

THE FORMULAS INTRODUCING QUOTATIONS OF SCRIPTURE IN THE NT AND THE MISHNAH

BRUCE M. METZGER

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

A COMPARISON of the formulas introducing quotations of Scripture in the NT and in the Mishnah is both practicable and desirable. It is practicable because much of both the NT and of the Mishnah reflects the methods of argumentation employed by those who had been reared and trained in orthodox Judaism of the first century.¹ Such an investigation is also desirable in so far as it may afford an additional means of comparing and contrasting the habits of thought and religious presuppositions entertained by the authors of both corpora of literature. To the extent that such an investigation appears to be both practicable and desirable, to that degree it is surprising that no satisfactory treatment of the subject is available. True enough, there is no lack of articles and books on the subject of the quotations from the OT in the NT,² several of which deal with the formulas of quotation.³ There is, furthermore, at least one definitive treatment of the terminology employed by the Tannaim in their Scriptural exegesis, the well-known work by Wilhelm Bacher.⁴ But apparently no scholar, interested in both the NT and the

¹ Although the sixty-three tractates of the Mishnah were not finally reduced to writing until about the close of the second century, by the Patriarch Judah (died c. 219), it is commonly allowed that their contents faithfully reproduce the oral teaching of the generations of the Tannaim, who date from about the beginning of the Christian era; cf. George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, the Age of the Tannaim*, I (Cambridge, 1932), 3-4.

² For an extensive catalogue of titles of such works, reference may be made to a bibliographical appendix in Elwyn E. Tilden's unpublished Th.D. thesis, *The Function of the Old Testament in the Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Synoptic Gospels* (1945), pp. 296-306, which is on deposit in the Library of Princeton Theological Seminary.

³ Notably David McCalman Turpie, *The New Testament View of the Old, a Contribution to Biblical Introduction and Exegesis* (London, 1872), Eugen Hühn, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im Neuen Testamente* (=Die messianischen Weissagungen des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes bis zu den Targumim, II. Teil; Tübingen, 1900), pp. 272-277, and, for Paul, Otto Michel, *Paul und seine Bibel* (=Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, II. Reihe, 18. Band; Gütersloh, 1929), p. 72.

⁴ *Die älteste Terminologie der jüdischen Schriftauslegung, ein Wörterbuch der bibel-exegetischen Kunstsprache der Tannaiten* (=Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen

Mishnah, has heretofore undertaken a comprehensive and scientific comparison of the formulas of Scriptural quotations in both the NT and the Mishnah.⁵ By way of making a beginning of such a study, it is the purpose of the present article (1) to list all of the separate formulas which introduce quotations of Scripture in the NT and in the Mishnah,⁶ and (2) to discuss the significance of similarities and differences between the usages of the two corpora.

I

For convenience of listing, the formulas of quotation of Scripture will be grouped according as they are quite general, more precise, or specific as to author or section cited.

By far the majority of quotations in the Mishnah are introduced by the verb **אָמַר**. It appears in the *gal* participle active, **אֹמֵר**, with the

Traditionsliteratur, I. Teil (Leipzig, 1899). A brief treatment of several of the formulas of citation may be found in Georg Aicher, *Das Alte Testament in der Mischna* (= *Biblisches Studien*, ed. Otto Bardenhewer, XI. Band, 4. Heft; Freiburg im B., 1906), pp. 41–44. Unfortunately Samuel Rosenblatt touches upon this subject very little in his *Interpretation of the Bible in the Mishnah* (Baltimore, 1935), pp. 24 and 35. None of these (or any other, so far as the present writer is aware) includes a comprehensive list of the formulas of quotation in the Mishnah.

⁵ There is, of course, a multitude of scattered comments on individual formulas in every scientific commentary on the NT and on the Mishnah, notably in Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München, 1922–28) and in G. Beer and O. Holtzmann, *Die Mischna; Text, Übersetzung und ausführliche Erklärung* (Giessen, 1912 —). Schrenk and Kittel touch upon the subject in their respective articles on *γράφω* and *λέγω* in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, I, 747 f. and IV, 110 f. The statement in the text above is not contradicted by the existence of the volume entitled *ספר המשוה sive BIBAOS KATAΛΛAΓHΣ in quo secundum veterum theologorum hebraeorum formulas allegandi, & modos interpretandi conciliantur loca ex V. in N. T. allegata*, auctore Guilielmo Surenhusio (Amstelaedami, 1713), for Surenhusius's method and purpose prevented his making a completely satisfactory examination of the evidence. His method, it may be remarked, was an eclectic one ranging over every area and date of rabbinical writings, and his purpose was to defend the interpretation of the apostles against the Jews of his own time, so that if blame be attached to the NT writers for their modes of quotation, it must equally belong to the Talmudical doctors. For other criticisms of Surenhusius, reference may be made to Thomas H. Horne, *An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, 13th ed., II (London, 1872), 186–187, and Crawford H. Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament* (New York, 1884), pp. xxx–xxxii.

⁶ It has not been the purpose of the author to supply an exhaustive list of all the passages where the formulas occur; this information can be secured from concordances of the Greek NT and of the Mishnah (e. g. that by Kassovsky). Consequently only a few passages will be cited as examples of any one formula.

Scriptures implied as its subject (Pe'ah 8:9; Sheqalim 6:6; Aboth 6:7) or with God implied as its subject (Sanhedrin 10:3; Makkoth 3:15, see Samuel Krauss's note in the Giessen edition). The verb is occasionally preceded by **הוּא** (Yebamoth 6:6; Sanhedrin 10:3) or by **וַיֹּאמֶר** ("and likewise it [or he] says," Ta'anith 4:8; Nedarim 9:10; Qiddushin 4:14), or yet again by **הָרַי הוּא** ("Lo, it says," Makkoth 3:15). Sometimes an adversative expression is used, as . . . **אֵלֶּא . . . אֵינוֹ אֹמֵר** ("It does not say . . ., but . . .," Sanhedrin 4:4). The introductory word may be an interrogative, **מָהוֹ אֹמֵר** ("What does it say?" Qiddushin 4:14 *bis*). By far the largest number of instances of formulas containing **אָמַר** involve the *niph'al* form, **נִאָמַר** (Nazir 9:5; Sanhedrin 6:4; Hullin 8:4, etc. etc.), translated by Canon Danby in his Oxford edition of the Mishnah, "It is written." Most frequent of all is the expression **שֶׁנֶּאמַר** (Makkoth 3:13; Shabbath 9:1, 2, 3, 4, 6; Yoma 1:1, and more than 300 other examples), rendered variously by Danby, "as it is written," "for it is written," and the like. As with the active form, the subject may be either the Scriptures or God. Like the active form, it is also elaborated adversatively, . . . **לֹא נִאָמַר . . . אֵלֶּא** ("it is not said . . ., but . . .," Shebi'ith 9:2; Ta'anith 2:1), or in other ways which make the reference more pointed, as **עַל זֶה נִאָמַר** ("of such it is said," Pe'ah 8:9; Sukkah 2:6; Sanhedrin 3:7), **מֵעַלְיוֹ נִאָמַר** (Yebamoth 9:6), or **מֵשׁוּם שֶׁנֶּאמַר** ("because it is said," Bikkurim 1:2 *bis*), or **מִמִּשְׁמַע שֶׁנֶּאמַר** ("by inference from what is said," Sanhedrin 1:6). The interrogative formula appears in two forms, **לְמָה נִאָמַר** ("why is it said . . .?" Sanhedrin 1:6) and **אִם כֵּן לְמָה נִאָמַר** ("if so, why is it said . . .?" Pesahim 9:1; Makkoth 1:6).

In a chain of quotations, frequently the passive form appears first followed by the active form linked by the simple connective, . . . **שֶׁנֶּאמַר . . . וְאֹמֵר** (Sanhedrin 1:4; Aboth 6:7).

Occasionally the Mishnah employs the word **דְּבַר** to introduce a quotation, as **לְדְבַר** (Shabbath 8:7) and **דְּבַר אַחֵר** ("another saying is," Sanhedrin 4:4; Makkoth 1:9).⁷

The introductory formulas in the NT which involve a verb of saying are more varied than those in the Mishnah, no doubt because the Greek language is correspondingly richer in verbs of saying than is Hebrew; thus **φησιν** (I Cor 6:16, with **ὁ θεός** understood as the subject), **λέγει**

⁷ Though not a formula introducing a quotation, the following comment in Baba Qamma 5:7 is also apposite, **אֵלֶּא שְׁדְבַר הַבְּחוּב בְּהוּזָה**.

(Rom 15 10), ἐρρέθη (Matt 5 27), εἴρηται (Luke 4 12), ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι (Heb 3 15), and κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον (Rom 4 18). As דְּבַר is used in the Mishnah, so ὁ λόγος (John 4 37), ὁ λόγος οὗτος (Rom 9 9), and ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος (I Cor 15 54) appear in the NT. The one speaking is identified as God, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεός (II Cor 6 16), οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λέγοντος as a question (Matt 22 31), and the Holy Spirit, καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (Heb 3 7). With the last may be compared הַרְוַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ בְּבִשְׂרֵי תַתְּ (‘‘the Holy Spirit proclaims to them,’’ Soṭah 9:6).

Once Paul refers to the Scriptures as though to a book of oracles, τί λέγει ὁ χρηματισμός; (Rom 11 4). In addition to a prefixed formula of quotation, Paul occasionally adds within or at the end of the quotation the words λέγει κύριος (Rom 13 19; I Cor 14 21; II Cor 6 17).

The Mishnah employs the root כָּתַב in both nominal and verbal forms in referring to the Scriptures. Thus הַכְּתוּב אֹמֵר (‘‘the Scripture says,’’ Yebamoth 4:4 *tris*), . . . כְּתוּב אָהָד אֹמֵר . . . כְּתוּב אָהָד אֹמֵר (‘‘one verse of Scripture says . . . and another . . .,’’ Danby’s rendering of ‘Arakin 8:7) and דְּכָתִיב (‘‘that which is written,’’ Aboth 6:10, four times). Unmistakably personalized is מְעַלְהָ עָלָיו הַכְּתוּב (‘‘the Scripture reckons it unto him,’’ Aboth 3:2). The NT authors allow themselves more freedom in attributing personality to the Scriptures than do the Tannaim. Not only are verbs of speaking used, as in the Mishnah, such as ἡ γραφή λέγει (Jas 4 5, 6) and λέγει ἡ γραφή (Rom 10 11), τί ἡ γραφή λέγει; (Rom 4 3) and τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; (Gal 4 30), καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή (John 7 38), οὐχ ἡ γραφή εἶπεν as a question (John 7 42), ἑτέρα γραφή λέγει (John 19 37), but the power of foreseeing the future is also attributed to the OT, as προῖδουσα ἡ γραφή . . . προενηγγέλισατο (Gal 3 8). Perhaps there should also be added here the personification of a Scriptural word as ‘‘Consolation’’ or ‘‘Exhortation,’’ ἐκλέλησθε τῆς παρακλήσεως, ἥτις ὑμῖν . . . διαλέγεται (Heb 12 5), as well as the placing of Mosaic words into the mouth of ‘‘Righteousness-which-is-by-faith,’’ ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει (Rom 10 6).

A type of formula which appears not infrequently in the NT is that which involves the perfect tense of γράφω. Often γέγραπται stands alone (Matt 4 4; Rom 12 19; I Pet 1 16), or is preceded by οὕτως (Luke 24 46, I Cor 15 45), by καθὼς (Acts 15 15; Rom 1 17), by καθάπερ (Rom 3 4; 10 15), by ὥστε (I Cor 10 7), by περὶ οὗ (Matt 11 10; Luke 7 27), and, as a question, by οὐ (Mark 11 17).

The perfect passive participle appears in such combinations as ἡν γεγραμμένον (Luke 4 17), τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο (Luke 20 17), κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον (II Cor 4 13), and ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος (I Cor 15 53).

Likewise the noun γραφή is used in the following combinations not hitherto listed: κατὰ τὴν γραφήν (Jas 2 8), περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ (I Pet 2 6), ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ (John 13 18, 17 12), ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή (John 19 38), and, as questions, οὐδὲ τὴν γραφήν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε (Mark 12 10), οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς (Matt 21 42), and οὐκ [οὐδέποτε] ἀνέγνωτε (Matt 19 4; 21 16).

Very rarely the *pi'el* of the verb קָוַם, ‘‘to establish, fulfill,’’ introduces a quotation, as שְׁנֵי כְתוּבִים קִיְמִים (‘‘both Scriptures are fulfilled,’’ Sheqalim 6:6) and קִיְמַתָּ (‘‘thou hast fulfilled,’’ Baba Qamma 3:9 *bis*).

Two indefinite expressions which occur infrequently in the Mishnah are וְהֲלָא כְּבָר נֵאמַר (‘‘But was it not once said . . .?’’ Nazir 9:5) and וְהֲלָן הוּא אֹמֵר (‘‘and elsewhere it says,’’ Soṭah 6:3). The only book in the NT which contains examples of this quite indefinite type of formula is Hebrews. In this document the place of origin of quotations is twice indicated by the indefinite word ‘‘somewhere’’: διεμαρτύρατο δὲ ποῦ τις λέγων (Heb 2 6, where the subject is a human being) and εἴρηκεν γὰρ πού (Heb 4 4, where the subject is God).⁸

The prepositions בְּ (Sukkah 13:9), לְ (Pesahim 5:7), מִן (Bikkurim 3:6), and עַד (Pesahim 10:6), are used to introduce a quotation. The conjunction וְ connects quotations. Somewhat similar in brevity of formula is the use of the definite article τὸ (Matt 19 18; Rom 13 9) to introduce a quotation in the NT, and the use of πάλιν to link a subsequent quotation to an earlier one (Rom 15 10–12). The conjunction γάρ (Rom 2 24) or τὸ γάρ (Rom 13 9), as well as μενούργε (Rom 10 18) and καθὼς (Gal 3 6), appear in Paul’s writings.

The question πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις (Luke 10 26) finds a verbal parallel in אֵיךְ אָתָּה קוֹרֵא (‘Abodah Zarah 2:5).

⁸ This formula (with πού) appears also in Philo, *De Ebrietate* § 14, *Quod Deus immutab.*, § 16, *De Profugis* § 36, *De Congressu er. gr.* § 31, and in Clement of Rome, [I] *Epist.* 15 2, 21 2, 26 2, 28 2, 42 5, and is generally taken as an Alexandrianism; see William Leonard, *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, [1939]), ‘‘Mode of Scriptural Citation,’’ pp. 265–287, especially pp. 275 and 283. Olof Linton cites no example of this indefinite formula in Clement of Alexandria; cf. Linton, ‘‘Fornkristina evangelicitat i traditionshistorisk belysning,’’ *Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, II (1937), 107–136, especially 131–134.

Several other conventionalized formulas, referring to an unnamed passage or division, appear in both the NT and the Mishnah. Thus *καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει* (where *τόπω* is probably to be understood, Heb 5 6) finds a parallel in *וּמִקְרָא אֲחֵד אֲוֹמֵר* ("and another passage says," *Soṭah* 5:3). The Mishnah also uses *הַבְּרוּ מְלִמֵּד* ("its fellow[-verse] teaches," 'Abodah Zarah 2:5), *בְּפֶרֶשֶׁה* ("in the section," *Soṭah* 5:1), *בֵּל* ("a prohibitive law," *Bikkurim* 4:2; *Qiddushin* 1:7), and *הַפְּרָשָׁה* ("the parashah," *Bikkurim* 3:6).

The expression *תְּלַמּוּד לְוֹמֵר* appears not infrequently (*Soṭah* 6:3; *Aboth* 3:8; *Hullin* 8:4; 9:5; 10:1; *Temurah* 6:4; etc.)⁹ This formula is interpreted quite variously. Marti and Beer in the Giessen edition of *Aboth* translate, "Aber die Schrift lehrt" (p. 73), dropping a footnote indicating that literally it is, "Belehrung ist zu sagen." In his *Wörterbuch* Levy (s. v. *תְּלַמּוּד*) gives the sense with "Daher steht in der Schrift." Bacher interprets it, "Es liegt eine Lehre (eine Belehrung) der Schrift in dem, was sie sagt" (*op. cit.*, p. 200). Jastrow explains it in his *Dictionary* (s. v. *תְּלַמּוּד*), "There is a teaching in the Scriptural text to intimate, the text reads (may be read)." Danby usually translates the phrase by "Scripture says." The NT has no verbal analogy to this formula. Perhaps the nearest in sense are *λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή* (*Rom* 9 17) and *ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή;* (*Gal* 4 30).

Formulas which refer more precisely to some one part of the Scriptures are the following: Although the Mishnah refers to the Scriptures as a whole by the word *תּוֹרָה* (*Aboth* 6:7, where all six quotations thus introduced are from Proverbs), usually the word is used in its more precise meaning, as *אֲמָרָה תּוֹרָה* ("the Law has said," *Hullin* 12:5). The root *דבר* frequently appears with the word "Law," as *מִדֵּשׁ בְּתוֹרָה* ("that which is written in the Law," *Pesahim* 6:2) and *מִפְּנֵי הַכְּתוּב* ("because of what is written in the Law," *Hallah* 4:10; *Bikkurim* 1:3). Likewise in the NT the word *νόμος* refers occasionally to the Scriptures as a whole, as *ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται* (*I Cor* 14 21, referring to *Isaiah* 28 11), *οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν* (*John* 10 34, quoting *Psalm* 82 6), and *ἵνα πληρωθῆ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν*

⁹ The form *לְוֹמֵר* is the *qal* infinitive of *אמר* with *ל* and is equivalent to *לאמר*; see A. Geiger, *Lehr- und Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mischnah* (Breslau, 1845), § 17, 4, and C. Siegfried and H. Strack, *Lehrbuch der neuhebräischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1884), § 98b.

γεγραμμένος (*John* 15 25, quoting *Psalm* 35 19). But more frequently *νόμος* precedes a quotation from the Pentateuch in the following formulas: *ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν* (*Rom* 7 7), *ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ γέγραπται* (*John* 8 17), *καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου* (*Luke* 2 23), and *κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου* (*Luke* 2 24). The NT also refers anonymously to the Prophet(s), *ὁ προφήτης λέγει* (*Acts* 7 48), *οὕτως γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου* (*Matt* 2 5), *ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* (*John* 6 45), *τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* (*Acts* 13 40), and *καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν* (*Acts* 7 42).

Among the more precise formulas are those which involve the name of a Biblical character or section of Scripture. In the Mishnah Moses, Joshua, David, and Ezekiel are referred to in introductory formulas; thus, *לֵאמֹר לְאֵלֶיךָ מִשֶּׁה עֲבָדְךָ יֵאָמֵר* ("as it is written in the Law of thy servant Moses, saying," *Yoma* 3:8; 6:2; see also 4:2), *שָׁאֵמַר לוֹ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ* ("for Joshua said to him [Achan]," *Sanhedrin* 6:12), *יְכֹן כְּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר* ("and thus it is written in the book of Psalms by the hands of David, King of Israel," *Aboth* 6:9, according to the *textus receptus*; MS *Monacensis* 95, ed. Strack, reads *שָׁכַן מְצִינוּ בְּדוֹד* (*מלך ישראל שנאמר*), and *עָלָיו הוּא מְפָרֵשׁ עַל־יְדֵי יְהוֹזְקָאֵל שְׁנֵאֵמַר* ("whereof he speaks expressly through Ezekiel, where it is said," *Tamid* 3:7; see also *Middoth* 4:2). In the NT *Μωϋσῆς* appears with *λέγει* (*Rom* 10 19), *εἶπεν* (*Matt* 22 24; *Acts* 3 22), *γράφει* (*Rom* 10 5), and *ἔγραψεν* (*Mark* 12 19; *Luke* 20 28). More precise is *ἐν τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ γέγραπται* (*I Cor* 9 9). Similarly *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Hosea*, *Joel*, *Daniel*, and *Enoch* are quoted by name in the following varieties of formulas: *Ἡσαΐας λέγει* (*Rom* 10 16), *Ἡσαΐας ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει* (*Rom* 10 20), *εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας* (*John* 12 39), *Ἡσαΐας κράζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ* (*Rom* 9 27), *καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας* (*Rom* 9 29), *καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης* (*John* 1 23), *ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἡσαΐας . . . ὡς γέγραπται* (*Mark* 7 6), *ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἡσαΐας λέγων* (*Matt* 15 7), *ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαΐου ἢ λέγουσα* (*Matt* 13 14), *ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ λόγων Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου* (*Luke* 3 4), *καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐου τῷ προφήτῃ* (*Mark* 1 2), *ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῆ ὃν εἶπεν* (*John* 12 38), *ἵνα* (or *ὅπως*) *πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος* (*Matt* 4 14; 8 17; 12 17), *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου*

λέγοντος (Matt 3 3), τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου . . . λέγων (Acts 28 25), ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος (Matt 2 17; 27 9, although in this last passage it is really Zechariah who is quoted), ὡς ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ λέγει (Rom 9 25), τοῦτὸ ἐστὶ τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ (Acts 2 16), τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δαυιδ τοῦ προφήτου (Matt 24 15), ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ Ἐνώχ λέγων (Jude 14).

The Psalter is referred to as follows: γέγραπται ἐν βιβλῳ ψαλμῶν (Acts 1 20), Δαυιδ λέγει ἐν βιβλῳ ψαλμῶν (Luke 20 42), Δαυιδ λέγει (Rom 11 9; compare Acts 2 34) or Δ. λ. εἰς (αὐτόν, Acts 2 25), Δαυιδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ (Mark 12 36), ἔδει πληρωθῆναι τὴν γραφὴν ἣν προεἶπε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυιδ περὶ . . . (Acts 1 16), ὁ [sc. θεός] τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυιδ παιδός σου εἰπών (Acts 4 25 according to B N A E, but this is ungrammatical;¹⁰ Westcott and Hort suspect a primitive error here), ἐν Δαυιδ λέγων (Heb 4 7, with ὁ θεός as the subject).

In Pesahim 5:7 לְעֵתָא אֲפֻרָא appears and in Yoma 7:1 the book of Numbers is referred to by name.

Two passages in the NT employ the dative case of a proper name to indicate the general location of the passage quoted: λέγει ἡ γραφὴ τῷ Φαραῶ (Rom 9 17) and ἡ γραφὴ . . . προευηγγελίστατο τῷ Ἀβραάμ (Gal 3 8).

The most precise formulas of quotation are those which involve an expression referring to a particular section of text. Lacking more definite divisions of chapters and verses, it was necessary, if one wished to refer to a special passage, to utilize catchwords or brief references to the contents of the passage. The only clear¹¹ example in the Mishnah is כִּן הוּא אָמַר בְּרִיךְ (Aboth 3:7), which Danby interprets, "And it is

¹⁰ J. H. Ropes believes that the reading of the old uncial group "is probably to be adopted here." He continues, "To assume, as the Antiochian revisers appear to have done, that both τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν and πνεύματος ἁγίου were interpolated, imputes too great ineptitude to the supposed primitive interpolator, whose text was certainly widely adopted; and the hypothesis is intrinsically too easy to be safe," *The Text of Acts* (= *The Beginnings of Christianity*; Part I, *The Acts of the Apostles*, edd. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, vol. III) (London, 1926), p. 40.

¹¹ Perhaps Sanhedrin 6:2 approaches this usage, לְעֵתָא אֲפֻרָא בְּרִיךְ ("For so have we found it with [lit. in] Achan").

written in [the Scripture concerning] David." The reference is to the history of David in I Chron 29 14.

Two such examples are found in the NT. The question, οὐκ ἀνεγνωτε ἐν τῇ βιβλῳ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάλτου; (Mark 12 26), which Luke reproduces Μωϋσῆς ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς βάλτου (20 37), refers to the narrative of the burning thorn bush in Exod 3 6. Similarly Paul asks the question οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφὴ . . .; (Rom 11 2), referring to the narrative of Elijah in I Kings 19 10.¹²

The most precise reference of all is that in Acts 13 33, which is probably the earliest known citation of a Psalm by number. The text is uncertain; B N A C 81 read ὡς ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ, but ὡς ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται is read by D d gig Origen, Hilary, and Latin mss. known to Bede.¹³ The passage quoted in Acts is from what is now called Psalm 2; the "Western" reading reflects a practice of uniting the first and the second Psalms.

II

Both the NT and the Mishnah, as one would expect in view of their origin, contain many similar or identical formulas introducing quotations of Scripture.¹⁴ When one compares the frequency of certain types of formulas, it is discovered that the Mishnah shows a great preference for those formulas involving a verb of saying, whereas in the NT the frequency of this type is more evenly balanced by the type containing a reference to the written record.

¹² Similarly Philo, *De Agricultura* § 24, λέγει γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ἀραῖς, referring to Gen 3 15. The Homeric poems were likewise commonly quoted in antiquity by brief references to the contents of the several sections.

¹³ Ropes favors the latter reading, *op. cit.*, pp. 263-265.

¹⁴ In certain cases the similarity is to be explained on the basis of a common dependence on formulas introducing literary references in the OT, as, e. g., Joshua 8 31, וְכָתוּב בְּסֵפֶר הַיְהוָה, LXX (9 26) καθὰ γέγραπται ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσῆ; or with a verb of saying, Num 21 14, וְהוּא יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אָמַר בְּסֵפֶר הַיְהוָה, LXX, διὰ τοῦτο λέγεται ἐν βιβλίῳ Πόλεμος τοῦ κυρίου; see also Deut 28 58, 61; Josh 8 34; 10 13; 23 6, II Sam 1 18, I Kings 11 41; 14 19; II Kings 13 12; 23 24, 28; I Chron 9 1; 29 29; II Chron 12 15; 20 34; 25 4; 35 12; Ezra 6 18; etc. As one would expect, certain of these OT formulas, particularly those involving the idea of writing, reappear in Josephus; see Adolf Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus* (= *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, 2. Reihe, 26. Band) (Gütersloh, 1932), pp. 64 f. It may also be mentioned that in the fragments of the so-called Zadokite Work a quotation is usually introduced by the "as He said," more rarely "as God said," or with the name of the human author, "as Moses [Isaiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah] said." See R. H. Charles in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, II (Oxford, 1913), 789.

It is noticeable likewise that the NT makes use of a much greater variety of types of formulas than does the Mishnah. This is not surprising, for the writings of the NT include a much greater range of literary *genres* than does the Mishnah.

All varieties of formulas indicate that the contributors to the NT and to the Mishnah had the very highest view of the inspiration of the Scriptures which they quote.¹⁵ Both corpora contain not a few examples where the subject of the verb of saying in the formula may be either the Scriptures or God.¹⁶ Indeed, so habitual was the identification of the the divine Author with the words of Scripture that occasionally personality is attributed to the passage itself.

On the other hand, both the Mishnah and the NT recognize the instrumentality of human authors in the production of the Scriptures which each quotes. The former refers, rather infrequently, to Moses, Joshua, David, and Ezekiel; the latter refers, with relatively greater frequency than does the Mishnah, to Moses, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, and Enoch.

It is not surprising also that the NT and the Mishnah, though agreeing in the use of many formulas, differ in the choice of certain other formulas. Thus, as was pointed out above, the Mishnah makes use of a phrase, תְּלַמְּדוּ לַיהוָה, which has no apparent parallel in the NT. This formula is particularly appropriate in a body of literature which became the basis of the Talmud (compare the first word of the formula).

Another characteristic difference is the relatively large number of occurrences in the NT (in Matthew and John) of formulas containing the verb πληροῦν, ἀναπληροῦν, or τελειοῦν. Whether the ἵνα with which these formulas are prefixed is to be interpreted as having a telic or an ecbatic force,¹⁷ the significance of the formulas for the purposes of the present analysis is not greatly altered. In either case the occurrence of certain events was held to be involved in the predetermined plan of

¹⁵ Cf. B. B. Warfield, "It Says': 'Scripture Says': 'God Says,'" *Revelation and Inspiration* (New York, 1927), pp. 283-332.

¹⁶ The author of Hebrews cites the words of Scripture as the words of God even where the OT does not so characterize them, and where the words are in the third person about God (1 6, 7, 8; 4 4, 7; 7 21; 10 30b).

¹⁷ It is probably telic, so Albert Debrunner, *Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 8te Aufl. (Göttingen, 1949), § 391, Anm. 5, and Emil Klostermann, *Das Matthäusevangelium (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 4)*, 2te Aufl. (Tübingen, 1927), p. 9. This judgment is strongly supported by the occasional substitution of ὅπως for ἵνα in the formula.

God revealed in the Scriptures. That the Mishnah makes no use of this formula¹⁸ cannot be accounted for in terms merely of the difference between the literary *genre* of the NT as a whole and of the Mishnah as a whole. The real reason is far more deep-seated than that and is to be traced ultimately to two differing interpretations of history. More precisely, the characteristically Christian view of the continuing activity of God in the historical events comprising the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, fulfilling and completing the divine revelation recorded in the OT, is reflected even in the choice of formulas introducing quotations of Scripture in the NT.

¹⁸ This statement is not contradicted by Sheqalim 6:6 and Baba Qamma 3:9 (quoted above) where the *pi'el* of מִן, though properly translated "fulfilled," is used in a way quite unlike the πληροῦν-formula in the NT. In these passages in the Mishnah, the Scripture which is quoted is said to be fulfilled by anyone whenever he complies with the Mosaic precept; there is no suggestion of a divine agent effectually fulfilling at one period in history his pre-disclosed plan, as is involved in the NT usage. Furthermore, even in later rabbinical writings the formula מְהַרְהֵרֵם (מִן מִן) bears only a superficial resemblance to ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ρηθῆν, *et sim.* It is significant that the three examples of this formula which H. L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck quote (*Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, I [1922], 74) from the Babylonian Talmud and the Siphre Deut. as parallels to Matt 1 22 are, in their contexts, general and lacking in any teleological import. Bacher cites (*op. cit.*, p. 170) but one example (from Seder 'Olam, c. 27 *fin.*) where Jose b. Halafta refers to the fulfillment of a prophetic word (Jer 9 9) through a historical event.