from which it is taken; such an addition merely provides useful information without affecting the substance of the speech reported, or of the document copied. We freely add references to our Bibles. In ancient times it was not usually felt necessary to distinguish such additions by placing them in brackets or footnotes, or by providing any special style of writing corresponding to our printed italics; sometimes indeed they were written on the margin or between the lines. But even when a note was marked off in any such way, the marks were usually omitted by subsequent scribes, and the marginal or interlinear additions got copied into the text. Even in the records of our Lord's discourses the Evangelists do not clearly mark off their own comments from the words of Christ; in St. John especially it is often difficult to say where the latter end and the former begin. *A fortiori* St. John, for instance, would not have felt it necessary to tell his readers that the title "Isaiah" in connexion with a quotation was an addition of his own. As it happens, the same verses illustrate the tendency both of evangelists and scribes to insert references. The passages in question are parallel reports of the same utterance of Christ; Mark xiii. 14, the oldest record, and Luke xxi. 20 refer to the "Abomination of desolation" or to "desolation," and give no reference to any Old Testament book; but Matthew xxiv. 15 introduces the reference "which was spoken of by Daniel the Prophet"; later on the copyists added this reference to the text of Mark. In the records of another discourse of our Lord's in Mark vii. 10, Christ introduces

a quotation with the formula "and Moses said," but in Matthew xv. 4, the formula He is said to have used is "and God said." While, therefore, we may maintain the substantial accuracy of the text of the New Testament, and of the record of our Lord's teaching, we cannot always be sure that the references to titles of books are part of the original discourses or documents.

Bearing in mind this important consideration, let us see what titles of Old Testament books are used in the New Testament. Let us take first the reports of our Lord's utterances. We have seen that the mention of Daniel must be ascribed to the Evangelist or to a copyist; but there is no doubt that Christ used the title "Moses" for the Pentateuch, and "Isaiah" for passages taken from the first part of the Book of Isaiah, and spoke of Psalm cx. as an utterance of David. In no other case does He use a personal name as the title of an Old Testament book. It is doubtless merely an accident that, though our Lord quotes passages from *II. Isaiah*, He does not quote them as "Isaiah."

Taking the New Testament as a whole, including our Lord's discourses and other speeches, we have the following personal names used as titles of Old Testament books: Moses, David, Isaiah (for both *I. and II. Isaiah*), Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel,¹ and Enoch. In some instances, as we have said, the insertion of the name may be due to the copyist and not to the original author. The use, however, of these personal titles does not always agree with the Old Testament. Anonymous psalms are quoted as "David," because, in spite of the variety of headings, it was the custom to use "David" as a title for the whole Psalter; Revelation xv. 3 ff. gives the Song of Moses and the Lamb, yet this poem has no connexion with the Old Testament Song of Moses, or with anything

¹ The text is doubtful.

ascribed to Moses in the Old Testament, but contains certain phrases from psalms, some anonymous, some Davidic. Further, a passage from the Book of Zechariah is quoted as Jeremiah,¹ and a passage from Malachi is quoted as Isaiah;² and a passage from the Book of Enoch is quoted as Enoch.³ Hence if the use of a personal name by an inspired writer in connexion with a passage from a book binds us to believe that the whole of that book as now extant was written by the person in question; if for instance the references to Moses and Isaiah bind us to believe that the whole of the Pentateuch was written by Moses, and the whole of Isaiah by Isaiah—if this is a necessary item of dogmatics, then we must believe that the whole of the Psalter was written by David, that the Book of Enoch was written by Enoch, that the Book of Zechariah was written by Jeremiah, and the Book of Malachi by Isaiah—which, as Euclid would say, is absurd. Here again we easily escape from all difficulties by recognizing that our Lord and His disciples left us no inspired message as to the authorship of Old Testament books. Nothing was further from their minds than any intention to decide controversies as to how many psalms were written by David, or as to how much of the Pentateuch was written by Moses, or whether the Book of Enoch was written by Enoch. Probably they shared the common belief that these books were written by Moses, Isaiah, and Enoch respectively, but they make no explicit *ex cathedrâ* utterance on the subject; they say nothing which can be meant to bind the Church for all time. They merely use the names of individuals as conventional titles of books.

Such a usage has always been common. To-day for instance, a writer who refers to "Esther" or "Matthew," or "Titus," does not necessarily mean that the books in question were written by Esther or Matthew, or Titus, as

¹ Matt. xxvii. 9.² Mark i. 2, 3, R. V.³ Jude 14.

the case may be. The Revised Version affords a remarkable example of this use of titles. You may read at the head of the Epistle to the Hebrews this title, "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews." Now if anything is certain in New Testament criticism, it is that St. Paul did not write the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Revisers were perfectly aware of the current opinion of scholars on this subject. This apparently explicit statement is a mere conventional phrase. The Revisers did not mean to express any opinion on the subject, much less to give an authoritative decision that St. Paul wrote the book, or to stake their own authority as scholars or Christian teachers on the Pauline authorship. If critical scholars in the critical nineteenth century thought it right in a popular book to keep a conventional title, a title clearly wrong if understood literally, can we wonder if our Lord and His disciples used conventional titles of books whose authorship was never discussed by them, and had no essential bearing on their message?

Next as to the attitude of the New Testament to the narratives contained in the Hebrew Scriptures. Here again we must remember that it is possible that references to ancient history may have been added as illustrative notes to our Lord's discourses by the Evangelists, or to the original documents by copyists. For instance, in Matthew xii. 40, the Evangelist gives, apparently as spoken by Christ, the words "as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea monster," but these words are absent from the parallel passage in Luke xi. 29-32, and may be an illustrative note of Matthew's.

Our Lord's references to the history of Israel are comparatively few: He refers to the flood, the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, the transformation of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt, the swallowing of Jonah by a sea monster, and the episodes of the brazen serpent, of David and the

shewbread, of the Queen of Sheba, of Elijah and the widow of Zarephath, and of Elisha and Naaman. Even in making these few references, His words are three times at variance with the statements of the Old Testament. In Matthew xxiii. 35 the father of the murdered Zechariah is said to be Barachiah; in 2 Chronicles xxiv. 21 the father's name is Jehoiada; in Mark ii. 26 the name of the priest who gave David the shewbread is Abiathar, in 1 Samuel xxi. 1 it is Ahimelech; in Luke iv. 25 it is said that the famine in the time of Elijah lasted three years and a half, according to 1 Kings xviii. 1, it lasted less than three years. It is possible that these names and dates are due to evangelists or copyists; but if so, of course, it is also possible that where there is no discrepancy names, dates, or references may have been added or altered. If we take the New Testament as a whole, the references to the ancient history are more numerous; the discrepancy as to the duration of Elijah's famine reappears in *James* and *Revelation*, and there are many other new discrepancies. In some cases the New Testament follows current Jewish tradition when it differs from the Old Testament. Moreover the New Testament uses illustrations taken from non-canonical apocalypses and other apocryphal works. *Hebrews*, as we have seen, includes in its survey of Sacred History the sawing asunder of Isaiah, from the *Ascension of Isaiah*; and the martyrdom of the seven from the Second Book of Maccabees; and the *Epistle of Jude* refers to the contest of Michael and Satan for the body of Moses, an incident said to be taken from the *Assumption of Moses*. Hence is impossible to say that a New Testament reference to an incident from an Old Testament historical book guarantees the accuracy and historicity of every incident mentioned in that book, or even of the particular incident mentioned; this is impossible for two main reasons: first, because the New Testament sometimes agrees with and sometimes differs from the Old. Secondly, because if we

maintain that the New Testament guarantees the historicity of every narrative in the Old Testament, we must on the same ground maintain that it guarantees the historicity of every statement in the *Assumption of Moses*, *the Ascension of Isaiah*, *the Book of Enoch*, and *2 Maccabees*. Now *2 Maccabees* states that after the capture of Jerusalem the tabernacle and the Ark followed Jeremiah to Mount Sinai, and the prophet hid them in a cave.

Even if we confine the guarantee to the incidents actually mentioned, we must accept not only the episode of the Brazen Serpent, the transformation of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt, and the swallowing of Jonah by the sea monster, but also the sawing asunder of Isaiah, and the contest of Michael and Satan over the body of Moses.

Such facts are clear warnings, given us by the Holy Spirit, against supposing that the New Testament was meant to teach us the history of Israel. These references are purely conventional, they were not intended either to confirm or contradict; the authority of the inspired writers is in no way involved. Thus, to-day, if a preacher who is not an expert in ancient history uses some narrative by way of illustration, and a later discovery shows that the narrative is inaccurate, the preacher is not in the least discredited as a spiritual authority. If any one charged him with making a mistake about Sesostrius or the Pharaoh of the Exodus, about Cleon, or Mark Antony, or Constantine, he would have a right to reply, "It was not *my* mistake; I merely meant it to be understood that these statements were made by standard authorities, and such was then the case." In His spiritual teaching our Lord spoke from the inspired experience of His own unique personality. His doctrines were not dependent on precarious arguments of which the details of Old Testament history were indispensable data; Jonah and Lot's wife were picturesque illustrations.

The attitude of the New Testament to such technical

matters as the text, canon, introduction, detailed historical criticism, and exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures is best defined by a saying of Christ's in Matthew xxiii. 2. This saying refers to the external observances of worship, which are, to say the least, closely connected with religion. He said, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat ; all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe." Other passages show that our Lord did *not* approve of all the rules of the scribes ; but the principle involved may be stated thus : "It is not *my* work to be a casuist, to instruct you in the details of Sabbath observance, of the tithes of mint and anise and cummin, of the washing of pots and pans ; these things I leave to the established authorities, whom it is your duty to obey in their proper sphere." In the same way, Christ left matters of scholarship to the scholars. He would have told the common people that He had no message on the subject, they would do well to accept what they were told by the best scholarship of their day. The views which much of the New Testament language, if taken literally, seems to imply about the Hebrew Scriptures are as much things which the scribes and Pharisees bade as the rules for washing and paying tithes. Christ did not mean to bind on the shoulders of Christians for ever the rabbinical exaggerations of the ceremonial law ; neither did He mean to fetter the Christian intellect throughout all ages by the absurdities of rabbinical exegesis or the mistakes which the scribes made about the composition of their sacred books. Imagine some one—singularly lacking all sense of fitness or proportion—asking Christ or St. Paul, "Are we to understand that it is part of your inspired message that every word in the current text of the Book of Isaiah was written by that prophet, and every word in the Pentateuch by Moses ? You claim to speak in God's name, and you say you are inspired by His Spirit, do you stake your authority on the exact and literal accuracy of your

language in these matters?" One can imagine Christ's indignant answer, "Man," He said once, "Who made Me a ruler or divider?" "Man," He might have answered, "Who made Me a higher critic?"

Space will only allow me to touch very briefly on New Testament methods of exegesis; and I am glad to feel that here I may confine myself to some of the more positive aspects of the question. The teaching of our Lord and His disciples shows that Revelation once given is not fixed, rigid, dead, but unfolds itself, develops, and grows. They use the words, statements, and phrases of the Old Testament in senses quite different from those of the original writers, and often still more different from those in which they were commonly understood at the beginning of the Christian era. They took phrases like "the Messiah," "the Hope of Israel," "the fulfilling of the law," "the coming of John the Baptist" which had a recognized meaning both in scholastic theology and in popular language, and yet did not feel in the least bound to use them in their established meaning. When our Lord spoke of Himself as the Messiah, He did not mean the conquering King whom His fellow-countrymen and even His disciples expected. The coming of Elijah meant with Him not the re-incarnation of the ancient prophet but merely the appearance of another person in the spirit and power of Elijah, a "second Elijah." In these and other cases He asserted the right to go back from the unworthy usages of scribes and Pharisees, to all that He, with His unique understanding of God's truth, could see was involved in and implied by the Revelation made to prophets and psalmists. The great words and ideas of Scripture had been appropriated for sectarian purposes, they had been given a narrowed and distorted meaning, and made the tools of human ignorance and error. Christ reclaimed them for God and His Revelation. He asserted the right to use them, not in the sense which error had for the time

imposed upon them, however current such meaning might be, but in all the depth and fulness which was rightly theirs. He claimed that they meant more than those who first used them had ever dreamed of, and His disciples followed in His footsteps.

It was no question of putting new wine into old bottles. Do you think our Lord would have used for the Sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament the figure of an old wine-skin, something dead, shrivelled, worn and dry, torn and patched? The inspired books are living and life-giving. Even the formulæ of science grow continually in meaning as we discern for them a wider range of application, as we combine them with fresh discoveries, and look at them in the light of growing knowledge. The New Testament helps us to realize that the phrases and formulæ of the Hebrew Scriptures are not less fertile and pregnant. It has been said that the inspirations of one generation become to the next "current coin worn away in the handling," and in contrast to this that "no fire is dead whose sparks strike new matter, and burst into new flame." It is this latter figure which applies to the Old Testament or rather to the whole Bible; again and again its sparks strike new matter and burst into new flame.

Another feature is the use made of prophecy. We sometimes meet with the idea that certain predictions corresponding, as we think, to events of the Gospel history, can be used as evidence that those events really happened. In the New Testament we find the argument stated differently. The Apostles started from the events; they asserted, as in St. Peter's speech on the Day of Pentecost, that Jesus of Nazareth had risen from the dead, and ascended to heaven; they maintained that the Resurrection and Ascension corresponded to certain marks and signs of the Messiah as given by the prophets; therefore, they maintained, the Jews were bound to believe that Jesus was the

Messiah. St. Paul, indeed, writing for the Corinthians, thought it necessary to adduce the evidence for the Resurrection; but here and elsewhere St. Paul and the other Apostles speak of these events as absolutely certain, as accepted facts which can be used as premisses of an argument to establish further conclusions. They unconsciously reveal the strength of their convictions. They do not use prophecy to reinforce a wavering faith; but find in these events the links which connect Jesus of Nazareth with the Messiah. To us the correctness of their logic and exegesis are of small importance, what we do care about is that which is absolutely clear, their certainty as to the great facts of the Gospel.

Another feature in the use of the Old Testament by the New is the Messianic application of many passages. We draw a distinction between what is Messianic in the older Scriptures, and what is not. The New Testament is hardly acquainted with this distinction; for it all positive, forward-looking passages are Messianic. Foremost are the pictures of judgment, of an ideal future for Israel and for mankind, of a coming Deliverer. Then whatever is said of the Israelite king, whatever good is said by David or of David and of his house, whatever promises are made to them, are unhesitatingly applied to Christ. Not only so, but Christ is also regarded as the fulfilment of sayings concerning Israel and mankind; and, most striking of all, verses which originally referred to God are cited as speaking of Christ; Jehovah the God of Israel and Jesus of Nazareth are treated as convertible terms. Christ, according to the New Testament interpretation of the Old, is the realization of all ideals, personal and social, human and divine; He is the true Prophet, Priest, and King, the true Israel, perfect Man and perfect God.

Doubtless the Jewish teaching had prepared the way for such doctrines; they followed at once from the recognition

of Jesus as the Messiah. But the more divine and wonderful the Messiah had become in Jewish theology, the more marvellous is the identification with that Messiah of a working man who was put to death as an impostor and a criminal. We feel how unique must have been the impression which His personality made upon men, how convincing was the testimony which the Holy Spirit gave concerning Him to the first generation of Christians. I have never been able to understand how any one could deny that the New Testament teaches the deity of Christ. Its writers did not reflect on all that was involved in the doctrine, nor did they work it out in technical terms, as an item in systematic theology; but their use of the Old Testament, apart from anything else, is a profession of faith that God was incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth.

The principles which this lecture has been intended to illustrate may be summed up thus: we must not look to the New Testament to decide our controversies as to the literary and historical criticism of the Old; but the use which our Lord and His disciples make of the Jewish Scriptures reveals their permanent spiritual value, and throws a flood of light on the Person of Christ, and the character, faith and enthusiasm of His followers. Such principles are now widely held amongst scholars who differ as to the results of criticism. You may find them, for instance, in the article by Prof. Lumby which I referred to, and in the works of George A. Smith, Toy, Clemen, Hühn, Briggs, and many others.

I have brought them to your notice in this lecture partly because they remove many stumblingblocks. It is sometimes suggested that the authority of Christ and of the New Testament is discredited in these days. There is very little truth in this; but if their influence has suffered somewhat here and there, it is largely because we have put them to uses for which they were never intended, and have taken

our Lord's authority as a weapon in scholastic and sectarian controversies with which He was in no way concerned. Charles Dickens once wrote that, "half the misery and hypocrisy of the Christian world arises from a stubborn determination . . . to force the New Testament into alliance with it [the Old]—whereof comes all manner of camel-swallowing and gnat-straining." We should not endorse such a view, the *alliance* between the two Testaments is a fundamental article of our faith. But the statement becomes true if we say that these evils have arisen from the attempt to force the Old Testament into exact and complete verbal agreement with the New. Recently Prof. G. A. Smith has told us that not only his own experience but also that of the late Henry Drummond show that such an attempt is a fatal stumblingblock to many. He says of a large class of correspondents who consulted Drummond on religious difficulties: "One and all tell how the literal acceptance of the Bible—the faith which finds in it nothing erroneous, nothing defective, and (outside of the sacrifices and Temple) nothing temporary—is what has driven them from religion."

One great difficulty to many has been the supposition that the authority of Christ was committed to views about the Old Testament, which were demonstrably mistaken. By showing that this august authority is in no way concerned with our critical controversies, we leave both Testaments free to assert their influence over heart and conscience.

As I am delivering this lecture within a mile of Lyndhurst Road Church almost on the eve of its coming of age, I will conclude with a quotation from the volume of the *Century Bible*, which contains Dr. Horton's commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. He writes:¹ "The use made of the Old Testament by the apostles . . . is often allegorical

¹ p. 164.

and apparently arbitrary. Passages are quoted out of their context, and with reference to things which the writers never dreamed of; frequently the force of the quotation is found in the Septuagint . . . and not in the original Hebrew, and sometimes words are quoted as Scripture which are not found in our Old Testament. But the Scriptures are not the less able to make wise unto salvation through faith in Christ because allegorical and other methods of interpretation are applicable to them. In proportion as faith in Christ Jesus transforms, by possessing, the interpreter, it has been found . . . that the Old Testament from beginning to end forms a textbook for the preaching of Jesus . . . Directly men turn to the Lord . . . all the Scriptures are found eloquent of Him."

W. H. BENNETT.

THE MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS.

II.

IN a previous paper we examined Christ's favourite self-designation, the Son of man, with the view of discovering what light it throws upon His Messianic consciousness; and we found that not only is the title best understood in a Messianic sense, but that by its form it draws emphatic attention to the human side of Christ's Person in relation to His Messianic work. This side does not however stand alone, and we have now to supplement what was then said by the consideration of a second title.

II. THE SON OF GOD.

At first sight indeed it may seem as if this title could have little to tell us regarding the inner consciousness of Jesus, for, in direct contrast to the title the Son of man, which was constantly on His own lips, there is only one passage