

SweetGospel/harmony.com

TESTIMONIES

by

RENDEL HARRIS

with the assistance of

VACHER BURCH

PART II

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1920

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER
LONDON : FETTER LANE, E.C. 4



NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN CO.
BOMBAY
CALCUTTA } MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
MADRAS }
TORONTO : THE MACMILLAN CO. OF
CANADA, LTD.
TOKYO : MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PREFACE

THE present volume continues the argument of Part I of *Testimonies*. A supplementary volume containing some anti-Judaic documents, new and old, is now one of our desiderata. Ars longa, Vita brevis! I am indebted to my secretary, Miss Speller, for the Index, as on the previous occasion, and to the Editor of the *Expositor*, for the reproduction contained in Cap. VI.

R. H.

JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY,
MANCHESTER.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. TESTIMONIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS	12
III. TESTIMONIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS (V.B.)	32
IV. TESTIMONIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS	38
V. TESTIMONIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS	43
VI. JESUS AND THE EXODUS	51
VII. TESTIMONIES IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS (V.B.)	58
VIII. TESTIMONIES IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN	71
IX. TESTIMONIES IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES	77
X. APOCRYPHAL TESTIMONIES (V.B.)	84
XI. PAPIAS AND THE TESTIMONIES	90
XII. DID JESUS USE TESTIMONIES?	95
XIII. SACRIFICES, CIRCUMCISION AND THE SABBATH	101

APPENDIX I

I. THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ATHOS MS.	109
II. THE SELDEN MS. AND ITS CONTENTS	122
III. THE SELDEN MS. CONTINUED	133

APPENDIX II

PATRISTIC EVIDENCE FOR TESTIMONIES IN ROMANS (V.B.)	137
INDEX	141

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

IN the first part of the present work¹ a general review was made of the investigations which had been carried out in recent years as to the use of *Testimonies* or *Quotations against the Jews* in the early Christian Church. It was pointed out that such collections of polemical passages from the Old Testament were inevitable, if there was to be any reasoned discussion or sustained debate between the Church and the Synagogue, or, rather, between the Jewish sects which became respectively the Church and the Synagogue; and it was also made clear that the further back we went into the time of division between Christianity and Judaism, the more definitely was the Christian literature tinged with the colour of such debating matter. It was possible to reconstruct portions of the popular arguments employed by early Christians in their controversy with the Jews, and to detect the very headings of the sections under which they were arranged, and the transcriptional errors that arose in the copies that were in circulation. From the fact that such errors occurred coincidently in very early Patristic writers, such as Justin and Irenaeus, it was easy to infer that the book which was responsible for them was necessarily early; and from the fact that the very same errors occurred in the great fathers of the fourth century, like Athanasius, it was clear that the polemical book of the first century had an official standing, and that it continued to be a text-book of Christian believers after it had ceased to be a *malleus Judaeorum* or a *pugio fidei*: yet its polemical character was not really lost, for the very same sentences, used in the very same manner, were shown to have been employed against the Moslems, when Christianity was again forced into open contest for the first principles of the Faith.

Granting, then, the antiquity of the method of primitive anti-Judaic controversy, and of some of the recovered arguments, it became interesting to examine how far existing books of *Testimonies* represented a lost original belonging to the first century,

¹ *Testimonies*, Part I. (Camb. Univ. Press, 1916).

and how far such a lost original was in evidence in the New Testament itself. The collections, in Greek or Latin, that were available for study, were two in number. There was, to begin with, the first two books of Cyprian's *Testimonies against the Jews* (omitting the third book which was ethical in character and not controversial). These two books showed traces of a derivation from a Greek original, however much they may have been remoulded by Cyprian himself. The original from which they were derived must have been very early. Then there was a collection of a somewhat similar structure in Greek, attributed to Gregory of Nyssa. The book is rather inaccessible, occurring, as it does, in that rare volume, the *Collectanea* of Zacagni¹. From these two collections, that of Cyprian and that of Gregory of Nyssa, a great many conclusions may be drawn as to antiquity and early form of the *Book of Testimonies*, when we study them carefully by the side of the Patristic writings of the first three centuries. The question of the relation of the *Testimony Book* to the New Testament itself was more difficult. For a long time we hesitated to believe it could be earlier than any existing portion of the Christian literature. It was, however, found to have influenced the oldest gospel, that of Mark, and the oldest of the Epistles, such as that of Paul to the Romans and the first epistle of Peter; and it became necessary to assign it a position anterior to the whole of the writings which make up the New Testament. The present volume will show more in detail how far-reaching its influence has been, and how often the recovered *Book of Testimonies* operates like a search-light in obscure corners of the gospels and epistles.

This far-reaching demonstration of a primitive *Book of Testimonies*, which antedated the New Testament, was accompanied by a suggestion that the lost book might be extant in manuscript, in a modified form, and had, in this form, been copied on Mt Athos as late as the invention of printing, or even later. A ms. in the Monastery of Ivéron on Mt Athos could be identified with the tradition of the Church in the matter of proof-texts against the Jews. It contained an anti-Judaic treatise in five books, and its authorship was attributed to a certain Matthew, described by Prof. Lambros in the catalogue of the Athos mss. as Matthew the Monk. This reference suggested that we should identify the author of the original work from which the ms. was derived with the

¹ It is reprinted in Migne's *Patrology*, tom. 46.

Matthew of the New Testament, and the book itself with the much disputed *Logia* upon which Papias commented. These *Logia* were now conceded to be Old Testament Oracles of the Lord, and not, as we had at one time supposed, a collection of the Sayings of Jesus. This important conclusion had already been reached by previous students, notably by an anonymous writer on the *Oracles of Papias* in 1894, by Prof. Burkitt in his book *The Gospel History and its Transmission* in 1906, and by Dr E. S. Selwyn in *The Oracles of the New Testament* in 1911.

Almost coincidently with the publication of the first part of *Testimonies* and its concession of the equivalence of the Papias-*Logia* with the Matthew-*Testimonies*, there appeared an article in the *Church Quarterly Review* for April, 1917, over the signature of Dr Bindley, in which he also combated the traditional belief that the *Oracles of the Lord* which Papias commented on were the *Gospel* of Matthew, and drew attention to the neglected work of the anonymous author referred to above. He disclosed the author as being a certain Dr Gregory of Bristol, for whom the work on the *Oracles of Papias* had been published anonymously by Messrs Longmans. Dr Bindley added a footnote to his article to say that our *Testimonies* had come to his notice when his essay was passing through the press.

It is important to observe how many of those who have written on the subject of the *Dominical Logia* have reached their result in the identification with the *Book of Testimonies* by independent roads. All roads, in fact, lead to Matthew, some of them, like Dr Selwyn's investigations, being rather fantastic than direct. But, as I said at the close of the first part of *Testimonies*, "the result is the important thing, and not the choice of methods by which the result is to be reached." Dr Selwyn, moreover, was careful to explain, that he did not derive his method or its result from the anonymous author. When he comes to the chapter of his book which is headed,

"What, then, did Papias write?"

he adds the following note:

This was written before I had seen a most convincing work on this subject, *The Oracles ascribed to Matthew by Papias of Hierapolis*, 1894 (anonymous), pp. 274 ff. I leave this chapter, however, just as it was written, while recommending the above contribution to the criticism of the New Testament. It is strange that it has escaped the notice of nearly all readers.

Dr Bindley thinks that Gregory's book was boycotted, no doubt on the assumption of its running counter to academic orthodoxy, which was still dominated by Lightfoot and his treatment of the subject in the controversy with *Supernatural Religion* (Mr W. R. Cassels). This explanation will not cover the fact that it did not find recognition in Germany, so far as I can recall the matter.

It is more likely due to the fact that the *Logia*, so-called, of Jesus, had already been found amongst the Oxyrhyncus papyri, and that the meaning of the word *Logia* was now supposed to be placed amongst the causes that had been decided. I find, to my regret, that I myself spoke disparagingly of Dr Gregory's book, although I had for some time been moving on parallel lines to the writer, without knowing it. If the Manes of just men are still interested in Biblical and Patristic criticism, it may please Dr Gregory not only to know that I was wrong in my judgment but also to hear me say so with the living voice, as Papias would put it.

Amongst foreign writers, Dr Solomon Reinach was led to the same result as ourselves, and in his case the result was reached by reading Selwyn's book. He saw, and has seen more clearly, I believe, through the reading of *Testimonies*, Part I., that the case for a primitive collection of Old Testament *Logia* was proved, and that such a collection belonged to the Apostolic times, and, perhaps, to an authorship in the Apostolic circle.

It is an interesting study in critical archery to watch the various shots, good and bad, at an important question, and to note how some are near to the truth and some are far from it. Take for instance, Sir John Hawkins's view of the situation in *Oxford Studies on the Synoptic Problem*, p. 105. Referring to the two sources spoken of by Papias, the *Logia* of Matthew and the book written by Mark, he says:

One of these two sources, *i.e.* St Mark's Gospel, contains as Papias says, both sayings and doings of Christ, while the other, which he ascribes to St Matthew, has as its main object sacred utterances (*τὰ λόγια*), which can only mean those of the Lord. . . . Does he mean, and did he expect his readers to understand, that St Matthew's object in writing was narrower than St Mark's, and that he designed only to record sayings and discourses of Christ? Probably he did.

One may say of this shot (under the influence of an attempt to bring Papias into connection with Matthew through the hypothetical Q, the common source for the non-Marcian sections in

Matthew and Luke) that it was a little wide of the target. Indeed, all investigators have been led astray by their desire to connect Papias with the traditional Hebrew original of the Gospel of Matthew. This desire has led to a series of unverifiable hypotheses, of the following erroneous types:

(a) Papias' *Oracles* are the Gospel of Matthew, the Hebrew original of our extant Gospel.

(b) Papias' *Oracles* are a collection of Aramaic Sayings of Jesus underlying our existing Gospel.

(c) Papias' *Oracles* are the source (Q) which underlies the common sections of Matthew and Luke.

(d) Papias' *Oracles* are a collection of fulfilments of prophecy, such as we find in the Gospel of Matthew.

It may be interesting to examine some of the *oracular* judgments concerning the *Oracles* which have passed current, for example: Paley, *Evidences of Christianity*, c. ix. 1. 6:

"As Irenaeus attests," quoting Eusebius, "in what language Matthew wrote, viz. in Hebrew."

(here there is no discussion of the meaning of *Oracles*: it is assumed that Matthew is meant).

Lardner, *Credibility of the Gospel History* (ed. Kipps, 1827), II. 117 ff.:

Papias says, this *Gospel* was written in Hebrew (no reference to the *Oracles*). S. Davidson, *Introduction to Study of N.T.* (1894 edn.) I. 317 ff.:

The passage quoted above shows that Papias' work was an exposition or interpretation of the *Lord's Oracles*; that he carefully collected all traditions illustrative in his exposition.

These *Oracles* were a collection of the Lord's sayings.

Papias was not alone in identifying the Aramaean *logia* collected by Matthew with the present Greek Gospel assumed to be a translation of them.

Salmon, *Historical Introduction to the N.T.* (ed. 8, 1897, 87-90):

Λόγια is one word, λόγοι another. In N.T. λόγια has its classical meaning "oracles"; I consider the true conclusion to be, that as we find from Justin that the Gospels were put on a level with the O.T. in the public reading of the Church, so we find from Papias that the name *The Oracles*, given to the O.T. Scriptures, was also given to the Gospels, which were called τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια. The title of Papias' own work I take as simply meaning "an exposition of the Gospels," and his statement about Matthew I take as meaning, "Matthew composed his Gospel in Hebrew," the word λόγια implying its scriptural authority.

Dr Salmon, in the foregoing, extended the use of the term *Oracles* till it covered the whole of the *Old and New Testaments*.

Dr Sanday doubted whether the word *Oracles* could really be held to cover even the whole of our Matthew-Gospel. He says, in *The Gospels in the Second Century* (1876, 155-6):

Papias says that "Matthew composed the Oracles (λόγια) in the Hebrew tongue." The meaning of the word λόγια has been much disputed. Perhaps the best translation of it is that which has been given, *Oracles*—short but weighty and solemn or sacred sayings. I should be sorry to say that the word would not bear the sense assigned to it by Dr Westcott, who paraphrases it felicitously (from his point of view) by our word "Gospel." It is, however, difficult to help feeling that the actual sense of the word has to be somewhat strained in order to make it cover the whole of our present Gospel.

Note the delicate irony of the foregoing description of Westcott's criticism, and the Sandayan reserve of his own final opinion and judgment.

The passages of Westcott referred to are as follows:

Canon of the N.T. (5th edn. 1881; 7th edn. 1896), p. 73:

(Papias's) purpose seems to be unintelligible unless there were definite and familiar narrations.

It was an *exposition of Oracles of the Lord*, and not of *the Oracles of the Lord*—such a summary (τὰ λόγια) as, for instance, St Matthew composed.

In a footnote to the same passage we are told that:

It is difficult to give the full meaning of τὰ λόγια, τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια:—the Gospel—the sum of the words and works of the Lord.

The sense, I believe, would be best expressed in this passage by the translation "Matthew composed his Gospel in Hebrew," giving to the word its necessary notion of Scriptural authority.

These comments are now seen to be charged with *petitio principii*. It is no wonder that the wrath of Mr W. R. Cassels (*Supernatural Religion*) was kindled. He, at all events, knew that Matthew's Gospel was not written in Hebrew, however many fathers might affirm the same, and that the equation between λόγια and "Gospel" was illicit¹. In spite of his accuracy of vision in these directions, both he and Lightfoot appear to have held on to the belief that *Oracles* were to be interpreted as Sayings of Jesus. We will show this conclusively by some extracts.

Supernatural Religion (6th edn.), p. 463:

Matthew is said to have composed the λόγια or Oracles, and there can be little doubt from the title of his (Papias's) own book, *Exposition of the Lord's Oracles* (λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις) that these Oracles referred to by Papias were the Discourses of Jesus.

¹ Curiously Westcott in his *Commentary on Hebrews* came to suspect the existence of collections of Old Testament quotations. See p. 476 ff.

Here we have (a) a wrong equation between "Oracles" and "Discourses," and (b) a wrong explanation of "Discourses concerning the Lord" as "Discourses of Jesus." He goes on to enquire whether:

the word *λόγια* means strictly "Oracles" or "Discourses" alone, or does it include within its fair signification also historical narrative. Were the *λόγια* here referred to a simple collection of the Discourses of Jesus or a complete Gospel like that in our canon bearing the name of Matthew?

The answer to this last enquiry is that they were neither the one nor the other. Mr Cassels, however, was right in his suspicion that "Discourses" was nearer to the true solution than "Gospel." He was quite clear, also, that the term did not include "doings" as well as "sayings." On p. 464 he says

there is no linguistic precedent for straining the expression, used at that period, to mean anything beyond a collection of sayings of Jesus which were estimated as oracular or divine, nor is there any reason for thinking that τὰ *λόγια* was used in any other sense.

Here the argument is spoiled by the insertion of Jesus, and when that name is removed another sense of *λόγια* immediately suggests itself. Mr Cassels seems to have been on the verge of the discovery, for in his seventh edition he frequently changes "oracles or discourses" into "oracles" which brings one very near to the description of Old Testament extracts. Perhaps if he had not been so eager to deliver damaging blows at canonicity and apostolicity, and could have taken his mind for a time off from the existing Gospel, he might have seen the direction in which the true solution lay; but he would have replaced a pseudo-apostolic document by a genuine one!

Now let us verify that Lightfoot was caught in the same net, and that he also believed that the *Logia* were the sayings of Jesus, to which Papias added illustrative anecdotes. He tells us in fact that the main object of Papias's book was the exposition of Sayings of Christ and the illustration of them by stories derived from tradition. (See Lightfoot on *Supernatural Religion*, p. 212.)

In discussing the story of the Sinful Woman in John viii., he asks the question:

Have we not here one of those illustrative anecdotes which Papias derived from the report of the elders, and to which he did not scruple to give a place along with his interpretations of our Lord's Sayings? (Lightfoot, *l.c.* p. 205.)

Again, when he is discussing the story of the miraculous vines of the millennial Kingdom, he says that we find in the narration:

the three elements which the preface of Papias would lead us to expect; *first*, the saying or sayings of Christ recorded in the written gospels; *second*, the interpretation of those sayings, which is characteristically millennial; *third*, the illustrative story, derived from oral tradition. (*l.c.* p. 159.)

In his commentary on the Colossians, he puts the matter as follows:

He (Papias) made it his business to gather traditions respecting the sayings of the Saviour and His Apostles: and he published a work in five books, entitled, *An Exposition of Oracles of the Lord*, using the information thus collected to illustrate the discourses, and perhaps the doings of Christ, as recorded in the Gospels. (3rd edn. p. 47.)

In all these passages we see that Lightfoot is endeavouring to prove that the *Logia* are sayings of Jesus and that they probably came from the Gospel: yet, strange to say, when he comes to the expression "Oracles of God" in Romans iii., he asks:

Can we suppose that St Paul meant anything else but the Old Testament Scriptures by this expression? (*ibid.* p. 173.)

It appears, then, that both of the combatants in the great historical dispute over the documents of the Christian religion were in the wrong, but Lightfoot appears to have been more in the wrong than the adversary whom he overthrew.

A few words may be added with regard to the treatment of the subject of the *Logia* in Prof. Stanton's book on *The Gospels as Historical Documents*.

Stanton proceeds from the Old Testament citations in the Gospel of Matthew, especially those of them which are peculiar to the First Gospel. His object is clearly to search for the Matthaean *Logia* behind the Matthaean Gospel. He comes to the conclusion that there was a *Catena of fulfilments of prophecy*, existing originally in Aramaic, and comparable with the prophetic parts of Justin's *First Apology* and *Dialogue with Trypho*¹. Stanton does not, however, see that such a Catena of Old Testament prophecies as he has described would be naturally described as *Logia*, and he reserves the title *Logian document* for the common source (Q) of Matthew and Luke. He was right in suggesting that the influence of a catena of Old Testament passages was traceable in Justin, wrong in identifying such a catena too closely with peculiarities in the

¹ Stanton, *l.c.* II. 342-345.

First Gospel. Moreover, he still thought that the *Logia* of Papias were sayings and discourses of Jesus: thus he says¹,

The idea of a source other than St Mark (or than a document like St Mark) which our first and third evangelists might have used, was suggested (as we have seen), in the first instance, by the fragment of Papias regarding a compilation by the Apostle Matthew of "the *Logia*," rightly interpreted to mean more particularly the Sayings and Discourses of Jesus...accordingly this second source has frequently been called "the *Logia*."...To call the source we are considering "the Logian document" cannot, I think, be open to...objection, and I shall myself so designate it after a certain point in my argument has been reached.

Thus, according to Stanton,

The Matthaean *Logia* = Sayings and Discourses of Jesus
= Q = Logian document.

In a footnote Stanton comes up against Prof. Burkitt's suggestion that the *Logia* of Matthew were Messianic proof-texts, and disposes of the hypothesis as follows:

Prof. Burkitt's recent suggestion that the *Logia* of Matthew of which Papias writes, were a collection of "Messianic proof-texts," like the *Testimonia* of Cyprian, does not commend itself to me....For (1) the natural name for such a work as he supposes would have been *μαρτυρία* as his own illustration reminds us, or *ἐκλογαί*, the name by which Melito, the younger contemporary of Papias, describes the collection of such passages which he made; (2) the use of *τὰ λόγια* as the description of a particular set of extracts from the Old Testament, when the whole Old Testament was commonly so called, would be too confusing to be thought of.... (3)...The words "every one interpreted as he was able..." refer to translation from Hebrew (or Aramaic) into Greek. Now there would be no need for this in the case of passages from the Old Testament, since the LXX was in common use.

Setting aside the term "Messianic" which Prof. Burkitt imports into the argument, Prof. Burkitt is in the right and Prof. Stanton is in the wrong. For, to follow his points of objection, (1) the title *ἐκλογαί* is probably an original title of the *Logia*, and as we have shown in Part I., explains a difficult passage in Victorinus, who works directly on Papias. It is the actual heading of Gregory of Nyssa's collection, which is entitled *ἐκλογαὶ μαρτυριῶν*. Here we have both the titles which Prof. Stanton desiderates. It is open to us to regard "Matthew's Eclogues" as one of the actual titles of the *Testimony Book*. (2) Papias does not use the article systematically before *λόγια*. He calls his work an "Exposition of Dominical Oracles." When he says, "Matthew wrote the Oracles,"

¹ *Ibid.* II. 47-48.

the article is demonstrative of the particular Oracles on which Papias comments. (3) If every one was capable of rendering a passage from the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek by the aid of the Septuagint, there was no need for Stanton to have searched the prophecies in the First Gospel to see whether they agreed with the LXX, and the following sentences on ii. 143 need not have been written:

It would seem that renderings of these passages (certain passages under discussion) other than those of the LXX have been used, but modified in some cases by reminiscences of that version: four of the former (passages under discussion)...are wholly independent renderings.

It seems, then, that on Prof. Stanton's own showing, people did sometimes translate Hebrew or Aramaic Old Testament prophecies into variant Greek, even when they had Septuagint reminiscences; in other words, it was possible to translate Old Testament passages as one was able.

We have given some attention to the discussion of the *Logia* problem by Dr Stanton, because he was face to face with the correct solution, and did not recognise it to be such. We made the same mistake ourselves at a certain point in the investigation. How often an important critical discovery is missed by taking a wrong turn at a particular moment!

We have only space for a reference to Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, where it is definitely stated (p. 34) that

the early Christian propaganda would produce, or adapt for its own purpose, short collections of extracts, Messianic or otherwise, for the use of those who had to argue from the O.T.

Dr Moffatt refers in passing to the author of *The Logia of Papias*, but without, so far as I can see, going so far as to accept his theory. His description of the primitive *Logia* as "extracts, Messianic or otherwise," is a judicious correction of prevalent definitions.

It is time for us now to pick up the threads which we dropped at the end of our First Part. We suggested that the original *Book of Testimonies* was still extant in Greek in a late and modified form, and that in this modified form it was current under the name of Matthew, and divided into five books. We must now examine more carefully into this peculiar survival from early Christian literature. Is it really true that the substance of the book can be referred to the earliest times, and is it the work of Matthew

the Apostle, or of a fifteenth century monk who bears the same name? And in particular, do the prefixed verses belong with the book, or may they be detached and referred to a separate authorship?

We have also undertaken to show, by a further and closer investigation, the reflex action of the *Testimony Book* upon the New Testament; we might almost have said "upon the rest of the New Testament," for, if we establish priority in the way that has been suggested, it will be difficult to refuse canonicity: the work that we are trying to restore will stand chronologically and dogmatically at the head of the Canon of the New Testament. Our first investigations on these lines were necessarily sporadic; we picked up the critical threads where we found them lying loose; we were able to show how certain of the oldest books of the New Testament, like the epistle to the Romans, were dependent upon the formal collection of Old Testament Oracles: to establish more fully and finally the matter of dependence of the extant canonical books we shall turn once more to the New Testament, and see whether its pages really become illuminated on the great scale by the hypothesis of an authoritative *Testimony Book*. It will be convenient to take up this side of the enquiry first, after which we can turn to the question of the relation of *Testimonies* to Matthew, and other connected and contiguous fields of research.

CHAPTER II

TESTIMONIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

IN our previous volume we suggested the dependence both of Peter and of Paul upon a primitive collection of *Testimonies against the Jews*, from which they had without collusion derived the doctrine that Christ was foretold in the Scriptures to be the Stone laid in Zion for a sure foundation, and equally laid for a stumbling stone on the part of the unbelieving Jews. The argument which was there developed was carried further as regards the Epistle to the Romans, in which St Paul brings forward the doctrine of the *Stoneship* of Christ (if we may coin a word, as our habit is oft-times to do), by an article in the *Expositor* for June, 1919, in which it was explained that the influence of the *Testimony Book* was widespread throughout the Epistle, and was absolutely necessary to its right understanding. We do not propose to follow this article in detail or reproduce it exactly. The subject requires a more thorough treatment, which is best given by a new survey of the whole ground.

We begin with the observation that both the prologue to the Epistle and the colophon invite us to recognise that the writer means to proceed from the prophetical writings as the basis of his theological argument. His definition of the Gospel in his opening sentence is that it was something which was promised of old *by God's prophets and transmitted by them in sacred writings*. The peroration with which it concludes intimates that the Gospel is a disclosed secret, long hidden away throughout the ages, but now revealed through *prophetical writings* with a view to the obedience and faith of *all the Gentiles*. The writer ends the epistle where he began, with the affirmation that prophetical testimonies are the basis of Christian faith: and these testimonies are anti-Judaic, for the faith is offered on a universal basis, to those who are not Jews at all. We have caught the writer, so to speak, on his keynote. In passing we observe that when something of a similar

statement occurs in Galatians iii. 8, the Apostle explains that the Scripture foresaw the justification of the Gentiles, and *foregospelled* (προενηγγέλισατο) Abraham, with the assurance of the blessing that was to descend upon his heirs. This curious word προενηγγέλισατο in Galatians iii. 8 is the exact equivalent of εὐαγγέλιον ὃ προεπηγγείλατο in Romans i. 2, and it is within the bounds of possibility that it should be restored to the text in the latter passage.

Assuming then that we are rightly interpreting the Apostle's intention of propagating by testimonies a Gospel which is at once pro-ethnic and anti-Judaic, we have to read the Epistle carefully in order to determine when the writer shows himself at work, with the tools in his hands, which he has promised to employ. We must look for the evidences of the proposed methods, and we must see whether the tools are his own manufacture or whether they have been borrowed from some other workshop.

A very easy method of enquiry is to set on one side all existing commentaries upon the Epistle, and replace them by the extant anti-Judaic writings of the early Christian Church, those which are actually made up of Old Testament quotations to be used against the Jews, and those which have dramatised the quotations (more or less completely) into Dialogues in which a representative Jew and a typical Christian discuss their divergences one from the other, and the Christian succeeds in disarming his opponent, and sometimes in converting him. As we have shown, all these writers are closely connected, and fall roughly into two groups, of which one finds its type in Cyprian's *Testimonies*, and the other in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, or still better, in the *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus*; we are to use these two groups of writings, arranged on two separate shelves, in place of the conventional commentaries on the Epistle. We are to annotate our margins not merely with Old Testament references but also with references to our *anti-Judaica*, wherever the same quotation from the Old Testament is made by an Anti-Judaic writer in the same sense as it is made by St Paul.

We fortify ourselves against possible misunderstanding by observing that the writers whom we are going to quote, and who are to be our guides in the determination of Pauline thought, are themselves independent of Paulinism. Their quotations which agree with Paul are not taken from Paul: they are independent

quotations from the Old Testament. It is easy to justify oneself on these points. It might be said that the Cyprianic origins are not independent of Paul, when they make a collection of prophetic testimonies: and the answer would be that anyone could verify for himself that Cyprian always works directly from the Old Testament, and specifies the author whom he is quoting; if at any time he quotes from the New Testament he tells you that he is doing so, and these New Testament supplements rarely commend themselves as a part of the original arguments of the book. They are few in number, and for practical purposes may be neglected. Cyprian's *Testimonies* are genuine Old Testament prophecies, made at first hand, and not transmitted by refraction through the New Testament. The same thing is even more clear of Justin Martyr; it will be difficult to convict Justin Martyr of any use of the Pauline Epistles: it is certain that he is saturated with the words of the prophets. Shorter dialogues, like *Athanasius and Zacchaeus* to which we referred, present the same air of detachment from New Testament Christianity. When we quote them in coincidence (or approximate coincidence) with Paul, we are not quoting Paul over again, nor is the doctrine which they inculcate in their quotations taken, except in a few rare instances, from Paulinism.

Suppose, then, that with these guides to help us, we annotate our margins in Romans, we shall be surprised to find how much of the biblical matter in Romans turns up in the *Anti-Judaica*. In the first part of the Epistle, biblical quotations are few and far between: the first to occur is in Romans i. 17, from Hab. ii. 4: one's natural impulse is to say that here at all events, in the statement that "the just shall live by faith," we have the characteristic Pauline note, the refrain from the Old Testament which he has made all his own, the speech of other days which he has rebaptized with new meaning: but when we look closer we see (a) that the passage quoted is applied, as a summary of the Gospel, to the case of "the Jew first"; (b) that when we turn to Cyprian (*Test.* i. 5) the text occurs not in any pro-Judaic presentation of the Gospel, but in the very opposite sense; not to prove the Jews are in the calling, but that they are out of it. It is clear, therefore, that the famous passage from Habakkuk, the Christian *Magna Charta* in a single line, is not confined to Pauline usage nor to Pauline interpretation. We see evidence for a collateral employment and explanation. As we read on in the Epistle, omitting one

or two insignificant allusions we come, in c. ii. 17, to a statement which is definitely introduced as an oracle:

The name of God is blasphemed on your account among the Gentiles, *as it is written*.

When we turn to the Hebrew of Isaiah lii. 5, which is the source of the oracle, we see that someone has anti-Judaized the passage: first of all by the insertion of δι' ὑμᾶς, second by the addition of the words, "Among the Gentiles." It is clear that these additions in the text of the LXX obscure, if they do not wholly change, the sense of the words in Isaiah: the prophet was speaking sympathetically of the sufferings of the exiled Israelites: "they that rule over them make them to howl, and my name continually every day is blasphemed"; but the Epistle uses them in an aggressive, antipathetic manner. The whole sequence of the passage in the Epistle, where the quotation is found, is abruptly anti-Judaic. This cannot be said of the Isaian original. Does any one else ever use the prophet in a similar manner?

In the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*¹ we find the Christian Timothy speaking as follows:

God reproached the children of Israel for their disobedience... Of the children of Israel the Lord said, On your account my name is blasphemed among the Gentiles.

When Eusebius in his *Demonstratio Evangelica* comes² to the passage in Isaiah, he treats it in much the same strain:

The Lord said to the people of the Jews..., I called and there was none to answer, and in the passage before us he says to the very same people, On your account my name is blasphemed among the Gentiles.

If we turn to the collection of *Testimonies* which passes under the name of Gregory of Nyssa, we find that the sixteenth chapter is devoted to "the incredulity of the Jews and the church of the Gentiles," and that it contains the following contrasts between the Christian calling and the Judaic rejection:

Isaiah says: I became manifest to those who do not seek me: I was found of those who do not enquire after me.

David says: I became an alien to my brethren, a stranger to my own mother's children.

But of the Gentiles he (David) says: I will declare my name unto my brethren: In the midst of the Church will I sing praise to thee.

But of the Jews (it is said): On your account my name is continually blasphemed among the Gentiles.

¹ Ed. Conybeare, p. 95.

² D.E. vi. 24.

There can, therefore, be no doubt that the passage quoted by St Paul is used anti-Judaically, and precisely as it is used in collections of *Testimonies against the Jews*. Moreover we see from Nyssen's extracts not only the passage that we are in search of, but two other remarkable extracts: one, which appears in the New Testament in Hebrews ii. 12, with a similar emphasis upon "my brethren"; the other we shall come across presently in Romans x. 20, in the very section where St Paul is dealing with the problem of the rejection of the Jews and the acceptance of the Gentiles.

It appears, therefore, that the anti-Judaic elements in the Epistle to the Romans are not confined (as is commonly supposed, and as a superficial reading suggests) to the chapters where the Jewish problem is being discussed in the middle of the Epistle; they are found throughout the letter and are an important witness to the substantial unity of the composition.

Before passing on to these middle chapters, where the margins of our text grow grey with identified *Testimonies*, we will take one other instance of an apparent employment of a *Testimony Book* in the earlier chapters of the Epistle. In c. iv. 17 we are told that Abraham is the father of the faithful, *i.e.* of those who believe, and the proof is given:

As it is written: Father of many nations (*ἐθνῶν*) have I set thee. (Gen. xvii. 5.)

It might very well be argued that this is characteristic Pauline doctrine and Pauline quotation; but since the extract from Genesis turns on the use of the word *ἐθνῶν*, and the words are used pro-ethnically, it becomes proper to ask for other instances of the use of the passage, in order to determine whether Paul is voyaging alone in the Old Testament seas, or whether others are sailing with him. The most anti-Judaic document among the Apostolic Fathers is, by common consent, the so-called *Epistle of Barnabas*. We shall find that Barnabas also fastens on this passage in Genesis, and on the reference which it contains to the vocation of the Gentiles; accordingly he says:

We find that the Gentiles were also brought to mind by Abraham (*reading* *ἔθνη ἐμνήσθη* for the erroneous Vulgate *ἐμνήσθη*). . . .

What then does he say to Abraham, when he alone believed and was set down for righteousness: Behold, I have set thee, Abraham, as the father of Gentiles who believe in God through uncircumcision: *ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε, Ἀβραάμ, πατέρα ἐθνῶν τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας τῷ Θεῷ.* Barn. *Ep.* 13. 7.

I suppose this would be called a free quotation, but the freedom is not licentious; it is Gen. xvii. 5 delivered in the manner of a Targum, and is deliberate enough. It is a quotation in the same sense as a Targum is a quotation.

Now let us look back to an earlier place in the fourth chapter of Romans: in the eleventh verse we shall find Paul saying that Abraham "received a sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which was his when uncircumcised, with a view to his being *the father of all that believe through uncircumcision* (εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας). Here we have almost the exact equivalent of the gloss in Barnabas, except that the latter has ἐθνῶν where Paul has πάντων, in which Barnabas is nearer to the text of Genesis than Paul, while Paul is, in appearance, more universal than Barnabas. When we bear in mind that Barnabas is a thoroughly anti-Judaic writer, whose epistle is saturated with prophetic *Testimonies*, and remark his complete independence of Paul in his manner of interpretation, we are obliged to admit that Barnabas, in the passage before us, is quoting from a *Testimony Book*, and that Paul is quoting from an almost exactly coincident source.

Thus we see again that the anti-Judaic elements in the Epistle to the Romans are not confined to the middle chapters; they are to be traced and recognised throughout the book. The expression of the writer's anti-Judaism is made, in many instances, from a manual of quotations which he had before him, with which he was evidently familiar. We can now go on to the ninth chapter, with its abrupt descent from the heights of Christian experience, to the lower lands of controversy with the men of his own race; and we approach this part of the book with the observation that the transition is not as abrupt as it looks; the first eight chapters have, in fact, presented us with the key to those which follow.

Any one who has even a moderate acquaintance with the early anti-Judaic literature will recognise familiar faces when he comes to the middle chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. The first few verses of the ninth chapter will reveal that the mind of the writer was familiar with the doctrine of the *Two Peoples* as foretold in the ante-natal perplexities of Rebekah with her twin-children, which lead up to the oracle that "the elder shall serve the younger," the elder being typically the Jews and the younger the Christians.

In Cyprian's *Testimonies* the heading of the section which contains the story of the twin-birth is as follows:

Quod duo populi praedicti sint, maior et minor, id est vetus Judaeorum et novus, qui esset ex nobis futurus.

Then follows:

In Genesi: Et dixit Dominus Rebeccae, etc.

But now notice that immediately on this quotation follows:

Item apud Osee prophetam: Vocabo non-populum meum populum meum et non-dilectum dilectum: erit enim, quo loco dicetur non-populus meus, illo loco vocabuntur filii Dei vivi. (Cyp. *Test.* i. 19.)

This is the composite quotation from Hosea which follows in Rom. ix. 25, 26; it agrees with Romans in the sequence of Hosea in two passages, Hos. i. 10 preceded by Hos. i. 23. Moreover, it has St Paul's *καλέσω* (*vocabo*) which certainly was in St Paul's sources, for it is implied in c. ix. v. 24 (οὐς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν...ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὁσηὲ λέγει), and it was in the writer's mind as far back as v. 12 (οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλὰ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος). The two extracts from Hosea along with the passage from Genesis belong together and are a part of a single *Testimony*. The antiquity of the *Testimony* appears again from its occurrence in a variant form in 1 Pet. ii. 10, where it certainly is not derived from Romans. Its diffusion may be seen in many ways. When Tertullian begins his treatise against the Jews, this story in Genesis is the first passage that he quotes. In Barnabas c. xiii. the Genesis legend is used to determine which of the two peoples is to inherit the covenant. The quotation from Hosea is in the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* (p. 74) in the following form:

διὸ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὁσιε ἐπηγγείλατο τὴν υἰοθεσίαν, λέγων· καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς Οὐ-λαός-μου, ἐκεῖ [cod. καὶ] κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος.

Bar Ṣalibi (vii. 21) has also the Hosea passage which he affirms to be spoken on our account (sc. the Christians). It need scarcely be said that there is nothing in Hosea to warrant such a perversion of ideas. When Hosea turns *Lo-Ammi* back into *Ammi*, he implies not two people but the same people in two states, sinful and penitent. There is no mention in the prophet of a new people.

Evagrius also, in the *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili* (v. 29) discusses the doctrine of the two peoples and proves it by the passage in Genesis: he does not, however, make the two peoples, one a believing people, the other an unbelieving; according to Evagrius

there are two peoples who are both to come to the faith of Christ, the circumcised Jew and the uncircumcised Christian.

Enough has been said on the subject of the *Two peoples* to verify our assertion that the student of anti-Judaic literature finds himself on familiar ground when he comes to the ninth chapter of Romans. We need not, therefore, repeat what has been said on the composite quotation at the end of the ninth chapter, in which Christ is proved to be the Stone spoken of by the prophets. We not only prove the antiquity of the *Testimony* by the independent concurrence in its use of Peter and Paul, but we have a whole section devoted to it in Cyprian (*Quod idem sit lapis*), as well as references to it on the part of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and elsewhere. The Cyprianic doctrine is not only anticipated in the fathers of the second century, it is actually extant, at least in germ, in the speech of Peter in Acts ii. 11 ("This is the Stone that was set at nought of you builders," Ps. cxviii. 22), so that any one who wishes to write the history of this *Testimony* in the Church must begin very early.

The study, moreover, of the manner of its presentation in the collected *Testimonies* and in the dialogues that are based upon them will take us some steps forward in our interpretation of the Epistle to the Romans.

We frequently find that a series of *Testimonies* is interpreted by a personal challenge to the Jew who is imagined to be listening to the demonstrations; and it was natural enough that this *argumentum ad hominem*¹ should be varied by protestations on the part of the Jew against the conclusions that are being drawn. It was almost inevitable that when the testimony becomes a controversy, the collection of testimonies should become a dialogue; which will sometimes seem to turn *Testimonia* into a series of *Questions and Answers*. For instance, in *Athanasius and Zacchaeus* we have the doctrine that Christ is the Wisdom of God worked out through various questions and protests on the part of Zacchaeus. Athanasius goes on to establish the doctrine that Christ is the Stone spoken of by the prophets. Zacchaeus listens to the state-

¹ See Gore on "The Argument of Romans ix-xi" in *Studia Biblica*, III. p. 38. "St Paul argues mostly *ad hominem* like Augustine....The opponent whom St Paul has in mind is a Jew; or one representing the Jewish case." Dr Gore misunderstood the situation; for him Paul was an argumentative writer, giving both sides of a case. That is too limited a view of the situation. St Paul is one of a series of argumentative writers, and many of his arguments are inherited.

ment that Christ was foretold to be *λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου*, and objects that God ought not to have made Christ into a Stumbling Stone, but should have presented Him so that He could be the object of an open confession. Athanasius replies that Christ is the object of faith; it is he that believes that will not be put to shame. But Christ was foretold as the Stone whom the builders (the Jews) rejected. Upon which Zacchaeus remembering the proofs that Christ was the Wisdom of God, interjects the question: "Do you mean to say that the Wisdom of God became—a stone?"

This might seem to be imported into the dialogue for dramatic effect, but it is not so; for we find that even in Barnabas, a similar question comes in at the point where Christ is said to be the foundation stone laid in Zion, upon whom whoso shall set his hope shall live for ever. At this point, an imaginary interlocutor interrupts and says, "Is our hope, then, set on a Stone?" "God forbid," says Barnabas, and goes on to quote from the prophet about Christ set as a solid rock, and about the Stone which the builders rejected becoming the head of the corner.

The manner in which the dialogue evolves out of the testimonies is clear, and it is equally clear that the evolution occurs early. We could give abundant illustrations of the point under consideration, but there is no need to do this; for we have enough before us to assist us in the elucidation of the Epistle to the Romans where the same phenomena present themselves, and where, as we shall presently see, the collection of testimonies is really a dialogue. Something of this kind had been suspected already: but it is only when we approach the Epistle from the point of view of a collection of testimonies that its structure and interpretation becomes really clear. We must, for instance, expect to have testimonies on both sides, if the discourse is really, in any respect, a dialogue. We cannot limit the interlocutor who occupies the position of Leader of the Opposition to an occasional spasmodic query. If he is anything like a real Jew he must have scriptures to set against scriptures and must be allowed to do it. Let us take an illustration. One of the commonest forms of the anti-Judaic attack consisted in the collection of all those passages in the history where Israel had played false to Jehovah, and all those passages in the prophets where Israel had been denounced or reproved for so doing. A favourite theme was found in the opening passages of Isaiah

where Israel is described as *a people that doth not know* and doth not consider. This is one of the earliest counts in the indictment against the Jews in Cyprian's first book of *Testimonies*. The heading of the section is as follows:

Ante predictum, quod Dominum neque cognituri neque intellecturi neque recepturi essent;

and it might have been inferred from the heading that Isaiah was going to be quoted in the opening verses; accordingly Cyprian has,

Apud Isaiam prophetam: Audi, caelum, et percipe auribus, terra, quoniam Dominus locutus est: filios genui et exaltavi; ipsi autem me spreverunt: agnovit bos possessorem suum et asinus praeseptum domini sui: *Israel vero me non cognovit et populus me non intellexit*, etc. (Cyp. *Test.* i. 3.)

The same passage is quoted in Lactantius (*Inst.* iv. 11), and Barnabas (ix. 3) quotes the opening clause with a curious addition:

Hear, O heaven, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken these things *for a testimony* (εἰς μαρτύριον).

No doubt the words were in actual use in the sense that Barnabas gives.

Now when we turn to Romans x. 19, we find the actual anti-Judaic testimony in the text, with the protesting interrogative *μή* of a real or supposed objector prefixed to it¹:

ἀλλὰ λέγω, μή Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω;

The passage in Isaiah has been assumed to have been used against the Jews: but there is no introductory sentence to explain its occurrence, and the reply which is required (whether Paul or some one else is the interlocutor) is not to be found in the text, which goes on with some irrelevant matter from Deuteronomy (irrelevant, that is, in the context of Isaiah).

It is clear, then, that we do not possess, at this point, a continuous or complete text of the Epistle. As to the answer required, we can only conjecture that it must have been biblical, and that perhaps it was Hosea viii. 2, "Israel shall cry unto me, My God, we know thee." In the *Testimony Book*, according to Cyprian, the passage from Isaiah was given in the form

Israel doth not know *me*.

To this the verse in Hosea would be a suitable reply. But whether this be the correct reply or not it is clear that some reply was required, and that the actual reply is missing. We can carry the

¹ The corresponding formula in Bar Ṣalibi is "But they (sc. the Jews) say."

argument a little further. If it is the case that the sequence of the Epistle is broken at the words "Israel doth not know," there is also a broken edge when we look at the words which follow, "First of all Moses says"; for there is nothing to lead up to these words: all we know is that something must have preceded the sentence

ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει,
ἐπ' ἔθνει ἀσυνέτῳ παροργιστῇ ὑμᾶς.

We will show presently that this is genuine *Testimony* matter, but first let us search for the missing prefatory words.

If we look at c. xi. v. 11 we find another objection on the part of the interlocutor. He finds fault with a statement that has been made that Israel has stumbled and fallen, and asks, with his conventional λέγω οὖν, μὴ ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν; the fall of Israel is challenged. The answer is given to the effect that the fall of Israel is to be the salvation of the Gentiles, with the intention of stirring the Jews to jealousy over transferred privileges: the words used εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτοὺς are the proper preface to Romans x. 19,

ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω αὐτοὺς κτέ,

which words from Deuteronomy are the scriptural proof of the statement made as to the reason for the fall of the Jews. Evidently the text of the Epistle is in some confusion, but where matter is missing, it is not always lost, it is sometimes merely misplaced.

We can now return to the tenth chapter and verify, by a closer examination, that we are working with a block of *Testimonies*, which are in process of dramatization by means of an interlocutor. The passage from Deut. xxxii. 21 will be found in Greg. Nyss. *Test.* 16 (p. 320, Zacagni) in the section "on the incredulity of the Jews and on the Church of the Gentiles"; and here (after a short stray sentence which has crept into the text from elsewhere) the argument goes on with

Ἡσαΐας· ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν,

precisely as in the Epistle. Surely there can be no doubt that Paul is working from a *Testimony Book*. The sequence of the passages is not his own; all that is his is the bracketed words in his introduction of the prophet: "Isaiah (is venturesome and) says."

Now let us turn to Bar Ṣalibi's *Treatise against the Jews* and we shall find the same passage from Deuteronomy, (Hear what Moses

says): it is followed by an extract from Isaiah, which is the *Testimony* quoted by our Lord against the Jews in Mark vii. 6 ("This people draws near to me with their lips, etc."), and then follows the passage from Isaiah lxv. 1:

And concerning the Gentiles he (Isaiah) saith: I appeared to the Gentiles, those who did not seek after me, etc. (Bar Ṣalibi, vii. 10, 11.)

Here, then, we have again the substance and the sequence of the *Testimony* matter which appears in Rom. x. 19, 20. When we turn to Aphrahat's treatise on Circumcision, which is a mass of Old Testament extracts, we find the passage from Deuteronomy introduced as follows:

In that hymn of *testimony* he intimates the people of the Gentiles, and says, I will provoke you by a people that is not a people, etc. (Aphrahat, xi. 1.)

We can take the matter a little further, both as regards the range of the quotations, and as regards their antiquity. The passage from Isaiah lxv. 1 is in Cyprian, *Test.* i. 21, with the addition:

Dixi, ecce sum, genti quae non invocavit nomen meum.

And it is quoted even more at length by Justin Martyr, in the very same anti-Judaic sense as by Cyprian.

Here is the passage from Justin to which we are referring:

καὶ πάλιν πῶς δι' αὐτοῦ Ἡσαΐου λέλεκται ὅτι οἱ οὐ προσδοκήσαντες αὐτὸν λαοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτόν, οἱ δὲ αἰὲ προσδοκῶντες Ἰουδαῖοι ἀγνοήσουσι παραγενόμενον αὐτόν· ἐλέχθησαν δὲ οἱ λόγοι ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰσὶ δὲ οὗτοι· ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην κτέ.... ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου ἐπὶ λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα κτέ. Justin: 1 *Ap.* 49.

It will be noticed that Justin carries on the quotation so as to include Rom. x. 21 ("I have stretched out my hands all the day," etc.). We notice also that, in his manner of introducing his quotation, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Justin employs a method which is common to most of the collections of *Testimonies*.

It is, no doubt, somewhat amusing to find Justin throwing his *Testimony Book* at the heads of the Roman Senate, and we are not surprised to find the same sequence turning up in the *Dialogue with Trypho*: and here, if we compare the quotation with the parallel in Cyprian, we shall be able to detect a further link with the passages quoted in Romans. In Justin we find as follows:

Come ye, let us walk in the light of the Lord: for he has rejected (ἀνῆκε) His people, the house of Jacob.... For I am manifest to them that do not seek after me, I am found of them that do not enquire after me. I said, Here I am, to the Gentiles who did not call upon my name, I spread out my hands all the day to a disobedient and gainsaying people, etc. (Justin, *Dial.* 24.)

The quotation is a composite one. We notice in it a passage from Isaiah ii. 5; but this is Cyprian, *Test.* i. 7:

Apud Esaiam prophetam: Venite, ambulemus in lumine Domini: dimisit enim populum suum domus Israel.

Thus we have not only all the passages in the closing verses of Rom. x. traced to the *Testimony Book*, but we have the key left in the lock for the objector, who appears at the beginning of the eleventh chapter with his characteristic

λέγω οὖν· μὴ ἀπόσατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ;

The suggestion is natural that there has been some abbreviation of the text at this part of the Epistle, whose elucidation clearly lies in the study of *Testimonies*, with which the ground is so thickly strewn that one can hardly put a foot down without treading on them.

Now let us test the matter by examining the three verses, Rom. x. 16-18, which precede those which we have been discussing. As the text stands, we have two passages of the Old Testament brought under review, viz. Is. liii. 1 and Ps. xix. 4, and both of them are used in an unnatural manner to show that the preaching of the Gospel has been carried everywhere by the Apostles, and that the Jews have been unwilling to receive it. The first thing that strikes us is a remarkable parallel between the Epistle to the Romans and the Gospel according to John, as follows:

They have not all obeyed (ὁπῆκουσαν) the Gospel; for Isaiah says: Lord, who hath believed our report?

(Rom. x. 16.)

They did not believe on him, that the word of the prophet Isaiah might be fulfilled which he said, Lord, who hath believed our report, etc.? therefore they could not believe, etc.

(Joh. xii. 37, 38.)

This is a curious coincidence in quotation and in interpretation, and it shows that if a *Testimony Book* is involved, it is one which is in common use by Paul and the Fourth Gospel. Let us then see whether we are working over an area of *Testimonies*.

If we turn to Justin Martyr, we shall find the very same conjunction of the Psalms and Isaiah as we find in Romans: Justin is explaining to Trypho that the twelve (sic!) bells upon the high-priest's robe are the twelve apostles; that is why David says

Their sound is gone out into all the earth,
Their words to the end of the earth;

and Isaiah, speaking in the person of the Apostles who are telling Christ that they do not believe their report, but they will believe the power of Him who sent them, speaks on that account in this wise: "Lord, who hath believed our report, and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? etc." (Just. *Dial.* 42.)

Justin quotes the passage from the Psalms also in his address to the Roman Senate: "Listen," says he, "also how it was foretold concerning those who proclaimed his teaching and intimated his epiphany" (followed by Ps. xix. 2-5; Just. 1 *Ap.* 40). The same point of view is taken by Tertullian who says

Indubitate quod in omnem terram exire habebat praedicatio Apostolorum.
(*Adv. Judaeos*, 5.)

So Bar Ṣalibi:

The Apostles after they had received the Spirit went forth to preach: therefore David said: "In all the earth went forth their message, etc."
(Bar Ṣalibi, vii. 37.)

The section that this is taken from is introduced as being "concerning the preaching of the Apostles." We notice further that Isaiah lii. 7 ("How beautiful are the feet, etc.") which precedes the passages which we have been studying, is one of the *Testimonies* concerning the Gospel in Gregory of Nyssa (c. xv. p. 319).

Thus every quotation in this part of the chapter turns out to be a part of one or other of the extant *Testimony Books*. We are working on a nexus of conventional quotations, which cannot be derived from St Paul.

At this point we strike a difficulty: for the interlocutor puts himself forward again and shakes his hand menacingly and utters his formula:

ἀλλὰ λέγω· μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν;

It is implied that a statement has been made to the effect that "Israel did not hear." This is not directly stated, but it may very well find its equivalent in Semitic speech in the words "they did not obey the Gospel": ἤκουσαν and ὑπήκουσαν being traced back to a common original. Or it may be that a verse like Jeremiah vii. 13 has dropped from the text; or some similar verse from Jeremiah:

I spake unto you, rising up early and speaking, but ye *heard* not.

In that case the disobedience of the Jews is not to the words of the Apostles, but to those of the prophets. This is one of the first counts in Cyprian's indictment of the Jews:

Quod prophetis non crediderint et eos interfecerint

and the proof text is as follows:

Apud Hieremiam Dominus dicit: Misi ad vos servos meos prophetas, ante lucem mittebam, et non *audiebatis me* neque intendebatis auribus vestris.

(Jer. xxv. 4 in Cyp. *Test.* i. 2.)

On the whole we incline to the belief that the primitive nucleus of this block of *Testimonies* was an attack on the Jews for not having listened to the words of the prophets, when they proclaimed good things concerning Jerusalem. There is still some obscurity in the tradition, but the main points of the identification between the Pauline language and current testimonies are sufficiently clear.

Now let us turn back to Rom. ix. 27, where the text follows a previous statement, the well-worn testimony of Hosea concerning Ammi and Lo-Ammi. The argument appears to have brought in the objector: for the expression

Ἡσαΐας δὲ κρᾶζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ,

is pro-Judaic rather than the opposite; and the text which follows introduces the doctrine of the *Remnant* who are to be saved, and it is clearly the *Remnant of Israel*. Moreover, the objector, whether Paul posing as Jew, or whoever he may be, goes on to expand the doctrine of the *Remnant* in language which itself is of the nature of a reply: "A seed has been left us, else had we been as Sodom" (Is. i. 9). This is really a reply to the common anti-Judaic attack, based on the language of Isaiah, and identifying Israel and its rulers with Sodom and Gomorrah (Is. i. 9, 10).

In Gregory of Nyssa we actually find the rulers of Israel dropped, and the passage in Isaiah runs as follows:

Esaias de Judaeis: Audite verbum Domini *fili Sodomorum*: attendite legi Dei, populus Gomorrae.

This is even stronger than Isaiah himself; and it should be noted. The Apocalypse itself is in evidence that Jerusalem could be called spiritually *Sodom* and *Egypt* (*Apoc.* xi. 8): and the early *Testimony Books* will confirm the suggested nomenclature. Justin Martyr, for instance, is very strong on the question of Sodom and the *Remnant* in his *Apology* to the Roman Senate. For instance, in c. 53 his argument is based entirely on *Testimonies*: he does not expect his hearers to believe in a crucified man who is the First-born of God and the Judge of All, unless he produces *Testimonies* (μαρτύρια) from the time anterior to His human appearance. By the same method he undertakes to prove that Gentile believers

are more in number, truer and more trustworthy than the Jews ("Sing, O barren, etc."); only a small remnant would be saved from the Jews: Isaiah, speaking in their person, attests it.

Then follows Is. i. 9 and the doctrine of the Remnant in biblical language, but it is not taken from Romans; as he affirms definitely in making his quotations:

ἀπαγγελοῦμεν τὰ εἰρημένα διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου.
προεῖπε τὸ ἅγιον προφητικὸν πνεῦμα διὰ Ἡσαίου.

Thus the doctrine of the *Remnant* is not Paul's invention, it is already in the *Testimony Book*, properly buttressed. We find that Paul returns again to this doctrine in c. xi. v. 2, "God has not repudiated his people"; so the argument stands, with the point conceded to the objector: but it is immediately picked up again with an adverse anti-Judaic quotation, to prove that Elijah is counsel *against* Israel, and denounces them for having killed the prophets. A counter-oracle is promptly produced; it is conceded that there is a *Remnant* according to the election of Grace. Now, surely, it will be said, we are on Pauline ground, properly so called. Do not let us be hasty in our conclusions; we found the doctrine of the *Remnant* in Justin's *Apology*; a queer place to find it, but then the address to the Roman Senate is much more like a treatise against the Jews than any *Apology* which ever was or could be presented.

Let us examine the *Dialogue against Trypho* where we shall find frequent references to the *Remnant*; for example,

ἐλπίζων τινὰ ἐξ ὑμῶν δύνασθαι εὐρεθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ χάριν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου Σαβαώθ περιλειφθέντος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον σωτηρίαν. (*Dial.* c. 32.)

Justin hopes that some one at least among his hearers will be found among the *Remnant according to the Grace* from the Lord of Sabaoth.

Again:

God has hidden from you the secret wisdom of the words (of the prophets) except in the case of certain persons, to whom, *according to the Grace* of his great compassion, he has left a seed for salvation, as Isaiah says, etc.:

πλὴν τῶν οἷς κατὰ χάριν τῆς πολυσπλαγχνίας αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἔφη Ἡσαίας, ἐγκατέλιπε σπέρμα εἰς σωτηρίαν. (*Dial.* 55.)

Again:

I would not venture to express an opinion in the case of any individual Jew whether he is, or is not of those that can be saved *according to the Grace* from the Lord of Sabaoth:

ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ χάριν τὴν ἀπὸ Κυρίου Σαβαώθ σωθῆναι δυναμένων. (*Dial.* 64.)

These passages show that Justin held that the *Remnant* was a Remnant of Grace: it is the Pauline doctrine in words, but is not derived from Paul. It is a formula from the *Testimony Book* and from Isaiah.

There is another extraordinary coincidence in language between Justin and Paul. When Justin comes to discuss the case of the intercession of Elijah against Israel, he introduces it as follows:

καὶ γὰρ Ἡλίας περὶ ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐντυγχάνων οὕτως λέγει· Κύριε, τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν κτέ. (*Dial.* 39.)

It is almost exactly the introductory formula of Rom. xi. 2. The first impulse is to assert that Justin is quoting Paul without saying so, but this will not do; the passage quoted is a conventional *Testimony* to prove that the Jews slay the prophets: it is in Cyprian (*Test.* i. 2) and in Lactantius (*Inst.* iv. 11), *e.g.*

Item in Regnorum tertio Helias ad Dominum: Aemulando aemulatus sum,
(Cyp. *l.c.*)
etc.

It appears then that the Intercession of Elias against Israel was in the primitive *Testimony Book*, with an introductory phrase, which is reproduced in Romans and in Justin.

We now pass on to remark that the anti-Judaic matter which appears to stop at the end of c. xi., and to be replaced there by a short treatise on Christian ethics, reappears unexpectedly at c. xv. v. 8, in such a way as to suggest that there has been either displacement or interpolation in the text of the Epistle. What follows in c. xv. is certainly closely related to the pro-ethnic and anti-Judaic matters that we have been discussing. We resume, in fact, the question of the *Calling of the Gentiles* and we have it from the *Testimony Book*. For example, Bar Ṣalibi says:

Isaiah (sic) said concerning the Gentiles; Rejoice ye Gentiles with his people.
(Deut. xxxii. 43.)

This is Romans xv. 10.

Cyprian says (*Test.* i. 22):

Item illic (sc. apud Esaiam prophetam): Et erit in illa die radix Iesse, qui surget imperare gentibus; in illum gentes sperabunt, et erit requies eius honor.
(The same in Lact. *Inst.* iv. 13.)

Athanasius, in his treatise on the *Incarnation*, discusses the unbelief of the Jews and shows that the calling of the Gentiles was foretold:

For there shall be a root of Jesse, and he that arises to rule the Gentiles,
in him shall the Gentiles hope. (Athanasius. *l.c.* 35.)

Bar Salibi on the calling of the Gentiles (vii. 27):

Isaiah said, There shall be a root, etc.

All of these writers are working from their collection of Prophecies, and it is reasonable to conclude that Paul is doing the same.

It is possible that these *Testimony* verses in c. xv. may constitute a misplaced page in the Epistle.

We have now sufficiently elaborated our hypothesis, and are in a position to affirm that for the right understanding of the Epistle to the Romans, a parallel study is necessary of the earliest and most comprehensive books on *Testimonies*. It is surprising to find how little is left of scriptural quotation in the Epistle after this test is applied, and we may affirm, at all events for Romans, that St Paul was a traditionalist, operating with conventional and approved matter, to a degree far beyond what we should *a priori* have expected.

It will be clear from what has preceded that a knowledge of the content and method of the *Testimony Book* is fundamental for the understanding of the authors and compositions that make use of it. When we say, for example, that the next commentary on Galatians or Romans or Hebrews will have to take account of the new fact that has been brought to light, we mean something more than the addition of a few explanatory notes, or the erasure of a few notes that are based upon misconceptions. The whole outlook upon the relation of St Paul to the Christian doctrine is affected by the enquiry which has been adumbrated. It may easily be the case that Paul has been altogether misunderstood: Prof. Bacon has recently been suggesting in his essay on the fundamentally Roman character of the Gospel of Mark that the position of Paul is not on the extreme left of the politics of the Church, but that he occupies the centre and that his task is that of reconciliation, and that this is more evidently the case in his letter to the Romans than in that to the Galatians. The test applied by Prof. Bacon is the anti-Judaic reaction, which he finds more violent in Galatians than in Romans.

It will be said, perhaps, that such a result might have been anticipated, for in one case the Apostle is the very focus of a controversy with the Judaizers, in the other he is the missionary of a peaceful propagandist movement. It will be interesting to examine the situation with the lost *Testimony Book* open before us.

We have shown that in the Epistle to the Romans there is an

imaginary objector who breaks the current of the Pauline argument and must be met either by concession or by refutation. His objections are evidently made to certain statements in the *Testimony Book*. They are introduced, as we have shown, by a characteristic formula,

ἀλλὰ λέγω, μή....

and he expects to elicit a negative reply. Four times he asks his questions: "is it true," he says, "surely it cannot be true" that

Israel did not know (x. 19),

or that they did not hear (x. 18),

or that God has abandoned His people (xi. 1),

or that they have stumbled so as to fall (xi. 11)?

A reference to the existing books of anti-Judaic quotation will show that all these enquiries are brought from outside into the Pauline argument: they did not arise, of necessity, from the text of the Epistle. As we have shown, sometimes the answer to the query is missing, and sometimes the text is in confusion. A glance at Cyprian will show that the first two statements are found in his opening section: the fourth query is evidently based on the same statement as in Rom. x. 33 that the Israel of God had stumbled at the stumbling-stone: and this doctrine that Christ is the Jewish "scandal" is one of the earliest bits of anti-Judaic dogma that we know. It is when we come to St Paul's answer to the real or possible objector, that we find it necessary to revise our conception of the Pauline position. In the three cases where a reply is given we have a modification of the statement which the anti-Judaic document presents: he will not allow that God has abandoned his people *en bloc*; he accompanies his characteristic *μή γένοιτο* with an explanation which, at least, puts the Fall and the Rejection of Israel in an entirely new light. Their Fall has been the salvation of the Gentiles, their Rejection does not apply to the salvable Remnant¹. It is clear that this is not the method of an extremist, anxious to make the worst case possible for a body of people from whom he has separated; it is the position of a conciliator that is occupied by the Apostle. He still belongs to both of the disputing parties. Occasionally he gives the objector more space than would be occupied by a protesting question, inviting denial of some current

¹ It should be noticed that this is precisely the position taken up by St Luke in the so-called *Song of Simeon*, that "this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel"; the child is, in fact, the "scandal" stone of the Jews.

opinion or oracle; He allows the Jewish objector to state the case (*ὑπὲρ Ἰσραήλ*) on behalf of his compatriots, instead of limiting himself to statements against Israel (*πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραήλ*, x. 21) and (*κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*, xi. 2).

It has not, as far as we know, been recognised that in ix. 27, 28 we have the answer to a missing question, just as we have in ix. 19 the question to a missing answer. It is, however, certain that the statement taken from Isaiah x. 22 in regard to the Remnant that are salvable is pro-Judaic, and the proof is made that, but for this statement, we Jews should have been as Sodom and Gomorrah; but this is a reply to the previous use of the opening chapters of Isaiah which identify the people of Israel, themselves and their rulers, with the rulers of Sodom and the people of Gomorrah. St Paul upholds the protest against the doctrine of the divine anger against Israel, which was too extreme for him to endorse. That is, he carries over into his letter a pro-Judaic statement which is meant to modify, in a Rabbinic manner, a current anti-Judaic doctrine. This conciliatory statement shows how different is the missionary who writes in Romans, from the defender of the faith, who pours out his anti-Judaic lava in Galatians. Thus the case is clear that much of the existing teaching, with regard to the parties that attach themselves to the great teachers of Christianity, may have to be seriously re-considered, in view of the discovery that the *Testimony Book* contains primitive Christian theology.

CHAPTER III

TESTIMONIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

THE same line of reasoning which we found was employed in the *Epistle to the Romans* against the Jews, we shall find again in the *Epistle to the Galatians* where Paul is dealing with Judaisers. The latter letter is cognate with the former as well as nearly contemporary. They are alike and yet unlike—alike in the use of the original material of the primitive Christian message, and unlike in the handling of that material. This is only to say in other words that one letter bears the name “Romans” and the other “Galatians.” The difference, then, is not fundamental but literary. The ancient material is not used to one end in “Romans” and to another in “Galatians.” In the former letter the *Testimonia*, upon which argument and plea throughout the document are based, are more closely gathered together, for instance, within the compass of chapters ix.–xi.; whilst in the latter letter they are so expressed as to be its literary and religious warp and woof. An intelligent reading of the two letters will demonstrate that Paul is not engaged in theology in the “Romans,” and with controversy in the “Galatians”; but that in both letters he is employing the polemic and evangelic phrases of the one and first Christian message, only in “Romans” he has more space, and in “Galatians” he is more direct. The shortness of the Galatian letter would, of course, make this necessary. And, moreover, it is to be expected that here he would use the *Testimony Book* with a pervading familiarity, for he is writing to those who have been won from the old to the new faith and are in danger of returning to Judaism from evangelical anti-Judaism. They, having heard the message, will recognise both allusion to and assertion of its contents. Hence the character of the *Epistle to the Galatians*. Thus in contrasting the claims of the old and new faiths, the bond-maid Jerusalem and the free-woman Jerusalem, Paul quotes Is. liv. 1 (“Sing, barren one, etc.”). This is ancient testimony matter, as may be seen from Cyprian, *Test.* i. 20, Just. i. *Ap.* 53, and so on. Even the famous passage

which tells us that "the Just shall live by faith," is in the first instance a testimonium, as Cyprian I. 5 witnesses; and there, for example, it has its proper force in an anti-Judaic complex of testimonies. It became famous through Luther, and not because of its primacy in the collection whence it was taken. Late systematic theology is not the same as primitive Christianity. Its companion testimonium, Gen. xv. 6, which also is in the text of the letter, receives larger place in *Testimony* authorities as can be seen, for instance, from: Barnabas XIII. 7; Irenaeus, *Apostolical Preaching*, 24, 35; Justin Martyr, *Trypho*, 92, 119; Isidore Hispalensis, *de Fide Catholica contra Judaeos* II. 2. 10, II. 22. 1; Evagrius, *Altercatio*, v. 18. The quality of the faith enjoined by Paul's use of Habakkuk II. 4 takes on, as already has been suggested, its true values when the passage is put back in its original place among the excerpts in the document which was the foundation to the first anti-Judaic polemic and gospel. It is well to notice also that what Luther made so much of, and later students have been inclined to reckon as a contribution to Christian thought due to the theological genius of Paul, is an item in a pre-Pauline document. For among other matters it helps to demonstrate that the editors of the various testimony texts were not transcribing Paul's use of the Old Testament in the Galatians and other letters, but that Paul was as dependent on the *Testimony Book* as any other first century Christian preacher. This question of the priority of the ancient source to Paul, or of Paul to it, receives light, as will be shown, from the compiler of the Cyprianic *Testimonia* as well as from earlier writers. The recognition of similar situations is important for the history of doctrine; and it may be that we have been searching in the wrong direction for the gulf which opened between Paul and the Jerusalem Pillars.

A notable feature of the Galatians, then, is this: although it stands very early in the list of Paul's letters, yet it affords evidence that already the *Testimony Book* was a familiar Christological treasury. This fact appears not so much in the testimonies quoted as in the explicit mention of, and in the influence exerted by, certain of the chief categories in the book; and they go to make up the *raison d'être* of the book and of its often strange collocations of testimony. Indeed, the Epistle, when reduced to its scheme, discloses that it is equal to a few *Testimony* headings or divisions. This can be illustrated from the text of the Epistle. The opening

chapter is biographical: the second chapter is of the same order, though into it the writer begins to bring the distinctive notes of the message committed to him—thus in (1) ii. 7 is the defining phrase, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας; (2) ii. 16 f. to iii. 11, ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται; (3) iii. 29, εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ; (4) iv. 26, ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ; (5) v. 2, ὅτι ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς κτέ; (6) v. 6, ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὐτε περιτομή κτέ; (7) vi. 16, Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ.

It will be noticed that these divisions can be paralleled from Cyprian's *Testimonia* without difficulty. Their equivalents in the headings of that book are:

- (1) I. 8. Quod circumcisio prima carnalis evacuata sit et secunda spiritalis repromissa sit.
- (2) I. 5. Nihil posse Judaeos intelligere de Scripturis, nisi prius crediderint in Christum.
- (3) I. 19. Quod duo populi praedicti sint, major et minor, id est vetus Judaeorum et novus qui esset ex nobis futurus.
- (4) I. 9–10. Quod lex prior quae per Moysen data est cessatura esset; quod lex nova dari haberet.
- (5) I. 13. Quod jugum vetus evacuaretur et jugum novum daretur.
- (6) I. 8. Quod circumcisio prima carnalis evacuata sit et secunda spiritalis repromissa sit.
- (7) I. 19–20. Quod duo populi praedicti sint, etc. as (3). Quod ecclesia quae prius sterilis fuerat plures filios habitura esset ex Gentibus, quam quot Synagoga ante habuisset.

The chief critical suggestion that may arise from the study of schemata so like to one another, is that they are mutually dependent: Cyprian, or the compiler of the work that goes under Cyprian's name, may have been influenced by the writings of Paul, or indeed it may be said by the use of the Old Testament in the books of the New Testament. This view would follow naturally from Professor Toy's¹ examination of the question, since he holds that the New Testament writers handle the Old according to a Talmudic manner *plus* their Messianic hope. This suggestion may be argued, by way of illustration, in the case of (2) I. 5. An examination of the testimonies under this head will show, however, that the Latin editor of the *Testimony Book* added to the initial testimonia a direct reference to the Epistle to the Galatians, when he says "Item apostolus ad Galatas," and quoted Galatians iii. 6–9. For that passage embodies and expands the last of those initial testimonia,

¹ Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament*, 1884, 21.

namely Gen. xv. 6. Further, it is to be demonstrated from Irenaeus's tract on the *Apostolical Preaching*, 35, that the heading is earlier than Cyprian, for it is the subject of that chapter¹; and also that in compiling his catechetical tract this division of the *Testimony Book* I. 5—which book was for him and his successors the Christological basis of catechetical teaching in the Early Church—stopped at the testimonium embodied in the Galatians where the reference is added in the Cyprianic *Testimonia*. It is to be regarded as well that the two *Testimonia*, Gen. xv. 6 and Hab. ii. 4, are quoted one after the other². What Irenaeus could use in this manner was not matter of his own planning. These several conclusions in turn throw new light upon the title of his tractate, *Démonstration of Apostolical Preaching*. There was a much more vital literary "motif" in the making of primitive sermons than Norden's *Agnostos Theos* (1913) has recorded. The headings, or divisions of thought, can be taken back still earlier by means of the *Epistle of Barnabas*; and the testimonium, which has been so markedly pronounced to be such in Cyprian's *Testimony Book*, occurs in one of the passages wherein Barnabas makes use of the divisions or categories we have specified. Taking the subjects, or rather branches of the one subject, as they appear in Paul's letter, they work out in Barnabas as follows:

c. ix. 1: πὼς περιέτεμεν ἡμῶν τὴν καρδίαν; ii. 6: ὁ καινὸς νόμος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, together with xiii. 7 in which is inset the testimonium Gen. xv. 6, and xiv.; vi. 19: κληρονόμοι τῆς διαθήκης Κυρίου γενέσθαι, or vii. 5: τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ καινοῦ προσφέρειν.

In many ways the Barnabas writing is the most illuminating commentary on Galatians, because it has conserved at length what Paul has compressed into a few vivid phrases or sentences, not only *Testimonia* evidence, but better still, something of the mode of interpretation inspired by the same book. Its value is not to be judged from some of its eccentricities.

It is well to remark at this point that the parallel which has been made between the groundwork of the Epistle and that of the *Testimony Book* should not be considered as a parallel of a formal order. There must have been a plan upon which the testimonia were gathered. That plan would issue in divisions, and these would soon gather formal designations. The difference between

¹ Cf. ed. 1907, Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 20.

² Cf. also Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* iv. 10. 2, iv. 15, iv. 56. 1.

the *Adversus Judaeos* of Tertullian, which has the heads in an implicit form, and the Cyprianic *Testimonia*, which has them in an explicit form, brings out this comparison in Latin *Testimony* documents of approximately near date. Even Tertullian's keen need to put things in his own way has not remade the old groundwork. He has only used it with something like Pauline freedom. Nor is it to be supposed that he is working on a larger *Testimony Book* than Paul's because the range of the subject in *Adversus Judaeos* is greater than in the letter to the Galatians. Tertullian is at work on the whole of the testimonia, Paul chooses those which his letter demands. But it may be asked, do not the Cyprianic *Testimonia* (II. 20 ff.) go far to confirm the view which, for example, Professor Stanton represents¹? This view is that a small collection of Old Testament extracts was gathered together in such a manner as to be the biography of the Lord in prophecies. On the surface, a portion of the Cyprianic *Testimonia* would appear to uphold this view. A reference to Tertullian's writing will show that he has testimonies concerning the Birth, type of Life, Death and Future Life of Jesus Christ. These matters are generically necessary to the first explanation of Himself. He could not make Himself known without them. These matters also would, in course of time, be divided into detail and labelled in harmony with the actual story of the Gospels. The process is seen going forward in the Cyprianic text, and complete in the Spanish text of Isidore's time. The four great facts of Christ, Birth, Life, Death and Life again, are not treated in the primary *Testimony Book* as biographical factors but as explanatory factors; in other words, as Matthew and Paul and Barnabas used them.

We find, then, that a writer in the Apostolic age is teaching Christianity from the same anti-Judaic source as Paul: and that he is grouping his teaching under the same natural divisions as the Apostle. In other words, both method and matter of this Gospel which Paul writes about are primitively Christian. There is neither old nor new Rabbinism in the teaching of Paul, nor even in the sometimes clouded exegesis of Barnabas. Linder's view², for instance, that in Galatians iv. 20-31 a novel rabbinical dialectic manifests itself is to be corrected by the knowledge that the passage is built upon the *Testimony Book*, as an equation like

¹ *Ut supra.*

² *Zeitschrift für Wissen. Theologie*, 1900, 223 ff.

Is. liv. 1 = Cyprian 1. 20 declares. How closely the subject of this section of Paul's letter is interwoven in the source may be tested in Justin, *Trypho*, 134, Irenaeus, *Apostolical Preaching*, 94, Isidore Hisp. *de Fide*, II. i. 7, Evagrius, *Altercatio*, v. 20, Origen, *In Lib. Reg. Hom.* 1. 18. Paul was a Jew; but he is a Christian, and for him even the Jewish Scriptures have been liberated into a newness of meaning by an altogether fresh method of exegesis; for such is the name we should give the method. And though to our late Western eyes these new powers, as represented by the *Testimonia*, may often seem to have exercised themselves waywardly in their choice of literary material, yet none the less the strange choice and manner of explanation are parts of the vernal message which came to Paul and the world, as he says:

δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[V.B.]

CHAPTER IV

TESTIMONIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

It would take us too far, both as regards time and available space, to apply our new canon of interpretation in detail to the successive epistles of the Canonical New Testament; and it might perhaps have been judged sufficient to have shown the dependence of two of the oldest Pauline Epistles upon a previous collection of *Testimonies*, and to leave to other students the further examination of the extent to which the influence of such a collection upon the New Testament writings can be detected and allowed for in the interpretation of the separate books.

It will, however, have been seen that in the course of the investigation we have had to walk warily in the identification of particular testimonies. We must not leave St Paul without any Old Testament except that which is contained in a popular handbook—that would be to reduce *Testimonies* to absurdity: neither must we say that every coincidence in anti-Judaic quotation between a New Testament writer (say St Paul) and an early Patristic writer (say Justin Martyr), is due to the use of a common source; for if St Paul is entitled to an Old Testament of his own, Justin Martyr must be allowed a New Testament to go with his Old Testament, and may sometimes betray, even in dealing with Trypho the Jew, that he is taking his hearers to the Old *via* the New. Every case must be investigated on its own merits.

Now when we turn to the Epistle to the Ephesians we shall find the hypothesis of a *Testimony Book* continues to be illuminating. For example, in the first chapter, we are introduced to the 110th Psalm, as the proof that Christ sits at the right hand of the Father. This is followed by the proof that all things have been put under His feet, from the eighth Psalm. It is not difficult to show that this transition is a genuine piece of *Testimony* work: the very same current of thought can be traced in 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26, and elsewhere: we shall see it also in Heb. i. 13, followed by Heb. ii. 6-8.

But here is a case that is more difficult to decide. In Heb. iii. 8 we have a quotation from Ps. lxviii. 18:

He ascended on high, he led captive captivity; He gave gifts to men.

The text is accompanied by a homiletic explanation as to the nature of the gifts, which are identified with the various spiritual offices in the Church. Now the question arises whether St Paul is the first to use the Psalm in this way: did he find it already in use, and has he continued and modified the use made of it?

We turn to Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* and we find as follows:

God knows (says Justin) that every day some are becoming disciples to the Name of Christ and are forsaking the way of error, *each of whom receives gifts according to his capacity and is illuminated by the name of this Christ of ours; for one receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of strength, another of healing, another of foreknowledge, another of teaching, another of the fear of God.*

Trypho said:

I want you to know that in talking this way you are irrational.

Said Justin:

Listen, Sir, and know that I am neither mad nor irrational; but it was foretold that after the ascent of Christ to heaven, he should lead us captive out of error and give us his gifts. The words are these: He ascended on high, he led captivity captive: he gave gifts to men. Those who have received gifts from the Christ can show from the prophetic Scriptures that it is those who are wise in their own conceits who are the ones who are destitute of sense.

(Justin, *Dial.* 39.)

Now here we notice striking coincidence between Justin Martyr and the Epistle to the Ephesians: there is, to begin with, the concurrence in the quotation from the 68th Psalm; next there is Justin's statement that *each of those who become Christ's disciples receives gifts from Him*; this statement agrees closely with what is said in Ephesians in introducing the passage from the Psalm:

To each one of us is given grace, according to the measure of Christ's gift.

We should naturally conclude that Justin, though quoting the 68th Psalm to Trypho, is really quoting from Ephesians, for he has the same introductory language that we find in the Epistle. When, however, we come to the scrutiny of the gifts as classified, we find an extraordinary variation. St Paul says they are the Christian offices, those of Apostle, Prophet, Evangelist, Pastor and Teacher. These five offices are the gifts of the ascended Christ.

With Justin it is a very different enumeration: the gifts are the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit in the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, with some significant variations: "Understanding, counsel, strength, *healing, foreknowledge, teaching*, the fear of God." In Isaiah xi. 2 it runs thus: "Wisdom and understanding, counsel and strength, knowledge and piety, and the fulness of the fear of God."

Clearly Justin is drawing upon Isaiah, when he comes to specify Christian gifts; he does not profess to be defining Christian orders. Will the coincidence in the manner in which the 68th Psalm is introduced outweigh the divergence in the enumeration of the gifts? Shall we say Justin shows acquaintance with Ephesians?

We turn back to 1 Cor. xii. 28, and we find another enumeration of Christian gifts, and this time without any reference to the 68th Psalm. The catalogue is now as follows: Apostles, *Prophets, Teachers*, Powers, Charismata of *Healings*, Helps, Governments, Varieties of Tongues.

Somewhat earlier in the same chapter we have again an enumeration of spiritual gifts:

To each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit for his advantage. One has through the Spirit the gift of Wisdom, another of Knowledge, another of faith, another of Charismata of Healings, another of the operation of Works of Power, another of Prophecy, another of the Discernment of Spirits, another of Varieties of Tongues, another their Interpretation. (1 Cor. xii. 8-10.)

It is quite clear that St Paul is here under the influence of the description of the Sevenfold gifts of the Spirit in the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, though I do not know that any commentator has detected quotation. We may equate the Gift of Wisdom with the Spirit of Wisdom, the Gift of Knowledge with the Spirit of Knowledge, the operations of Power (*δυνάμεις*) with the Spirit of Power (*ἰσχύς*). We are then taken back to Isaiah by the way of First Corinthians. On the road we pick up Justin again, who is clearly heading for the same goal, and we have the coincidence with Justin in the Gift of Healing and the Gift of Foreknowledge and the Gift of Teaching, where Paul has Charismata of Healings and the Gift of Prophecy and the Gift of Teaching. It must be admitted that Justin's work is here independent of Paul; it was not through Paul's language that Justin found out that the gifts of the 68th Psalm were specified in the eleventh chapter of Isaiah: when, however, we detected with Justin's help that Paul had a submerged reference to the Sevenfold Gifts of the Spirit, we were

entitled to claim that Justin gives us an earlier form of the enumeration of the Gifts. Where Justin varies from Isaiah, as in the reference to Healing and Prophecy and Teaching, he is on the line of explanation which will presently bring us to the later Pauline catalogues of Christian officers and offices.

It appears, then, that there was before Paul's time some documentary statement as to the distribution of Christian gifts among believers. Every believer received some such gift, and the proof was made, as St Paul and Justin make it, from the 68th Psalm. If one wants to know more in detail what these gifts are, both St Paul and Justin direct us to the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, and especially to the Healing and Prophetic and Teaching Gifts.

We have gone into this instance in some detail; the passage quoted in Ephesians was a striking one; it was necessary to prove it to be an original *Testimony* of the first period. We are reminded that in the *Odes of Solomon*, Christ Himself is made to quote it: "that I may lead a good captivity to freedom"; this shows again the currency of the quotation, but the Odists are not using the passage in the Pauline sense, but in an independent manner. We have little doubt that the 68th Psalm was used very early as a proof-passage for the Ascension.

We can see the correctness of the foregoing proof of Justin's independence of the Epistle to the Ephesians, if we turn to another chapter of this *Dialogue*.

Trypho asks in c. lxxxvii how it comes about that these prophecies in the eleventh chapter of Isaiah concerning the gifts of the Spirit to the one that comes out of the Root of Jesse can have their fulfilment in Christ, whom Justin has been affirming to be pre-existent to all creation; was he, then, destitute of these gifts that they should thus be bestowed upon him in their predicted fulness?

Justin has a long reply, which turns on the fact that Christ is the Crown of the ancient prophets, and the Rest and Cessation of the Holy Spirit, as far as the Jewish line of prophecy is concerned. The Spirit of Prophecy rested, *i.e.* ceased in Him. It was continued, however, in the Christian line of believers, *for it had been foretold that there should be gifts*, which he gives to those that believe on Him, as *each one of us is worthy* in his sight (ὡς ἄξιον ἕκαστον ἐπίσταται). And it was foretold that it should so happen after His return to Heaven, as I said before and now repeat.

It says: *He ascended up on high, he led captive a captivity, and gave gifts to the sons of men.* Justin goes on to explain the transfer of the gifts to Christian believers. Here, then, we have again the conjunction of the 68th Psalm and the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, and the apparently Pauline statement that the gifts of the ascended Christ are bestowed upon each of his followers. These gifts are in the Church dispersedly, which are in Him in totality. Justin has this distributive feature so strongly in his mind, that he carries it back into the Old Testament. Solomon had the Spirit of Wisdom, Daniel of understanding and counsel, etc. The prophetic gifts of the ancient saints converge on Christ, and from Him diverge again.

It seems clear that Justin cannot have made this connection between the Psalm and the Prophet, by merely reading a verse or two in Ephesians; as we have said, he would never have detected Isaiah in St Paul, nor would he have easily connected Isaiah and the Psalm. What seemed to be a tell-tale link between Justin and Paul ("each one of us") is rather a proof that they both depend upon anterior interpretations.

CHAPTER V

TESTIMONIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

WHEN we turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews, the problem of the relation of the Epistle to the extant collections of *Testimonia* takes on a new form. It is quite easy to show that much of the biblical matter in Hebrews agrees closely with parallel quotations in the anti-Judaic writers, so that Hebrews, as well as Romans and Galatians, presupposes the *Book of Testimonies*: but the peculiarity in Hebrews consists, as we shall see, in the fact that there are whole blocks of submerged *Testimonies*, which never show their heads above the surface, but are the foundations upon which the discourse of the writer is built up and sustained.

The first instance of such submerged blocks of *Testimonies* is in the Exordium of the Epistle, one of the most splendid passages in the whole of the New Testament, which produces upon the reader the impression of having been let down from above rather than of being built up from below. In the first four verses there are only three tell-tale words, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ, to betray the use of the Old Testament; but these are significant, and will recur and tell us that the 110th Psalm is a part of the armoury of the author of the Epistle: but whatever be the evidence of the direct language of these verses, the substance of their argument is built up out of the identification of Christ with the Wisdom of God, through whom the worlds were made, that Wisdom which is described as the Effulgence of God in the book known as the Wisdom of Solomon; and this identification and description is the foundation stone of the Christology of the *Book of Testimonies* and of the involved primitive Christian creed. In this sense the Prologue to the Epistle is built up on submerged *Testimonies*.

The same thing occurs in quite another region of thought in the argument of the fourth chapter which, as we shall see presently, is made up out of a series of typological identifications between the Jesus of the New Testament and the Joshuas of the Old. Here the foundations were so completely hidden, that no commentator

on the Hebrews ever suspected their existence, until attention was drawn to the matter in a recent issue of the *Expositor*¹.

Sometimes we have what may be called a partial submergence of the Biblical and antecedent sources of the Epistle. For instance, every one who reads the document carefully is struck by the emphasis which is laid on the novelty and the betterness of the Christian dispensation as contrasted with Judaism. We have a better covenant established on better promises, and it is a new covenant that replaces one that waxes old and is ready to vanish away; the comprehensive contrasts between the old and the new form the central argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews; but, if we want to form a correct estimate of them, we must turn to another document where the matter is stated more baldly and more in detail. The heads of the *Testimonies* which are given in the first book of Cyprian's *Testimonies against the Jews*, tell us that there is to be a New Circumcision, a new Law-giving, a new Covenant, a new Baptism, a new Yoke, a new Priesthood, a new Temple, a new Sacrifice, and that all the prior types of these were marked for extinction and oblivion. This is the method of the writer of the Epistle, and when we find that it is worked out with frequent coincidences in the Scriptures that are employed in the *Testimony Book* on the one hand and in the Epistle on the other, we can readily deduce that the *Book of Testimonies* is the Book of Origins of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

From these general considerations as to the foundations upon which the structure of this beautiful book is built up, we turn now to a more detailed examination of the Scriptures that are quoted. We begin to annotate our margins with anti-Judaica just as we did in the case of the Epistle to the Romans.

The first direct quotation is from Psalm ii. 7 ("Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee"): a very important verse, because it was the Adoptionist "Western" text for the voice from Heaven at the Baptism of the Lord. But is it an early *Testimony*? Here are some occurrences of it.

Tertullian, *adv. Judaeos*, 14:

Non audetis negare: quia, etsi negaretis, statim vobis in Psalmis, sicuti jam praelocuti sumus promissio Patris occurreret dicentis: *Filius meus es tu*, etc.

Followed by an extended argument that the words do not apply to Solomon.

¹ *Expositor* for July 1919.

Greg. Nyss. *Test.* i. p. 292, deserves special attention:

τίς δὲ πρὸς τίνα ἔλεγεν· Δεῦτε, καταβάντες συγχέωμεν τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτῶν· ἡ δὴλον πρὸς ὃν εἶπεν, Ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε; καὶ, πρὸ τοῦ ἡλίου τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ πρὸ τῆς σελήνης; καὶ πάλιν, Κύριος εἶπε πρὸς με, Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, αἰτῆσαι παρ' ἐμοῦ καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου, καὶ τὴν κατὰσχεσίν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς· καὶ πάλιν, Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν;

We notice that Nyssen introduces a number of well-known quotations with attached questions, such as "To whom did he say this?" "To whom do these words apply?" This is the feature that is imitated in Hebrews: "Did he ever say this to any—Angel?" Then we notice the familiar sequence καὶ πάλιν which occurs in Hebrews; and moreover, we have the quotation we are in search of, followed immediately by the one that comes next in Hebrews. The sequence is all right in Nyssen, but it has become meaningless in Hebrews, where the questions have been limited artificially to Angels. So we say Hebrews is quoting the sources of Nyssen and not Nyssen Hebrews.

Something of the same argument as we found in Tertullian occurs also in *Athanasius and Zacchaeus* (49 sqq.); where Athanasius asks Zacchaeus:

You have heard David speaking prophetically in the second Psalm and saying "The Lord said unto me, Thou art my Son, etc."

and Zacchaeus tries to show that David was talking about himself.

In *Timothy and Aquila* (p. 70) the quotation is even more interesting in its relation to Hebrews:

The Christian says: David speaks on this wise in the second Psalm, "The Lord said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee."

The Jew says: What is written in the second Psalm relates to Solomon: do you not know that before he was born, God spake about him saying, "I will be to him a father and he shall be to me a son"?

Then follows some curious matter from the lost *Testament of Solomon*. We notice again that the sequence in *Tim.* and *Aq.* is the same as in Hebrews, and that the argument is on the same lines as Tertullian, and that all who make these quotations are anti-Judaic. We need not hesitate to say that Hebrews is quoting from the *Testimony Book*, and if this be so, we cannot avoid the

suggestion that Paul, in his discourse in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia is also quoting from the same source when he says

As it is written also in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, etc.

The quotation in v. 6, "Let all the angels of God worship him," will be found in Greg. Nyss. (p. 293) with the attached question "Whom are they to worship and of what God are they the angels?" Nyssen has a little before quoted Ps. ii. 7 and 2 Sam. vii. 14 in the order of Hebrews.

As we have said, these questions, inserted in the midst of the body of *Testimonies* and furnishing their connecting link and elucidation, are often primitive in the anti-Judaic literature. It is quite possible that it is to such an early interlocutory that we owe the introduction of the angels in Heb. i. 4, 5. Gregory of Nyssa has grouped a number of proof-texts together, and prefixed the query,

τίς δὲ πρὸς τίνα ἔλεγεν;

as for example, "Let us go down and confound their speech," "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," "I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son." Who said these things and to whom did he speak?

Now it is clear from the existing anti-Judaica that one of the answers given (or assumed to be given) to such a question as "To whom did he say this," was that God was talking either to Himself or to the angels. The plural of majesty was not, however, commonly invoked; and the Christian advocate had an easy task to show that God could not say δεῦτε to Himself, and that He did not employ the angels as collaborators in the making of man, or in the dispersion of tongues. Thus the introduction of the angels in Heb. i. 4 may be due to an early interpretation of ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον or of δεῦτε, καταβάντες συγχέωμεν. We shall find the argument, for instance, in the *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili* (c. 9) in the following form:

Simon. Potuit hoc et ad angelos dixisse.

Theophilus. Erras, Judae! Cui unquam angelorum dixit Deus, Filius meus es tu, hodie genui te....

Angelis autem iubet ut Christum adorent, et iterum in Cantico Deuteronomii dicit: Laetamini gentes cum eo, et adorent eum omnes angeli Dei.

One needs to walk warily in quoting a comparatively late document like the *Altercatio*, which, in spite of its being derived

from an early Greek original, is sometimes subject to infiltration from the New Testament; but it does not seem that Hebrews has been drawn upon here: the quotation regarding the angels is taken direct from Deuteronomy, and is more extended than in Hebrews. The inference is that we are dealing also with *Testimony* matter in Hebrews, and that the question

τίτι γὰρ εἶπέν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων

was in the first draft of the book of quotations. There is submerged testimony leading up to the question of the text, and it is not far down from the surface of the argument.

We pass on now to an important block of *Testimonies* which conclude the first chapter: where we have Ps. xlv. 6, 7, followed by Ps. cii. 25-27 and Ps. cx. 1.

We shall be able to show conclusively the wide diffusion and the antiquity of these testimonies: let us begin with Gregory of Nyssa, and we find Ps. xlv. 6, 7 introduced as from David, accompanied by the remark, "You see that God is anointed by God: he assumed human nature and became the High Priest and Apostle of our confession"; and "after a little," says Nyssen, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, etc.," which is Psalm cii. 25-27, so that the sequence in Nyssen is the same as in Hebrews: it may be objected at this point that Nyssen, in describing Jesus as the High Priest and Apostle of our Confession is using the very language of Heb. iii. 1, and may, therefore, be supposed to be quoting from Hebrews. This is certainly possible, and the supposition would affect any argument drawn from coincidence between Nyssen and Hebrews, but it would not dispose of the hypothesis of quoted *Testimonies*, if further evidence should be forthcoming from other quarters. But are we sure that this description of Christ as High Priest and Apostle has its origin in the Epistle of the Hebrews? We remember that Justin Martyr several times describes Christ to the Roman Senate as Son of God and *Apostle*, Angel of God and *Apostle*, for example:

The Word of God is His Son, as we have said; and He is called Angel and Apostle.

... These words (of Moses) show that Jesus Christ is Son of God and Apostle.

... The one who really spoke to Moses was the Son of God, who also is called Angel and Apostle. (Justin: 1 *Ap.* 63.)

It is, therefore, well within the bounds of possibility that *Apostle* and *High Priest* may be a collocation borrowed from the Heads

of *Testimonies* as in the Cyprianic *Angelus et deus* and similar collocations elsewhere in Justin.

The real question for us, however, is to determine how far the extracts from the Psalms which we find grouped together in Greg. Nyss. and in Hebrews are fundamentally a part of the early *Books of Testimonies*. Here the evidence is, happily, abundant and incontrovertible. The proofs are constantly made, for example, as Nyssen does that "God is Christed by God"; for example, Irenaeus tells us, after quoting Ps. xlv. 7 ff.:

Utrosque enim Dei appellatione signavit Spiritus, et eum qui ungitur Filium et eum qui ungit, id est Patrem. (ed. Mass. III. vi. 1, p. 180.)

and Justin, who has to show that the Son is both God (*θεολογεῖται*) and Lord (*κυριολογεῖται*) puts side by side two of the three extracts of the Psalms to which we are referring:

(David says): "The Lord said unto my Lord Sit on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool"; and again in other words, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy Kingdom. . . . Therefore, O God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." (Justin, *Dial.* 56.)

When we look back at the passage quoted from Irenaeus, we find the same collocation as in Justin: "Sit on my right hand": he shows the colloquy of the Father with the Son. Cyprian and Lactantius quote the 45th Psalm to the same purpose in their collections of *Testimonia*: see Cyp. *Test.* II. 6 (Quod Deus Christus); and Lact. *Inst.* IV. 22: they also quote the 110th Psalm in its opening verses: see Cyp. *Test.* II. 26, and Lact. *Inst.* IV. 12.

It would be superfluous to quote further evidence: the passages from the Psalms were in the primitive *Testimony Book* and it is reasonable to infer that they passed from thence to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and not in the converse direction. These results will be found to have critical value in the study of the text of the New Testament and in its interpretation: for it stands to reason that if a passage of Scripture is transferred from the Old Testament to the New Testament by way of the *Testimony Book* it is not lawful to edit or interpret such a text in the New Testament so as to contradict the source from which it is derived. This is a valuable consideration in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which has suffered more than most parts of the New Testament from erratic handling. For instance, in the passage before us from Ps. xlv. 6 attempts have been made to obscure the fact that *ὁ θεός* is a

vocative, and, by altering the punctuation, to produce the impossible translation that "God is some one's throne for ever and ever," or that "some one's throne is God for ever and ever." Neither the Hebrew nor the Greek of the Psalm will bear these interpretations which can only be described as perverse and impossible: we may now add the verdict of ecclesiastical tradition, by which we do not mean the later fathers, who might have special reason for not wishing to translate ὁ θεός other than as a vocative, but that tradition which is older than the books of the New Testament in which it is embedded, and *a fortiori* much older than any existing ms. of the New Testament or comment on the same. In these matters we need to be recalled from subtlety to simplicity, from Grotius and Hort to the *Testimony Book*, if we are to understand the Scripture rightly.

Let us now pass on to say a few words with regard to the Old Testament extracts in the second chapter of Hebrews. The first passage is from the eighth Psalm, and relates to the subjection of all things under the feet of man. Since the text says alternatively *man* and *son of man*, which are really equivalent terms, the early interpreters catch at the second of the two equivalent terms and say that it means Jesus to whom, though for awhile in an inferior position to the angels, all things are to be subject. We are not concerned to justify the method even if, with the writer of the Epistle, we applaud the inference. What we want to know is whether this text and this interpretation originate with Hebrews or is there a previous use and history. As we read the passage over, we see that it is definitely introduced as a *testimony*: "some one somewhere testified (ἐμαρτύρατο) and said": that is significant: the next thing we notice is that there is evidence of the use of the same passage, in testimony fashion, elsewhere in the New Testament. For instance, in 1 Cor. xv. 25, we are told that Christ must reign until God puts all his foes under his feet; this is the famous *Testimony* from the 110th Psalm which has already been quoted in the previous chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and is the link that leads up to the next chapter. But the text in 1 Cor. goes on, "He has put all things under his feet," which is the eighth Psalm as in Hebrews. Thus the sequence of quotation being the same betrays again the use of the *Testimony Book*. In the nature of the case this is a very early testimony: traces of its use in later times are few and far between, but it is curious that Eusebius

(*Eclog.* II. 4) takes the whole Psalm as a prediction of the calling of the Gentiles, because it says, "How excellent is thy name in all the earth."

The next series of extracts (*vv.* 12, 13) in which the kinship of Christ with believers is affirmed, are easier to identify. The reader must delete the second *καὶ πάλιν* in *v.* 13 which makes the words *ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ* hang in the air in a meaningless fashion. We have then two quotations linked together. The first can be found in Greg. Nyss. c. 16 (p. 321) in a string of antithetic *Testimonies* concerning Jews and Christians *e.g.*:

David says (in the person of the Lord):

I was an alien to my own brethren,
A stranger to my mother's sons;

but of the Gentiles he says:

I will declare thy name unto my brethren,
In the midst of the Ecclesia I will sing praise to thee.

It occurs also in Cyp. *Test.* II. 20, in the midst of a longer quotation against the Jews.

The second quotation will be found in Cyp. *Test.* I. 9, where it follows an anti-Judaic extract, which stops short with "fidens ero in illum." Thus an extract used controversially against the Jews can be employed by a later writer so as not to show the anti-Judaic strain of thought.

Perhaps these illustrations will suffice to show that the Epistle to the Hebrews is honeycombed with anti-Judaic quotations, which were the stock-in-trade of the primitive Evangelist.

We will now go on to the matter of the submerged *Testimonies* in the Epistle, to which we have already made some reference. As the analysis which detects such submerged foundations is revolutionary in its results as regards the interpretation of the Epistle, we will reprint under a separate chapter heading what we said in the *Expositor* for July, 1919. The student will have little difficulty, after reading this chapter, in finding the sequence of the thought of the writer to the Hebrews in other chapters than those which we have discussed. The whole document should rather be called by the title *Against the Hebrews* than *To the Hebrews*.

CHAPTER VI

JESUS AND THE EXODUS

THE textual critic of the New Testament is aware of a curious variant in the Epistle of Jude, which appears to refer the miraculous deliverance of the people of God from the land of Egypt to the Jesus of History, or, if we prefer to put it so, to the Second Person of the Trinity. The writer has been attacking an obscure group of heretics who have turned to impious ways, and have denied our only Master (δεσπότης) and Lord, Jesus Christ. He proceeds to warn those to whom he writes that, although Jesus had saved the people out of the land of Egypt, yet afterwards he destroyed those of them who did not believe or who did not remain loyal.

The traditional text has evaded the difficulty of reading Jesus into the story of the Exodus, where He ordinarily appears only in symbol as Christ our Passover, Christ our Paschal Lamb, and has given us instead the somewhat colourless phrase:

The Lord (κύριος) who had saved the People (or a people), etc.

The text of the Epistle of Jude is often difficult and obscure, but in the present case there is such good support, both from external and internal evidence, for reading *Jesus* that it is not surprising that it found its way into the margin of the revised New Testament: for, it will be said, here if anywhere the harder reading, if well attested, has the right of way. We agree that, if a reasonable meaning can be given to the reading, which seems at first to be the more difficult, we ought to try and edit it. This does not mean the general acceptance of the "canon of the harder reading," in whose name many textual atrocities have been perpetrated in modern times. All canons of criticism are mere approximations, and need to be used as good servants which make bad masters. In the present case we may evade the authority of the canon, and of the mechanical critic behind it, by asking the question whether, after all, it is so much harder to read "Jesus" than to read "the Lord," especially when in the previous verse (ver. 4) Jesus Christ has

been declared to be the only Master and Lord? Are we necessarily alien to the thought of primitive or Palestinian Christianity when we read "Jesus" into the events of the history of Israel? Is it not one of the firstfruits of primitive exegesis to find Christ in the Old Testament, and to demonstrate His pre-existence, authority and miraculous power by means of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms? Take, for instance, the *Testimony Book*, which we may regard as the first handbook of Palestinian Theology, and notice how Christ is spoken of as the Angel of the Old Covenant, and how He is especially declared to be both *God and Lord*, the proofs being, of necessity, anti-Judaic, and consequently made from the Old Testament. If, however, Christ is identified with the *Angel of the Covenant* in the Pentateuch, or with the *Angel of the Great Counsel* in Isaiah, as may easily be seen to be the case, then this Redeeming Angel is the explanation for the statement that Jesus saved the people from the land of Egypt, and that Jesus afterwards destroyed the unbelievers. We may add a liturgical parallel from a sixth century papyrus (Pap. Gr. 7) in the Rylands Library:

Lo! the Virgin has borne Emmanuel: He came down from heaven, and saved from the land of Egypt the people that were astray.

Assuming that we have correctly read and rightly interpreted the passage, we may now go on to interpret a second passage, where it is not a question of text, but only one of translation.

In Hebrews iv. 8, we have in the Authorised Version the statement that

If Jesus had given them rest, he would not afterwards (*i.e.* by David) have spoken of another day.

Here the Revised Version has replaced "Jesus" by "Joshua," and added an explanatory note that in Greek the word is Jesus. In Tyndale's translation, in the Bishop's Bible and the Geneva version, the text says Josue. Probably there is no correction made in the translation of Hebrews that has met with greater acceptance, for there could be no doubt that "Jesus" is the equivalent of "Joshua" in the Septuagint translation (which appears, as we have said, in most of the great versions), and the sense appears to be cleared by restoring the Hebrew equivalent of the leader who brought the people into the Land of Promise. It would be easy to show how the early Christians were keen to recognise the name of their Lord in the Jesus of the Old Testament, whether it were in Jesus the son of Nun, or in Jesus the son of Josedeck the high

priest: and they were, at least philologically, correct in their identification.

It is, however, open to grave doubt whether the correction was necessary, in view of what we have already brought to light as to the Leadership of the People of God by Jesus, the Covenant Angel, in the wilderness. The emended rendering lays the emphasis on the proper name,

If *Joshua* had given them rest;

but in the Greek text, the emphasis is laid on the Jews who disbelieved and disobeyed, by placing the object at the beginning of the sentence,

If it was to *them* that Joshua gave rest, etc.,

where perhaps it will be said that, in that case you ought to have *ἐκεῖνους* as in verse 2, and not *αὐτούς*.

Our point is, that it was Jesus that did not give the promised rest to the Jews ("If they shall enter into my rest"), and it is Jesus who promises to give it, and gives it to the people of God.

The context in Hebrews, moreover, is distinctly anti-Judaic, and this makes for our interpretation; it takes us at once to the *Testimony Book*, one of whose sections was devoted to the proof that the Jews had fallen out of favour with God. When we find the writer arguing that God had been wroth with them for forty years, and that their limbs fell (*i.e.* were scattered) in the wilderness, this is a parallel to the statement in 1 Corinthians x. 5, that "God was not pleased with most of them, for they were scattered abroad in the wilderness": and in this passage the statement is preceded by the identification that Christ, the spiritual rock, was with the people in their journeyings.

Thus all roads of inquiry lead to the *Testimony Book* and to Christ, and we should therefore infer that it was Jesus who gives the Rest to believers, and who does not give it to unbelieving Jews.

If the objection be made that in the Book of Joshua (xxii. 4), we have an express statement by the people's leader that they had attained the Rest, and that this must be the passage referred to by the writer to the Hebrews, we find on referring to the passage that Joshua does not speak of himself as the author of the rest, even in a secondary sense, but says that "The Lord your God hath given you rest." And we conclude that the original translation was the correct one, and that it does not even require an explanatory note, as in the later Genevan versions, which add the remark

“meaning Joshua” to a text where they had restored “Jesus.” Perhaps the best translation would be, “If Joshua-Jesus had given them rest.”

In any case we have to think ourselves back into a time when the two names were equivalent and there is reason, moreover, to which we now proceed, for believing that by restoring the meaning Jesus, we shall make the Epistle to the Hebrews translucent to an extraordinary degree.

We shall see that Jesus and not Joshua is required for the understanding of the passages which follow: we are told (a) that the Logos is sharper than a two-edged sword or knife (*μαχαίρας διστόμου*): (b) that we have a great High Priest.

If we keep in mind what has been said above, as to the identification which the early Christian made of Jesus with Joshua, we shall see the thread of the discourse in the Epistle. In Joshua v. 2 a command is given to make *μαχαίρας πετρίνας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου*, and this gives occasion for Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (c. 113 ff.) to discourse at length on Jesus and the New Circumcision. That is the key to the introduction of the sharp-cutting Logos in Hebrews. It is Joshua-Jesus who is the Circumciser. The process of inspection by the Logos is not (as commonly expounded) the examination of victims for sacrifice, it is the new circumcision *of the heart*, the thoughts and intents of the heart. So in the *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus* (p. 62) Athanasius says the *μαχαίραι* were of stone, because “the stone is Christ.” The sharp instrument of circumcision is the Logos¹.

But this Joshua with the sharp knives suggests to us the figure of another Joshua, the son of Josedech, in Haggai and Zechariah. This Joshua is the *high priest*. Thus the whole of the argument is linked up. The confirmation of this will be found in the anti-Judaic writers and their testimonies. For example, Justin, in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, has much to say of the similitude of Christ furnished by Joshua and the High Priest: let us see how he

¹ The same identification of Jesus and Joshua occurs in *Simon and Theophilus*, c. 20: Et ad Iesum Naue dicit deus: Fac tibi gladios petrinos etc. Numquid tunc ferrum non erat? Sed deus ad Iesum Christum nostrum loquebatur, quod per apostolum suum spiritualiter corda circumciderit. Here the Apostle is Jesus who is identified as the Stone: cf. Heb. iii. 1. The text of the *Altercatio* was misunderstood at this point, and Peter was made the *Apostle* and the *Stone*: Apostolus noster Simon dictus est et postea Petrus nomen accepit. Read rather: Apostolus noster Jesus dictus est et lapis.

expresses himself: he begins (*Dial.* c. 115) by saying to Trypho that "you ought to believe Zechariah when he shows you in a figure the mystery of Christ, and secretly proclaims Him." Then he proceeds to quote the prophet, and comes presently to the verse, "And he showed me Joshua (Jesus) the *great* high priest, standing before the angel of the Lord." Here we have the prefixed adjective "great" as it occurs in Hebrews: it is not a part of the Biblical text, but was, apparently, part of the passage as quoted in *Testimony*. The coincidence is important and should be noticed. That it stood so in the *Testimony Book* may be inferred from Greg. Nyss. *Testimonies* (c. 2, p. 296), where the very same addition is made. "The Lord showed me Jesus, the *great High Priest*, standing, etc.," and again, "Listen now, Jesus the *great High Priest*." So in the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*, p. 73, we have the same expansion.

And as Justin had already in his discourse on the meaning of the name Ἰησοῦς explained how one who was named Jesus divided the land by lot to the people who entered with him, and another of the same name will gather together the remnant of Israel, and divide the good land to each for an eternal possession, it is clear that the sequence in Justin explains the sequence in Hebrews, and each writer depends ultimately on the *Testimony Book*.

Thus we have in each case,

Jesus the Guide to the Land of Rest;

Jesus the new Circumciser;

Jesus the great High-Priest.

Here are some further proofs that these things belong to the *Testimony Book*.

In Cyprian i. 8:

Quod circumcisio prima carnalis evacuata sit et secunda spiritalis repromissa est. . . . Item apud Jesum Nave: et dixit Dominus ad Jesum: fac tibi cultellos petrinus nimis acutos et adside et circumcide secundo filios Israel.

The story in Joshua is explained to mean the new spiritual circumcision.

Now let us see how Aphrahat, the Syrian father, will handle this testimony; for he has a whole book on circumcision. He tells us that

Jesus the son of Nun circumcised the people a second time with a scimitar of stone when he crossed over Jordan with his people. Jesus our Saviour

circumcised a second time, with the circumcision of the heart, the peoples who had been baptized by baptism, and they were circumcised *with the scimitar which is sharper than a sword with two edges*.

Here Aphrahat has seen the connection between the proof-text for the New Circumcision, and the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews. He then goes on:

Jesus the son of Nun took the people across into the Land of Promise: Jesus our Saviour has promised the Land of Life to all who have crossed the true Jordan, and have believed and have been circumcised with the circumcision of the heart.

We have again the connection made for us between the two subjects in Hebrews iv., the Jesus who gives the entrance into Rest, and the Logos who cuts and explores the intents of the heart. By the help of Justin we were able to see the source of the "*great high priest*" in Hebrews iv. 14, it was clearly derived from Jesus the son of Josedeck through the *Testimony Book*. But this helps us at once to see the origin of the famous chapter on Melchisedek in Hebrews: for the doctrine that Christ was the great High Priest was in the *Testimony Book*: Cyprian has it under the heading:

That the ancient priesthood should cease, and a *new high-priest* should come who should be *for ever*.

The heading tells us plainly what to expect; the proof begins with Psalm cix. (cx.). . . . "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek." Now let us see how Justin expounds the famous passage. He complains that the Jews try to transfer it to Hezekiah; but Hezekiah was neither a priest nor a priest for ever. The very language shows it was spoken of Jesus. Then he turns to the Jewish audience and says: "Your ears are closed up and your hearts are blinded" (*Dial.* c. 32). But this is involved in Hebrews v. 11, where the writer says that the subject of Melchisedek is very long and obscure, and "you have become *slow of hearing*." Justin was quoting from Isaiah vi. 10, and it was a *Testimony* used anti-Judaically. So we explain the language of Hebrews in the same way. It is meant to be anti-Judaic. It need not refer to any special weakness of any Church addressed in the Epistle: it is almost conventional, and means what the *Testimony Book* roundly affirms, that the Jews cannot understand the Scriptures, however much they read them, for "Israel doth not know." It might equally be said that the Christian cannot understand the

Epistle to the Hebrews, nor the New Testament generally, unless they see the underlying document which almost all the writers employ. For everything in these matters depends on being in the line of sight. The identification of the historical Jesus with Old Testament situations appears to have been a commonplace with a school of primitive exegetes. For instance, there is a famous passage from Melito preserved in the Syriac¹ where that father says he has made collections (*ἐκλογαί*) from the Law and the Prophets (the terms are proper to describe a Book of Testimonies), with the object of showing that our Lord Jesus Christ was "Creator together with the Father; was the Fashioner of man...that he was Pilot to Noah...was sold with Joseph, was Captain with Moses, was *the divider of the inheritance with Jesus the son of Nun...*" and Melito goes on to describe New Testament events, such as the Virgin Birth, the Adoration of the Magi, etc., thus showing conclusively that he means the same person both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. The reference to the division of the lands by one Jesus with the aid and oversight of the other, is an argument for leaving the name of Jesus standing in Hebrews iv. or at least for reading Joshua-Jesus, and not merely Joshua.

¹ Cureton, *Spicilegium Syriacum*, p. 53.

CHAPTER VII

THE TESTIMONY BOOK AND THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

THE use of the Old Testament in the Gospels is a question which at present has had settlement in a triple answer: the linguistic, which determines whether the LXX or a Semitic original was used for the purposes of quotation; the apologetic, which affirms that the use of quotations manifests certain values of Inspiration for the two Testaments; and the prophetic, which says that quotations crown the long efforts of the prophets of Israel. If the *Testimony Book* is more than a hypothetical document, there is brought to this question a new determinant. It may have much to say on the linguistic side—it will not find it necessary to say anything on the apologetic side; it will have very much to say on the prophetic side; and further, it will re-open and restate the whole question of the purpose of the Old Testament in the Gospels. From the discussion of this matter there may be excised at the outset all those passages in the three Gospels which are said to have either phrase or colour from the Old Testament in them, and which may show the Hebrew quality of the teaching and person of Jesus Christ.

Such passages, for example, as the following:

Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	O.T.
xvi. 27			Pr. xxiv. 12
xviii. 16			Deut. xix. 15
xix. 4	x. 6		Gen. i. 27, v. 2
xix. 7	x. 4		Deut. xxiv. 1
xix. 26	x. 27	i. 37	Gen. xviii. 14

Or in even more individual instances than the first two passages, like the averred Hebrew relations of much in the Sermon on the Mount, and the Semitic base of the songs in the first and second chapters of Luke. These passages involve another literary problem of "source." There are other passages, however, which though they quote the Old Testament, just as the latter three passages, yet are they not as those passages in their use of the literary material which composes them. This second class demands the

Testimony Book for their understanding; and because that is so an examination must be made which shall cover the whole text of the Gospels. Taking Matthew, then, as the basis, without reference to any critical theory of priority among the Gospels, we shall examine some nineteen passages.

Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	O.T.
1. i. 23			Is. vii. 14
2. ii. 6			Mic. v. 1 (2)
3. ii. 15			Hos. xi. 1
4. ii. 18			Jer. xxxi. 15
5. ii. 23			Is. xi. 1
6. iii. 3	i. 3	iii. 4-6	Is. xl. 3-5
7. iv. 15-16		i. 79	Is. viii. 23, ix. 1-2
8. viii. 17			Is. liii. 4
9. ix. 13, xii. 7			Hos. vi. 6
10. xi. 10	i. 2	i. 76, vii. 27	Mal. iii. 1
11. xii. 18-21			Is. xlii. 1, 4
12. xiii. 14-15	iv. 12, viii. 18	viii. 10	Is. vi. 9-10
13. xv. 8-9	vii. 6-7		Is. xxix. 13
14. xxi. 5			Zech. ix. 9
15. xxi. 42	xii. 10	xx. 17	Ps. cxviii. 22-23
16. xxii. 32	xii. 26		Ex. iii. 6, 15
17. xxii. 44	xii. 36	xx. 42-43	Ps. cx. 1, viii. 7 (6)
18. xxvi. 31	xiv. 27		Zech. xiii. 7
19. xxvii. 9-10			Zech. xi. 13

This second series covers what are now to be regarded as passages exhibiting *Testimony* notes; since it is to be claimed for each of them that it must have that document as its source and faculty of application. These cannot go without demonstration. Without that another hypothesis has been framed and no document found. There is no call to increase the number of fallen leaves in the Vallombrosa of hypotheses: for the richest deposit there will not fertilize into a document. The demonstration, then, should be twofold: it must show that the Old Testament excerpts occurring in the Gospel text are in the *Testimonia* text, and that they are used in the Gospels as the *Testimony Book* directs. First, then, the attestations will be tabulated, and with the idea of showing that even when done on a representative plan the *Testimonia* evidence is not meagre; and afterwards selections from the Gospel passages will be made so as to illustrate the work of the *Testimonia* motive.

I. *The Testimony Base.*

1. *Dialogue Ath. and Zac.* 32; *Dialogue Tim. and Aquila*, p. 77; Justin, *Trypho*, 66; Tertullian, *Adversus Judaeos*, ix.; Cyprian, *Testimonia*, II. 9;

Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* iv. 12; Athanasius, *de Incarnatione*, 33; Isidore Hispalensis, *de Fide Catholica contra Judaeos*, i. x. 1; Gregory Nyssen, *Testimonia adversus Judaeos*, iii.; Evagrius, *Altercatio*, iii. 12; Gislebert, *Disputatio Judaei cum Christiano*, P.L. 159, 1020 B.

2. *Dialogue Tim. and Aquila*, 69; Irenaeus, *Apostolical Preaching*, 63; Justin, *Dial.* 78; Cyprian, ii. 12; Eusebius, *Demonst. Evang.* viii. 2, *Eclg. Proph.* iii. 19; Gregory Nyssen, ii.; Chrysostom, *Hom. quod Deus Christus*, viii. 624 (ed. Savile); Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* xi. 20, xii. 20; Evagrius, iv. 17.

3. Justin, *Dial.* 75, 100, 126—cf. *Testimonia*, Part i. 125 ff.

4. *Dialogue Tim. and Aquila*, 70; Justin, *Dial.* 79.

5. Irenaeus, 59, compare *Adversus Haereses*, iii. 10; Justin, *Dial.* 86, 87, 1 *Ap.* 32; Tertullian, ix.; Cyprian, ii. 11; Lactantius, iv. 13; Eusebius, *D.E.* ii. ii. 19, ii. iii. 41, iii. ii. 39, vii. iii. 28 f., *E.P.* iii. 41, *Contra Marcellum*, i. xx. 16; Evagrius, iv. 15; Isidore Hisp. i. ix. 1.

6. Cyprian, ii. 6; Justin, *Dial.* 50; Eusebius, *D.E.* ix. 5, *E.P.* iv. 17; Cyril of Jerusalem, iii. 1, xviii. 34.

7. Cyprian, i. 21; Irenaeus, *Greek Fragment*, xvii.; Eusebius, *D.E.* ii. i. 23, vii. i. 133, ix. 8.

8. *Dialogue Ath. and Zac.* 38 f.; *Dialogue Tim. and Aquila*, 88; Irenaeus, *A.H.* iv. iv. 2; Cyprian, ii. 13; Gregory Nyssen, vi.; Lactantius, iv. 16; Justin, *Dial.* 89 (compare also Justin's use of the context of this verse in 14 ff.); Cyril of Jerusalem, xiii. 34; Evagrius, iii. 11.

9. Irenaeus, *A.P.* 96, *A.H.* iv. xxix. 5; these Irenaeus references, together with Matthew, enable the restoration of this testimonium to the extant *Testimony Book* texts whence it has been dropped. Compare Barnabas ii. 5, 6; Tertullian, v.; Cyprian, i. 16; Isidore Hisp. ii. xvii. 1; Bar Ṣalibi, *Treatise against the Jews*, vi. 16 f.

10. Irenaeus, *A.H.* iii. xi. 8; Eusebius, *D.E.* v. 28, *E.P.* i. 17, iii. 31; Gregory Nyssen, ii.; Cyril of Jerusalem, xii. 8; Bar Ṣalibi, v. 17.

11. Cyprian, ii. 13; Tertullian, ix.; Eusebius, *D.E.* ii. ii. 12, iii. ii. 44, viii. i. 52, ix. 15, *E.P.* iv. 20; Gregory Nyssen, xxii.; Cyril of Jerusalem, xvi. 30.

12. *Dialogue Tim. and Aquila*, 100; Cyprian, i. 3; Justin, *Dial.* 12, 33, 69; Eusebius, *D.E.* ii. iii. 81 and 85, vii. i. 92, viii. ii. 129; Isidore Hisp. ii. xxi. 1.

13. Justin, *Dial.* 27, 39, 80, 140.

14. *Dialogue Tim. and Aquila*, 71; Irenaeus, *A.P.* 65, *A.H.* iii. xxi. 2, iv. 50, 55, 3; Cyprian, ii. 28; Eusebius, *D.E.* ii. iii. 9, viii. i. 76, viii. iv. 2, ix. 17, *E.P.* iii. 24; Gregory Nyssen, ii.; Bar Ṣalibi, iv. 17; Cyril of Jerusalem, xii. x. 17, xiii. 34.

15. This testimonium (Ps. cxviii. 22–23) is so inextricably bound up with the subject of the "Stone" and its companion testimonia that references must be given to show how large a place was held by this Testimony subject in the earliest Christian thought: Barnabas, vi.; *Dialogue Ath. and Zac.* 112 f.; Irenaeus, *A.H.* iii. xxi. 7; Justin, *Dial.* 34, 76, 100, 126; Cyprian, i. 16; Hippolytus, *de Antichristo*, 26; Origen, *in Joann.* i. 23, 41; Tertullian, xiv., *Adv. Marcionem*, iii. 7, v. 5; Celsus, *Ad Vigilium ep. de Judaica incredulitate*, v.; Eusebius, *D.E.* i. 7, *E.P.* iii. 42; Augustine, *Hom. in Joann.* iv. 15; *Exp. PSS.* cxviii. 22–23, *Sermo*, li. 15, lxxxviii. 10, xcvi. 4, clvi. 15; Gregory

Nyssen, VIII.; Methodius, *Orat. de Sim.* VI.; Cyril of Jerusalem, X. 3, XII. 18, XV. 28; Firmicus Maternus, *de Errore Prof. Relig.* 20; Gislebert, *P.L.* 159, 1017 cf.; Aphraates, *de Fide*, 6 ff. (ed. Parisot), p. 15 sq.

16. Irenaeus, *A.H.* IV. ix. 1; Cyprian, II. 19; Justin, 1 *Ap.* 63; Eusebius, *E.P.* I. 12; *Contra Marcellum*, II. 19; Cyril of Jerusalem, XVIII. 11.

17. *Dialogue Ath. and Zac.* 81; *Dialogue Tim. and Aquila*, 69; Barnabas, XII. 10; Irenaeus, *A.P.* 85; Justin, *Dial.* 33, etc.; Cyprian, II. 26; Eusebius, *E.P.* IV. 8; Lactantius, IV. 12; Firmicus Maternus, 24; Gregentius, *Disputatio cum Herbano Judaco*, *P.G.* 86, 653 B; Isidore Hisp. I. iii. 7; I. lvi. 1; Gislebert, *P.L.* 159, 1025 B.

18. Barnabas, V. 12; Irenaeus, *A.P.* 76; Eusebius, *E.P.* III. 27; Gregory Nyssen, VII.; Bar Šalibi, VI. 3.

19. See *Testimonia*, Part I. 52 ff., 74, 75.

The seeing eye will have noted more than stones for purposes of building in this analysis. It will have anticipated the architectural details which manifest themselves when from the Testimony base we turn to the Testimony motive. Before this is done, however, some general comments must be made on the foregoing analysis. It should be understood that in it is only a representative set of testimonia; it would be easy to extend their number from all sides of the *Patrologia*, and far down towards the close of the Middle Age. Another point is what some may describe as the lack of proportion between the attestations of the different passages. There is some little variety if the subject is to be looked at as a question in statistics. If, however, it is remembered that the subject is a question in documentary evidence, then it would appear to be unlikely that the firm and consistent nature of the evidence should be overlooked. Allowing for the vagaries of a long line of redactors, with the strong temptations upon them from the sides of church and theological thought, it is remarkable that so little has been done to alter the original traits of the *Testimony Book*. It is certain that some of the Testimonies are dropped by different copyists: though the editors' reason is not plain, nor is it sure yet whether there was more than one very early type of *Testimony* text. These are problems which will find their place when actual texts are edited and discussed. For the present we would claim that if for any other basal problem in the Gospel texts there was such a body of evidence, the whole field could be cleared of the thistledown of hypotheses.

II. *The Testimony Style.*

The external notes of Testimony usages have been dealt with in the first part of this book. The internal notes will have to do with

the finding of the fusion of those usages in the text of the Gospels, and in such a manner as to assume that only the *Testimonia* could have been its origin. A beginning of discovery can be made with (5) Is. xi. 1. A hasty criticism will say that the two writers do not say the same thing. Its answer is in its haste. The chief guesses which have been made concerning Matthew's meaning in the phrase Ναζωραῖος κληθίσεται, have tried either to find it first, in the writer's employment of some word from the Old Testament which sounded like Nazareth (נִצְרַת), either *nasar*, to "keep" or to "watch over," or *Nazir*, a Nazarite or ascetic vowed to God; and second, in the writer's allusion to the social conditions of Nazareth and analogous descriptions in the prophetic writings, such as the lowliness of the place, and the consequent despisal for Jesus Christ which might have linked itself, for instance, with well-known words from Is. liii.¹ If now we turn to the writers who use the *Testimony Book* another reason arises why Matthew should have taken inspiration from Is. xi. 1. Lactantius quotes that passage, and comments thus:

Iesse autem fuit pater Dauid, ex cuius radice ascensurum esse *florem* praelocutus est, eum scilicet, de quo Sibylla dicit ἀνθήσει δ' ἄνθος καθαρὸν.

Evagrius has the comment:

Virga enim Maria virgo fuit, quae ex semine Dauid processit, ex qua Christus, *flos patriacharum* secundum carnem nascitur.

Isidore says:

Haec virga de radice Iesse virgo est Maria, de David radice exorta, quae genuit *florem* Dominum Salvatorem.

These comments might cause us to oscillate between a nominal or a figurative use of ἄνθος. But Eusebius brings a more definite suggestion of the nominal use where, in his *contra Marcellum*, he discusses the various names for Jesus Christ, and says: ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀπεκάλει αὐτὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, λέγων, and quotes Is. xi. 1. And Justin, *Trypho* i. 26, which is a catalogue of the names of Jesus, says with finality: καὶ ἄνθος. It is a birth passage (e.g. Cyprian, *Test.* ii. 11) and a name passage in the Testimony style. This provides an adequate motive why Matthew should have interwoven it into his Gospel. The ἄνθος, or *nasr*, would then chime naturally and potently with the Aramaic for Nazareth and

¹ E.g. Toy, *op. cit.* 12 f. has given these reasons in detail.

Nazarene. Names play a large part in the primitive spelling-out of Christology¹. This literary reason for Matthew's phrase, and which thus is older than or apart from the writer of the Gospel, would best explain the use of his allusion τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν with which he introduces ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται. That allusion, then, will not mean a vague glance back at the body of Hebrew prophets, but a reference to the prophets in the *Testimony Book*. A parallel to Matthew is in Eusebius, for example, where he says ἐν προφητείαις (*D.E.* i. ii. 4, 10) and προφητικὰς ἐκλογὰς (i. ii. 11) to show its equivalent.

The "root" and "branch" clue in Matt. ii. 25 offers the reason why (7) Is. viii. 23, ix. 1-2 should be found in Matt. iv. 15-16. For first Cyprian quotes the last testimonia just after Is. xi. 10 which speaks of the "root of Jesse"; whilst Lactantius (iv. 13) quotes Is. xi. 10 immediately *before* Is. xi. 1; and in this way declaring an original relationship for the passages. Moreover, both the Cyprianic book and Eusebius have kept the point, which Matthew's use of Is. viii. 23 has a little dulled, that the words are anti-Judaic. This point is preserved in the Cyprianic heading: *Quod Gentes magis in Christum credituræ essent*. It would be improbable that the writer of the Gospel should choose the Isaian passage because in the coming of Jesus into the North Country there was some sort of a divine compensation for the Assyrian invasion about eight hundred years before He was born. The "root" and "branch" clue, as it has been called, gains verisimilitude from the phrase of direction in Matt. iv. 13: καὶ καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρά; and the anti-Judaic motive gathers force from Matt. iv. 17 which tells how Jesus turns to preach His Kingdom. Matthew's use of these passages must govern the Old Testament, and not that book govern the Gospel.

Another illustration of the influence of the *Testimony Book* towards restoring original literary and religious values is to be seen in (8) Matt. viii. 17 where Ps. liii. 4 is quoted. The strong inclination has been to read into this use of the words some part of the theory of an Atonement. Certain writers, indeed, have found parallels to Matthew in John the Baptist's cry concerning the Lamb who bears the sin of the world, or Peter's statement of

¹ The possession of *Testimonia* by the Fathers did not always mean that they kept to its primitive meanings. Compare Eusebius, *D.E.* vii. 2, 46 ff. on Mt. ii. 23 and Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem*, iv. 8. That primitive meaning has to be recovered by delicate analysis.

One who bore our sins to the tree. The theological handling of Matthew has alone contrived such a gathering of disparates. Some commentators have believed that the Evangelist meant something of the kind by quoting Is. liii. 4 in such a form as to identify Jesus with our infirmities and diseases. Irenaeus has the verse in the same form as Matthew: "et ipse infirmitates nostras accipiet, et languores portabit"; and he also has preserved the *Testimony* usage of the verse by quoting it concerning *the first advent of Christ*. This is the Cyprianic use, and that of Lactantius. It is true that Is. liii. is one of the great testimonia for the dying of the Lord Jesus; but it should not be urged to convey that most grave significance before the right moment, and then according to the old values. (10) Matt. xi. 10, Mk. i. 2, Lk. vii. 27, these passages with their Old Testament citation from Mal. iii. 1 present a twofold problem, for there is one in the phrase with which it is introduced by Matthew and Luke: οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, and by Mark: καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφῆτῃ; and another is in the question of the priority of use, whether Mark's way is older than that of the Evangelists. It is to be noticed that the prefatory phrase in Matthew and Luke embodies a conclusion drawn from the Baptist narrative; and that it would be more correct to describe it as an integral than as an introductory phrase. Mark, however, has an incontestable prefatory phrase. The question of right or wrong ascription in his use of the name of Isaiah will not now offer difficulty. It is an introduction to composite citations which, in *Testimonies*, Part I., has been recognised as traceable to the *Testimony Book*. What follows from this opinion concerning the testimonium? The approved view is, of course, that Mark uses it to guarantee prophetically the Baptist and his work. From Basil the Great onwards commentators have seen the threads which bind together this citation and the events that Mark goes on to relate. A much earlier witness has made other findings, and as a consequence has been criticized and ignored. But is it certain that Irenaeus was wrong when he wrote

Μάρκος δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἐξ ὕψους ἐπιόντος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐποιήσατο, λέγων· Ἀρχὴ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφῆτῃ (III. xi. 11)?

or again:

Propter hoc et Marcus ait: Initium Evangelii Jesu Christi Filii Dei, quem admodum scriptum est in prophetis (III. xvii. 3).

A prefatory *Testimony* phrase followed by a recognised testimonium could claim to be treated according to the values of the document whence they come. If this be so, then they do not point towards John the Baptist. In the *Testimony Book* the words concern Jesus Christ, and not another. As the Eusebian references have conserved, their significance lies in the word Angel, and that Angel is God the Word. It may not be without meaning for the understanding of Mark that in the second Book of the Cyprianic *Testimonia*, which is the Christological half of this anti-Judaic document, the subject *Quod idem Angelus et Deus* is in the great beginning of that book and follows its Sophia base for the doctrine of Christ. It occupies the same position in the *Dialogue between Athanasius and Zacchaeus*. Thus from these ancient witnesses the natural conclusion to draw would appear to be the following—that Mark i. 1–3 should be given a rubrical position in the text of the Gospel as denoting the starting-point of primitive Christian thought. The narrative of John the Baptist should follow it as the very fitting confirmation of what Christian eyes saw in the prophetic writings. That noble soul, as always, affirms not himself but the One whose sandals he might not unloose. Even if the late Dr Nestle's view be accepted that we should not read ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ but with the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*: Gospel of Jesus Christ; for the ἀρχὴ would be only a palaeographical *incipit*, and the actual beginning was καθὼς γέγραπται¹: there is no reason to alter the opinion that the *Testimony* material should be rubricized, and that the Baptist matter should be to it as now stated.

It will be well that the next illustration of *Testimony* values should also be one which concerns the three Gospels: (13) Matt. xiii. 14–15; Mk. iv. 14, viii. 18; Lk. viii. 10. The use of Is. vi. 9 f. has lost its anti-Judaic edge for the most part, except in the second of the Marcan instances (viii. 18) where the context and application of the Old Testament passage brings out that feature into secure relief. Again, the thought of the *Testimony Book* is aptly summarized in the Cyprianic heading: *Ante praedictum, quod Dominum neque cognituri neque intellecturi neque recepturi essent*. This position is upheld by the other *Testimonia* authorities which are gathered above. There is then another element, the anti-Judaic,

¹ Nestle, *Expositor*, 1894, 458 f.; see also Swete, *The Gospel according to St Mark*, 1902, *ad loc.*

in the parable of the Sower, that exegetes have not yet recognised in their rightful endeavours to find universal types of religious barrenness or fruitfulness depicted in the story; and again, the recognition of this feature in the incident of the Pharisees seeking a sign from Jesus Christ, with His warning to the disciples lest they fail to understand Him, lends the original and actual note to the whole. It is evident then that the first Christian teaching had two sides—the polemic and the evangelic: the anti-Judaic and the Christologic. A more complete substantiation of this view of the ancient document, and also of its use in the Gospels, could not be found than in (15) Matt. xxi. 42; Mk. xii. 10; Lk. xx. 17, where the testimonium Ps. cxviii. 22–23 is used for Christ as the Stone.

A further instance, where Mark appears to have kept an ancient distinction when Matthew has dropped it is in (16) Matt. xxii. 32, Mk. xii. 26 = Ex. iii. 6, 15. The Exodus words are cited in answer to questions concerning the Resurrection. This citation has caused astonishment among the expositors. Some have said that it was meant to emphasize the Hebrew formula for God, “I am”; others, taking up the Marcan addition ἐπὶ τοῦ βάλτου, have said that the intention of Jesus was to single out the section of the law which relates to the burning bush (Ex. iii. 1 ff., where an open *parashah* still begins); and they would support this view by believing that the use is parallel with Rom. xi. 2 where a like indication of a “pre-Talmudic system of sections” appears¹. It is not to be denied that Rabbinism singled out this Exodus passage. What prompted its use in the Gospels owes nothing to the schools of Hebrew exegesis: since the *Testimonia* values for this passage are such that in it was seen, not the God of the Old Testament, but Jesus Christ. Moses is made to play his part in the Christophany, according to *Testimonia* thought; and as well in it the “bush” and the “tree” adumbrated the Cross. In the light of the Gospel context to this Exodus passage, the questions of resurrection and marriage, it should be recorded that the Cyprianic *Testimonia* introduced the passage with the phrase: “Item in Exodo Moyses iubetur calciamentum deponere, quod nec ipse sponsus esset,” and that it with other passages is ranged under the following head:

Quod ipse sit Sponsus ecclesiam habens Sponsam, de qua filii spirituales nascerentur.

These matters represent, at least, an ancient line of interpretation,

¹ Cf. Swete, *ad loc.*

nearer to what was Christ's mode of viewing things in a larger light than that which could lead to an ascetic opinion on social relations.

Once more an illustration covering the three Gospels is found in (17) Matt. xxii. 44, Mk. xii. 36, Lk. xx. 42-43, in which is Ps. cx. 1. Here the Matthaean and Markan formulae of introduction are clearly older than the Lucan: *Δαυεὶδ γὰρ λέγει ἐν Βίβλῳ Ψαλμῶν*; since those of the former writers can be shown to be identical with the prefatory phrase known to the Armenian translator of Irenaeus's tract on *Apostolical Preaching*. The formulae of the other *Testimonia* texts support this opinion as to the source of the introductory phrases in the first and second Gospels. The discovery of the source relieves the Gospel writers, and especially Jesus Christ Himself, from committing the anachronism of answering the twentieth century scholar's views which have arisen from the enlightened use of Semitic knowledge on the Psalter. The late Professor Swete, in his commentary on Mark, had seen that the occurrence of *ὑποκάτω* in Matthew and Mark points to a "collection of testimonia" as the source of the Synoptic citation. The complement of his right view lies in the understanding that the *Testimonia* not only are a collection of Old Testament excerpts, but that the gathering of those excerpts was made on a basis of simple and conscious idea: and therein is the other reason why this piece of Ps. cx. is incorporated in the Gospel text. There is unanimity among the extant texts of the *Testimony Book* that this testimonium was a foundation one for the primitive Christian idea of the Divine Christ, who, as those who held that idea believed, had "come down" and "went up" again. We have lost a good deal of their simple and fine dramatism of thought. In the particular instance of Ps. cx. 1 and their use of it, which is the Gospel use, it appears that the Psalm balances the Wisdom books' statement of the Sophia's "coming down"¹. This point was curiously lost to view, though the argument came close to the matter, in the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*, 69. These last suggestions must not be taken as looking in the direction of a view of literary balance, or dramatic fitness of things in the composition of the Gospels—and a prologue of a "coming down" from Sapiential books demanding an epilogue of "going up" from whatever Semitic source could be found to supply it. There is no literary

¹ Cf. e.g. *Sirach*, xxiv. 3 ff. Cyprian, *Test.* II. 1. Also Rendel Harris, *The Origin of the Prologue to St John's Gospel* (1917).

artificiality in either the *Testimonia* or the Gospel text, but each is dominated with the hope to portray, for the understanding, the One who came.

This important consideration can be illuminated again by the next illustration which is to be commented upon here, that is (18) Matt. xxvi. 31, Mk. xiv. 27 = Zech. xiii. 7. A notable reading occurs in the Zechariah citation, *πατάξω*, which receives direct confirmation from a Fayyumic papyrus fragment first edited by Bickell¹. It is more striking, however, to find virtual support for this reading in the *πάταξον*² of *Testimony* texts; such as, for example, Eusebius, *Eclogae Propheticae*, III. 27, and Justin, *Trypho*, 53; Gregory Nyssen, *Testimonia*, VII. Once more the late Professor Swete points the moral when he remarks on the necessary Marcan passage: "the latter reading (*πατάξω*) is possibly due to a collection of *testimonia* from which the common tradition drew." In *Testimonies*, Part I. 98 f. the beginnings of a case for a *Testimonia* text, as distinct from the LXX, were laid down. It is evident that this is a subject which calls for special treatment: since it can be final in its judgment on the whence and the why of Old Testament citations in the writings of the New Testament. Now the *Testimony Book* did not use this testimonium from Isaiah with anything like a time significance; that is to say, from its use in the Gospels there is no possibility of deducing the view that this Zechariah testimonium may be quoted in support of a view of a gathering of *testimonia* on the basis of events in the life of Jesus Christ, rather than the dual basis of anti-Judaism and Christology. The *Testimonia* use of Zechariah xiii. 7 had to do with the facts of the death of Christ, or as Gregory Nyssen says in the heads of his chapter in which the testimonium comes, of the Cross and the shadows. Attention should be directed again to the manner in which the *Testimony Book* informs the Gospel text. In not one of the extant texts are *testimonia* for the sayings on the Cross. The Spanish text, which, for instance, Isidore of Seville uses is a larger document than the *Testimony Books* of the first and second centuries. The extension is not due to himself as the interwoven older exegesis points out³.

¹ Cf. e.g. Harnack, *Texte*, v. 4, 488 f.; Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, 1901, 19.

² Swete, *ad loc.*, concedes this "virtual support."

³ Brehaut, *An Encyclopedist of the Dark Ages: Isidore of Seville*, 1912, 183 ff. This writer has not recognised the novel though ancient features of Isidore's religious thought. It is true that it has little interest and is merely orthodox if only the *Sententiarum* is read.

But even in a text where testimonia are given concerning the Two Thieves, or the Hyssop, there is no attempt to minimize the actuality of the recorded sayings of Jesus during the last hours of His life in Palestine. In this way the primitive source marks its distance from the opinion that its use could only add artifice to the mind of the evangelists, by having set up an Old Testament framework to which the incident of the Gospel must be true; and also there is shown how, in so large a measure, the integrity of the primitive source has been maintained, down into late Spain and as well into much later Britain or Byzantium. There is a reticence about the *Testimonia* source towards the historical which is quite in keeping with its simple and profound Christological intent. There are a few testimonia in the Gospels, though they have been tabulated, which have not been commented upon, and for the reason that they are so plainly from the first source as not to need comment. Also several have been commented upon in the table of *Testimonia* attestations. Before this side of the subject is left, however, notice should be drawn to distinctly Lucan *Testimony* pieces: namely Lk. iv. 18-19, xxii. 37. They both come from Isaiah and are respectively lxi. 1-2¹ and liii. 12². From the point of *Testimonia* ideas no other comment is necessary than some words which precede the quotation of Is. lxi. 1-2 in the *Dialogue between Athanasius and Zacchaeus*. The sixtieth section in the Armenian version of that writing records how Athanasius replied to his Jewish questioner:

That which Isaiah said, he said in the person of Christ. Listen, therefore, to his entire prophecy, that thou mayest know that the prophecy suits no one else, except Christ alone.

That passage gives the *Testimonia* standpoint in idea and attitude to the Old Testament; for surely nothing is clearer than this that the Old Testament citations which go to make up the *Testimony Book* are there because of a looking back to them from the view point of Jesus Himself. We may find fault both with the passages chosen and the use to which they are put; for we are of the twentieth century, and so we are far away from the first century mind of

¹ E.g. Barnabas, xiv. 9; Irenaeus, *A.P.* 53, *A.H.* iii. 18. 1, iii. 19. 3, iv. 37. 1 where Irenaeus adds "curare contribulatos corde"; Eusebius, *E.P.* iv. 31, *D.E.* iii. 1, iv. 15. 30, iv. 17. 13, v. 2. 6 etc.; Cyprian, ii. 10; Gregory Nyssen, iv, xxii; Evagrius, vi. 27.

² E.g. *Dialogue between Ath. and Zac.* 39; Justin, 1 *Ap.* 50; Cyprian, ii. 15; Lactantius, iv. 18. 25; Cyril of Jerusalem, xiii. 20; Evagrius, vi. 22.

Palestine unto which His revelation was made. A closer consideration should incline us to see that a creative mind was at work providing others with a language with which they could natively understand and express the meanings of Jesus Christ: indeed, so effective is this language, and so profound has been its influence on the text of the Gospels, that the suspicion arises with power whether Jesus Himself did not originate the *Testimonia* method. We are told that on the way to Emmaus He opened up the older writings to His disciples to give them natural reasons for His unique self and life. The critical study of the text of the Gospels would seem to adduce that in this respect all His ministry was a walking of ways to Emmaus.

There are some students of the New Testament who will desire that an answer should be given to the question, does the hypothetical source *Q* use the *Testimonia* document. If this reconstructed source has peculiar Matthaean quality, as a number of its advocates believe, the answer that *Q* must acknowledge the priority of the *Testimonia* to itself seems difficult to deny. If, on the other hand, the opinion of others concerning a special Lucan recension of *Q* is held, then Prof. Burkitt's argument for its inclusion of a Passion narrative¹ offers a reason why the *Testimony Book* was before that assumed source. Such a narrative includes the testimonium Is. liii. 12 (Lk. xxii. 37). It is worthy of notice that its reading *μετὰ ἀνθρώπων* is not from the LXX. Justin's reading, however, is that of the source of the Lucan saying: if then the argument is valid that a Markan saying must come from *Testimonia* where there is agreement between his text and Justin, the validity of that argument is not impaired when it is urged concerning a striking agreement between the text of the second century anti-Judaist and Luke.

¹ Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, 1906, 134 f.

CHAPTER VIII

TESTIMONIES IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

THE question of the relation of the *Fourth Gospel* to existing groups and collections of *Testimonies* has many interesting sides. In one respect it is similar to that already discussed for the Epistle to the Hebrews; for in the opening chapter we have here also the evidence for a block of submerged *Testimonies*, which make the identification of Christ with the Divine Wisdom. This identification of the Fourth Gospel has been clearly exhibited in the book called the *Origin of the Prologue to St John's Gospel*, and more briefly in the shorter treatise called the *Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity*. The Fourth Gospel, however, differs from the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the fact of the almost complete absence of definite written *Testimonies*, such as those which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews collects, as soon as his prologue is over. Yet it is clear and has long been recognised that the Fourth Gospel is a definitely anti-Judaic book, in which the writer stands as far away as possible from "the Jews" to whom he refers. We should have expected a plenitude of Old Testament references, at least in those parts of the book which are not properly speeches of Jesus himself, but we do not find them. Perhaps the writer is already in revolt against the *Testimony* method on the grand scale, and finds it unphilosophic. It could scarcely be thought convincing to the average Greek mind, which was not easily nor willingly Semitised.

Although we have to mark this paucity of Old Testament references, we must also observe that, when they do occur, they betray acquaintance quite clearly with the method and the contents of the primitive *Testimony Book*. This we will now proceed to show and it will raise some interesting questions.

Nothing definite is to be noted from the Old Testament, after passing John the Baptist's oracle concerning himself, till we come to the declaration of Jesus to the Jews in chap. v., v. 39 that, if they will search the Scriptures they will find them *to testify concerning me*. After that we note in chap. vii., v. 42, that the Scribes

dispute over Jesus, as to the place at which he ought to have been born. This is one of the very early heads of *Testimonies*, and one that continues to a very late period of propaganda and defence. For instance, we find in Cyprian, *Test.* II, that section xi. is devoted to the proof that *Christ comes of the seed of David*, and section xii. that *Christ should be born in Bethlehem*. The proof of the first statement begins with the speech of God through Nathan to David (2 Sam. vii.), which contains our old friend the Testimony in Heb. ii. 13 (ἐσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ), and the second statement is the one from Micah v. 1 ("Thou Bethlehem, land of Ephrata, etc.) as we find it in the Gospel of Matthew; yet it does not seem that Cyprian is taking his prophecy from Matthew. The situation in the Fourth Gospel, whether historical or not, is correctly imagined.

We come next to that very perplexing verse (x. 34), in which Jesus argues his own deity from the passage in Ps. lxxxii. 6, where God is made to say to some condemned enemies, "Ye are Gods." Even when we make allowance for possible ironical treatment (and there is much more of this in the Gospel than is commonly recognised), the use of such an argument is, to say the least, perplexing. It is even more perplexing to find traces of the same argument, taken seriously, in the early anti-Judaic tradition, which takes pains to collect cases of men being called gods, as for instance, that Moses was a god unto Pharaoh!

In Cyprian II. 6 we have the proof-texts collected that come under the heading

Quod Deus Christus;

at the end of this section we have the following curious quotations with an addition from the Fourth Gospel.

Item in Psalmis lxxxi.: Deus stetit in synagoga deorum in medio autem deos discernens. Item illic: Ego dixi: dii estis et filii excelsi omnes, uos autem sicut homines moriemini.

Then follows the explanatory gloss:

Quodsi iusti qui fuerint et praeceptis diuinis obtemperauerint, dii dici possunt, quanto magis Christus Deus Dei filius; sicut ipse in euangelio secundum Johannem.

John x. 35-38 is then transcribed. Shall we say that the passage from the Psalm passed into the *Testimony Book* from the Fourth Gospel, or is the reverse order the true one? In that case, what are we to make of the Fourth Gospel, when putting outlandish testimonies into the mouth of Jesus?

Cyprian, clearly, had the matter in his *Testimony Book* from the Psalm, and added the explanation that seemed necessary, as well as the secondary reference in the Gospel. Will it be said that this is Cyprian's own work, and that it cannot claim antiquity relative to the Gospel? Let us look a little further into the matter. We turn to Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, and find him making the statement in chap. 123 that we Christians are also called *true sons of God*, and so we are, we who keep Christ's commandments. Justin's hearers were much perturbed at the statement, and to make things clearer to them, Justin proceeds (c. 124) to expound the whole of the 81st (82nd) Psalm. "Listen," he says, "gentlemen; how the Holy Spirit speaks of this people, that they are Sons of the Most High and that Christ Himself will be present in their Synagogue, to act as judge of the whole human race." He then proceeds to quote the Psalm in a translation, which he suggests to be Aquila's, and is, in our texts, merely the LXX with slight variants, and then he quotes what he says is the version of the LXX, and deduces from it an amazing story, about the Fall of Adam and Eve, and the Lapse of Lucifer! At the end he returns to the real issue, which had perturbed his hearers, and says:

It has been demonstrated that they were counted worthy to become gods, and all of them to be able to become sons of the Most High, . . . and as to Christ being called God that has been proved in many ways.

Now it is clear that Justin could not have argued in this way, unless he had been familiar with the *Testimony* in the Psalm, and with the use made of it in the Gospel. That is, we are not dealing with matter belonging to the age of Cyprian, but with matter anterior to Justin.

The very same arguments turn up in the very same premised text in Irenaeus.

In Book iv. c. iii. we have the proof made, altogether from the *Testimony Book*, that no one in the Scriptures is called God or Lord, except the Father of all and His Word. When we come to examine the proof-texts, we find that Irenaeus had before him a more extended statement. He follows the proof of Christ's deity in Ps. xliv. 7, by the statement:

Et iterum: *Deus stetit in synagoga Deorum, in medio autem deos discernit; de Patre et filio, et his qui adoptionem perciperunt dicit;*

and he returns to the same explanation a little later:

Quorum autem deorum? Quibus dicit: Ego dixi, Dii estis, et filii Altissimi omnes? His scilicet qui adoptionis gratiam adepti sunt, per quam clamamus, Abba Pater.

It is quite clear (the reader can verify it for himself), that every other bit of Old Testament Scripture in this chapter of Irenaeus is taken from *Testimonies*. We have no reason to suppose this last quotation from the 82nd Psalm is an exception¹.

The proof seems to be adequate that Psalm lxxxii. 6 was in the primitive *Testimony Book*. No wonder that Justin's hearers were astonished and perturbed by it!

We pass on to a passage which we have already discussed in part in the chapter on Romans. In John xii. 37-41 we have a very striking anti-Judaic outburst, fortified by *Testimonies* from Isaiah, c. vi. and c. liii.:

Lord, who hath believed our report? etc. Is. liii. 1.

He hath blinded their eyes, etc. Is. vi. 9, 10.

followed by the remark that Isaiah said these things, when he saw his glory, and it was of him (sc. Christ) that he spake.

This last observation is peculiarly interesting, for it is almost the only passage where the Targum is cited in the New Testament. Isaiah says that he saw the Lord. The Targum says that he saw the Glory: the Christian says he saw Christ.

Of the two passages referred to, the first, referring to the incredulity of the Jews, we have shown to be a part of the anti-Judaic matter in the tenth chapter of Romans, and to be a part of St Paul's *Testimony Book*.

The second is quoted by Christ in Mark iv. 12, and from Mark passes to Matt. xiii. 14, 15; it turns up again definitely as anti-Judaica in the last chapter of the Acts, where St Paul makes his *congé* to the Jews who had interviewed him, tells them that Isaiah has known them in advance, and that he was now going to take the message of Salvation to the Gentiles. It would be superfluous to add proofs that we are dealing with genuine and primitive *Testimony* matter.

We notice that Greg. Nyssen in quoting from Is. liii. 1 uses the passage, not to emphasize the refusal of the Jews to hear the Gospel, but to prove the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father.

¹ Irenaeus makes the same explanation of the Psalm in Bk iv. c. 1, "No other God and Lord has been foretold, except the God who is Lord of all, and his Word, and those who receive the grace of adoption."

See also Bk iii. c. 20 (ed. Mass. 212): when he quotes again from the Psalm, and speaks of those who despise the Incarnation, and rob man of his ascent to God!

He says thus (cap. i. p. 294):

[καὶ Ἡσαΐας] ὅτε εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν, καὶ ὁ βραχίον Κυρίου τινὲ ἀπεκαλύφθη;

Evidently Nyssen had in his sources both quotations from Isaiah; the first has dropped out, not being suited to the argument for the Trinity. The emphasis in the second quotation is on *Christ as the Arm of God*; it is actually quoted by Cyprian (*Test.* II. 4) under the heading:

Quod Christus idem manus et brachium Dei.

We notice that Nyssen's sources had the quotations in the reverse order from the Fourth Gospel. The added note from the Targum should be found in the primitive *Testimony Book*.

One more illustration may suffice for this part of the subject.

It will be found that there is one theme in the story of the Passion, upon which the earliest books of anti-Judaic evidence dilate, more than upon others. The treachery of Judas was sought and found both in the Psalms and in the Prophets. A whole chapter might be written on Judas in prophecy.

The Fourth Gospel accordingly (John xiii. 18) quotes from Ps. xli. 9 as follows:

ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ, Ὁ τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.

To this corresponds Greg. Nyss. v. (p. 306):

Δαβίδ· ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν.

In *Timothy and Aquila* it takes the same form, which is that of the LXX. The Fourth Gospel has an earlier form of the Oracle: an independent translation. We have now demonstrated the antiquity of the *Books of Testimonies* relatively to the Fourth Gospel.

A further word may be added at this point with regard to the use of the Targum in John xii. 41, and in the *Testimony Book*. As we have said, the use of Targum in the New Testament is infrequent; yet one might reasonably suppose that in Judaeo-Christian circles there must have been many cases of it: the *Odes of Solomon* for example, found one of the clues to their interpretation in the acquaintance of their writer with a Biblical Targum. It seems, then, not to be improbable that, just as the Targumic references lay for some time unrecognised in the *Odes*, so there may be similar matter lying latent in the New Testament. Here is an example of what we mean.

It is part of the primitive Christian confession that Christ sits at the right hand of God, and it is usual to prove the doctrine (in modern times) by a reference to the closing verses of Mark, which are hardly adequate buttress, to say nothing of foundation, of belief. However, as the primitive Christian proof was not made from the New Testament, but from the 110th Psalm, we need not trouble ourselves further over modern exegesis. What we were going to point out was, that the proof-testimony, by its reference to the Right Hand of God, considered as a local and anthropomorphic appellation, was offensive to the theism of the thoughtful Jews, and required an apology in the form of a Targum. In the extant Targum on the Psalm, the reference to the Right Hand entirely disappears. That is one way of solving the difficulty. Now it is interesting to notice that the writer to the Hebrews has in the passage made something of a Targumic evasion, when Christ is spoken of as "seated at the right hand of the Magnificence on High"; here the suggestion is natural that the word *μεγαλοσύνη* is a substitute for the Name of God; the words *ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* should therefore be taken with *ἐκάθισεν*, "He sat down on high at the right hand of the Majesty."

A similar periphrasis occurs in the Gospel (Mk. xiv. 62) where the substitution "right hand of the Power" (*τῆς δυνάμεως*) occurs, which becomes in the account of the martyrdom of St James the Just, in Hegesippus' tradition, "the right hand of the Great Power" (*τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως*). It will be extremely interesting and important if it should turn out that Jesus, upon his trial, used a composite quotation from Daniel and the 110th Psalm in which the Psalm was Targumised, and if there should be traces of similar Targum in the early Christian literature. The *Testimony Book* may have had a trace of similar exegesis; on the other hand, the *Testimony* writers commonly get rid of the Right Hand of God by equating it with Christ, as in their interpretation of Isaiah liii. 1 ("To whom is the Arm of the Lord revealed?").

CHAPTER IX

TESTIMONIES IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

THE question as to how far the existence of collections of anti-Judaic quotations is involved in the *Acts of the Apostles* has already been opened for us by the discovery that in the last chapter there is a long anti-Judaic prophecy from Isaiah, which occurs also in Mark, in Matthew and in the Fourth Gospel. It is followed by a pro-Ethnic announcement of salvation, which betrays the language of the Psalms in the LXX. The passage quoted from Isaiah by Paul is, as we have shown, one which had already been quoted by Jesus. No one would have anticipated that such a passage would have formed a part of an anti-Judaic indictment. In this case, as in so many similar cases, it is the peculiarity of the matter chosen that enables us to unify the traditions where the passage occurs, and trace them to a single authority. In studying, then, the problem of the relation of *Acts* to *Testimonies*, we may begin to read the book backwards, instead of following the usual order. As we turn the pages the wrong way, we stumble upon the statement which Paul makes in Acts xxvi. 23 with regard to his teaching, that it was based upon the Prophets and Moses, and that one section of it was a question:

Does the Messiah suffer?

Is he the first to rise from the dead?

Does he announce light to the People and the Peoples?

We have shown in the first part of this work that this is Testimony matter¹, and that Paul declares the method to be his usual line of proceeding. The suggestion of *Light for the Gentiles* takes us back naturally enough to Paul's discourse at Antioch in Pisidia, which is packed with *Testimonies* and ends with Isaiah xlix. 6:

I have set thee for a *light to the Gentiles*
To be for salvation unto the ends of the earth.

Evidently this discourse needs to be tested closely for coincidence with the existing anti-Judaica².

¹ Cf. Justin, *Dial.* 39, ὅτι γὰρ καὶ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστὸς διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κηρύσσεται. *Athan. et Zacc.* p. 3, ὅτι καὶ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός.

² We may, for instance, compare Greg. Nyss. *Test.* 16, p. 325.

But before we come to this point we have to deal with the speech of James the Lord's brother at the Jerusalem Council (Acts xv. 14-31). Here we find the Calling of the Gentiles proved from the words of the prophets. St James begins to recite from the prophecy of Amos (Am. ix. 11, 12), following, with interesting variants, the text of the LXX:

After this I will return,
And I will build again the tabernacle of David,
That which is fallen down:
And I will rebuild her ruins,
And again set her up;
In order that the remnant of men may seek after the Lord,
And all the Gentiles upon whom my Name has been called¹
Saith the Lord, who doeth all these things,
Things known from old-time.

It is well known to scholars that the text of these last two lines is in great confusion, and the editors have commonly fallen back upon the shortest possible text, in spite of its having an air of mutilation. This is one of the cases where an acquaintance with the method of the *Testimony Book* would show light to these critical Gentiles. For it is clear that we are dealing with a composite quotation, whose two parts have run together. The words *γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος* are from Isaiah xlv. 21. That is fairly certain: then we are dealing with a composite quotation, such as we are familiar with in books of Testimonies. Let us see what Isaiah really says. The words in the LXX which concern us are these:

*ἐγγισάτωσαν, ἵνα γνῶσιν ἅμα τίς ἀκουστὰ ἐποίησεν ταῦτα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς....
ἐπιστράφητε ἐπ' ἐμέ, καὶ σωθήσεσθε, οἱ ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.*

The reason for turning to Isaiah is not apparent in the Acts, but it jumps to the eyes (to use a Gallicism) when we see salvation promised in Isaiah to those from the ends of the earth. The text in the Acts is, therefore, abbreviated. It is also a variant text as regards the LXX for instead of *ἀπ' αἰῶνος* it has *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, and instead of *γνῶσιν...ἀκουστά* it has [*ἀκούσωσιν*]...*γνωστά*. There can be no doubt that the text in Acts is based on the passage in Isaiah, and the connecting link between Amos and Isaiah is gone. We may put stars, or, if we prefer, suggest how the error has arisen, as thus:

¹ Bar Ṣalibi quotes the passage from Amos with many variations, and stops short at this point.

ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα.
[καὶ πάλιν· ἵνα ἀκούσωσιν τίς ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα,] γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος.

In this way the study of the methods of *Testimony* helps us to restore an unintelligible sequence into coherence and intelligibility.

Using the experience which we are accumulating, we now turn back to the discourse of Paul at Antioch in Pisidia, in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts. We soon find familiar faces. In v. 33 is the testimony from the second Psalm, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee": we knew this passage already from its occurrence at the head of the block of *Testimonies* in the first chapter of Hebrews (and again in c. v., v. 5). It is not, however, clear how this verse becomes a proof-text for the Resurrection. Then follows an even more perplexing reference to Isaiah lv. 3, which we translate by

I will give you the sure mercies of David:
Δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαυεὶδ τὰ πιστά.

It may well be asked, "What on earth has this to do with the Resurrection? and what on earth does it mean?" Whatever it means, a glance at the text of the LXX will show how it came to be quoted; for here the words quoted are followed by:

Ἰδοὺ μαρτύριον ἐν ἔθνεσιν ἔδωκα αὐτόν, ἄρχοντα καὶ προστάττοντα ἔθνεσιν· ἔθνη ἃ οὐκ οἶδασιν σε ἐπικαλέσονται σε, καὶ λαοὶ οἳ οὐκ ἐπίστανται σε ἐπὶ σε καταφεύξονται, ἕνεκεν Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ σου.

Here the translator has called David, or the Davidic successor, by the name *μαρτύριον*, a *Testimony*, and this curious substitution of *μαρτύριον* for *μάρτυρα* would have been sure to attract attention, even if the passage had not been seized upon for its pro-ethnic character. It is certain, then, that the text in Acts is mutilated: something has dropped, either before or after the Sure Mercies of David. As we have said, Isaiah lv. was very likely to be quoted for the calling of the Gentiles, as for instance in Cyp. *Test.* i. 21. Probably, then, a passage has dropped out in which the calling of the Gentiles was the theme.

The warning which St Paul gives in v. 41 will be found in *Timothy and Aquila* (p. 77). As this is a late form of the *Dialogue* between Jew and Christian, it is possible that it may have been influenced by the text of the Acts. On the other hand, it is so characteristically anti-Judaic that it must have been very soon taken into the Christian armoury.

It will be observed that these instances which we have been studying are taken from speeches, of Paul and the other Apostles, and that there is nothing of the kind in Luke's ordinary narration. He, at all events, does not turn aside to tell us that "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken of by the prophet." If Luke does not use the method of *Testimonies* on his own account, he is quite clear that it was the Apostolic method. It was either what they actually said or what they ought to have said. But if we concede that the *Testimony Book* was behind Luke, the historian of the Acts, it seems absurd to deny that it was behind the speakers with whom he had intercourse and whom he professed to report. The natural consequence is that we have a report of speeches which cannot be very far from their actual utterance.

And now we are getting into an awkward position critically, for as we elected to work backward through the Acts we are approaching the speech of Stephen, and the Pentecostal speeches of the Apostles, both of which are stuffed with anti-Judaic matter, in frequent concurrence with the earliest forms of the *Book of Testimonies*. Now it is one thing to say that a collection of *Testimonies* was current in the Church in the time of Paul's first missionary journey, or at the time of his first imprisonment in Rome, and quite another thing to say that it was extant in the first days of the Church at Jerusalem. To make the matter clearer we will take an instance, and study it closely. In Acts iv. 25 we find the Church praying in the words of the second Psalm:

Wherefore did the heathen rage?

and expounding as they pray, the meaning of the Kings and Rulers of the earth who set themselves in array against the Messiah.

In Cyprian, *Test.* i. 13, the passage is quoted without any reference to Herod and Pilate, but in order to show that the old yoke is passing away and a new yoke is being substituted; the section is headed:

Quod iugum vetus evacuaretur et iugum nouum daretur.

In Psalmo primo: Quare fremuerunt gentes. . . et proiciamus a nobis iugum ipsorum.

It is clear that this is a case of the use of the second Psalm, which is altogether unlike that in the Acts. Indeed, in the Acts one can hardly call it anti-Judaic (except so far as every fulfilled prophecy is anti-Judaic); it is directed against the Gentiles and their rulers. When we return to Gregory of Nyssa we find the Psalm quoted as in the Acts as a part of the prophecies of the Passion, by

which, of course, the Jews ought to be convinced; it is introduced as in the Acts:

Δαβίδ· Ἵνα τί ἐφρύαξαν τὰ ἔθνη;

and this is followed by a passage from Jeremiah:

(Lam. iv. 30): The Spirit of our face, the Lord God, has been taken by their corruptions, of whom we said, Under his shadow we shall live among the Gentiles.

In *Athanasius and Zac.* (p. 53) Athanasius says:

You hear *David saying*: Wherefore did the heathen rage...and against their Christ?

which is in the manner of the *Testimony Books*, and agrees with Acts.

In *Timothy and Aquila* (p. 73) the sequence in Greg. of Nyssa is inverted, and the Christian says:

Concerning Christ *Jeremiah says* thus, The Spirit, etc., and *David says*: Wherefore did the heathen rage.

Timothy then goes on to quote the Gospel of Luke and uses the prophecies he has quoted to prove that Christ is God and Lord. This is recognised at once as a conventional heading of *Testimonies*. So far there is no necessary priority of the quotation in Acts over other collections of prophecies in which the Psalm appears. But what are we to say when we find Justin quoting the first two Psalms in his *Apology* en bloc, and saying that Herod the King and Pilate the procurator are foretold in those words of David?

δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Δαβίδ...μηνύει τὴν προγεγενημένην Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως Ἰουδαίων καὶ αὐτῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ Πιλάτου τοῦ ὑμετέρου παρ' αὐτοῖς γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου, σὺν τοῖς αὐτοῦ στρατιώταις κατὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ συνέλευσιν.

Here Justin is making the same interpretation as is made in the Acts, and to all appearance making it from the Acts: we must not, then, use Justin to argue priority for the *Testimony* quoted over the Acts in which it is embedded; nor can we generally argue priority for a fulfilled prophecy, considered as fulfilled, over the event which is supposed to be the fulfilment. In other words, some of the passages quoted in the Acts from the Old Testament will be earlier than their appearance in the *Books of Testimonies*.

Let us take another example: in the second chapter of Acts we have the descent of the Spirit described as a fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel. When Gregory of Nyssa wants to prove from the Old Testament that *Deus* and *Dominus* are two persons (p. 294) he quotes this very passage of Joel:

It shall come to pass in the last days...your daughters shall dream dreams (sic!);

and a little further on,

The Sun shall be turned into darkness...before that great and notable Day of the Lord.

Notice (says Nyssen) he does not say "*my* great and notable day."

And it shall come to pass that, whoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved;

he does not say "on *my* name."

Now this subtlety cannot be primitive, nor belong to the first deposit of *Testimonies*: it is the result of later reflection on a passage in Joel to which attention has been drawn on other grounds. On the other hand, Acts ii. 21, which we have thus seen to be misused by Nyssen is a genuine *Testimony* in Rom. x. 13, and thus has priority on its own account.

The question of the genuineness of the speeches of the Apostles and of Stephen in the early chapters of Acts may require to be re-opened in view of the fact that they contain so many early *Testimonies*, which cannot, except in a few instances, be traced to the Acts themselves. For instance, there is Psalm xvi. 8-11, "Thou wilt not leave," quoted by Greg. Nyss. viii. p. 311, and by *Athan. et Zacc.* p. 46, and there is the oft-quoted 110th Psalm, where as in the previous quotation the matter is introduced by *Δαβὶδ λέγει*, and in Acts iii. 22 there is the oft-quoted passage from Deut. xviii. 15 ("A prophet shall the Lord your God") introduced by the conventional "Moses said." Then in chap. iv. we have *Christ the Stone* introduced, which we have shown to be one of the oldest of *Testimonies* and referred in the Gospel to the Lord himself. The frequent occurrence of these conventional quotations in the early speeches in the Acts raises a very grave question, such as does not occur in the latter part of the book. We will take one final example, before referring the whole matter to a more definite and detailed enquiry by Biblical scholars.

The early writers in the New Testament and outside its pages were very strong on the Story of Judas' Apostacy, and on the predictions that had been made of it. We are familiar with Matthew's proof of it, by a combined *Testimony* from Zechariah and Jeremiah, and we have it on the authority of Peter in Acts i., that it had to be and that it is proved by Ps. lxix. 26:

γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυσις αὐτῶν ἡρημωμένη·
καὶ ἐν τοῖς σκηνώμασιν αὐτῶν μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν·

and Ps. cix. 8:

καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λάβοι ἕτερος.

We have the same thing on the authority of the Fourth Gospel which has imported it into the prayer of Jesus in c. xvii., "the son of perdition, *that the Scripture might be fulfilled.*" The combination of Matthew, John and Acts is sufficient to show that Judas had an early place in the *Testimony Book*, and this again raises the question whether the collection of *Testimonies* on Judas may not be earlier than all the writers referred to: in which uncertainty we must, for the present, leave the matter.

CHAPTER X

THE USE OF APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE *TESTIMONY BOOK*

It is a matter of knowledge now that some of the New Testament writings quote apocryphal books. From the earliest texts of the *Testimony Book* the conclusion is to be drawn that in them also were included pieces from the same sort of books. This might mean no more than a statement of unrelated facts. If a proof could be brought forward that these facts, rather than being unrelated, call attention to another phase of the influence of the earliest Christological document, the result would have valuable bearing not only on the great question of the literary sources of primitive Christianity, but also upon the subject of that regard given to certain writings which once were received by Christian folk as authoritative, and which have since been extruded from the Canon. The first of these questions is the radical one, and not only in the sense so prominent in the chapters of this book; for there is a naturalness about a Christian re-handling of the Old Testament which is not to be found when we first set side by side with such Old Testament material pieces from writings which have not kept a first place in the reverence of the Christian Church. The demonstration that early Christianity should have given this rank to those writings in a primal document, without any sense of shyness in anticipation of a Preface to the Vulgate which Jerome would write, or of the findings of the Council of Trent, is a fresh support of the view that there is need to revise the accepted opinion concerning Old Testament prophecy and its processional fulfilment in the New Testament. Enoch, for instance, is difficult to fit into that evolutionary view. There are others who will be found to be more troublesome. But 1 Peter and Jude actually cite the Enochic writings; they do not stay, where perhaps it can be said the writer to the Hebrews stayed,—that is to say, at representing Enoch according to the mortuary method in Genesis. Enoch has a voice for them which, it appears, is as awake as the prophecies of Isaiah. Whatever culture may be conceded to Jude, it is not usual to

expect from Peter the grace of literary quotations. Yet in 1 Peter Enoch companions with Isaiah, and in the same informative manner for the religious ideas of the Letter. Peter's use of the Enochic writings¹ makes in the direction of a close relation between his citations from them and his citations from Isaiah. If his Old Testament foundations came whence Paul quarried his, then the question is more than an interesting one whether Enoch was in the first *Testimony Book*. The two passages in 1 Peter which acknowledge acquaintance with the Enochic writings are i. 12 and iii. 19. Concerning the first of these, it is to be remarked how Enoch is braided into the statement of Peter upon the prophets who "testimonied" (προμαρτυρόμενον) to the suffering and glory of Jesus Christ. By the time of the writing of this Letter then the *Testimony Book* has become so familiar that Peter would appear to be making the prophets do what they could not before the religion of Jesus Christ took their writings and re-read them; and as if to show that he was doing this with senses alive to what the prophets had not said and what now they could say, Peter makes the Enochic writings say that they "got this intelligence" (διενοοῦντο, Enoch i. 2), and which angels desire to look into (παρακύψαι, Enoch ix. 1), for those unto whom the Gospel was being preached. A short summary of that Gospel follows, and Peter sets out again his foundations in i. 24-25, and ii. 6, each of which passages is among the better known *Testimonies*. The first testimonium belongs to that which is found on the lips of John the Baptist (cf. Matt. iii. 3, Mk. i. 3, Lk. iii. 4-6). It is not surprising to find that the heading under which it is put in the Cyprianic *Testimonia* is: *Quod Deus Christus*. For that is what John said, and Peter is also saying the same great thing. The letter of Peter is in religious accord with the Gospels, and it serves to complete on the side of the *Testimonia* the incomplete citation in the Gospels—just as Justin, *Trypho* 50, completes the form of the testimonium in Cyprian ii. 6. Two refined features in the use of this testimonium (Is. xl. 3-5) should not be missed, if we would see how closely such a factor is braided with the earliest Christian message, and they are these: this Isaian citation involves the ἄνθος which can fade away (ἐξέπεσεν) and suggests the contrast with the ἄνθος who is Christ; and again Peter underlines the *Testimony* content for

¹ Rendel Harris, *Expositor*, 1901, 194 ff. and 246 ff.; Taylor, *Expository Times*, 1901-1902, 40.

this citation, which is *Quod Deus Christus*, by following it directly with the assertion:

τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.

This theme he continues in the next few words of his letter, and once more as if to give firm foothold to the first pilgrims in the faith of Jesus Christ, he introduces *Testimony* matter in the form of the warrant for Christ *the Stone*. The venerable quality of this attestation almost partakes of the basal and original attributes of the One it attests. For the first folk of Christ the two cannot be separated. From the first letter of Peter we may draw this conclusion concerning *Enoch* that at least he is given *Testimony* contiguity—he is made more than neighbour in office and speech to those who are foretellers of Jesus Christ, by the chrism of primitive Christian election.

Another first century writer who is not within the pages of the New Testament, can further strengthen *Enoch's* position. It has been shown many times that Barnabas uses the *Testimony Book*; now in the sixteenth chapter of his Epistle, he introduces a quotation from *Enoch* with a phrase that declares a recognised usage: λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή. This Enochic citation is flanked on either side by *Testimonia*; for before it goes Is. xl. 12, lxvi. 1, and after it comes Daniel ix. 24–27. The first of these has, among other *Testimonia* support, Justin, 1. *Ap.* 37, *Trypho*, 22; Irenaeus, *A.P.* 45, *A.H.* II. xxx. 1; IV. ii. 6; Cyprian, II. 4; and the second Athanasius, *de Incarnatione*, 39. Barnabas also gives *Enoch* the same exalted place as Peter; and he has kept what must be called the *Testimony* note, with his citations from the Enochic writings in his notable introductory phrase.

For other support we must turn again to the New Testament. The little letter of Jude is our next authority. This document achieves the distinction of being nearly the shortest writing in the New Testament, and of having more apocryphal material in it than the longest book within that gathering of writings. This is a valuable mark to bear. There are few subjects, indeed, of more importance for the study of the first century Christian mind than the knowledge of how it felt its way into the heart of the Revelation of Jesus Christ. Jude cites *Enoch*; he does also what is more significant, he makes use of Balaam¹. Certain of the *Testimonia* texts use Balaam; and in a manner which hitherto has caused

¹ Cf. also 2 Pet. ii. 15.

perplexity. Eusebius in his *Eclogae Propheticae*, I. 14, is to be found using the following heading and testimonium, ἐκ τῆς Δ. τοῦ Βαλαὰμ προφητείας, under which he ranges Numbers xxiv. 17, ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ κτέ. Gregory Nyssen, in his *Testimonia* II. sets down Βαλαάμ as the prefatory phrase to the same citation as in Eusebius. It may seem that we can dismiss this matter by invoking that infrequent elasticity of attribution which is an ancient phase of the *Testimony Book*. There is no apocryphal work with Balaam's name to lighten the difficulty. And further, it looks as if the Balaam of Jude and the Balaam of the *Testimonia* are not quite the same person. If, however, the help of Priscillian is called in, it becomes possible to replace some excised matter—or it may be some matter which the primitive Christians would supply us from an inexcisable mental context—to the text of the *Testimonia*, and so to find the thread between that source and the letter of Jude. The fourth century Spanish writer says:

Quem etiam Balaam idolorum cultor et daemonum in infelicitatis suae testimonium profetauit dicens: exiet homo ex semine Iuda, etc.¹

The *Testimony* quality and mode of this statement is as clear as the reason now why Jude should write:

καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν.

At this point attention may be called to the word "testimonium." It is a favourite term with Priscillian; for in the tiny *corpus Priscilliani*, Schepss records it forty times. Not always is it used in our technical sense. It is so used; and more noticeable than this, Priscillian has, as his chief Christological category, "Christus Deus," and this category was more than once based on Baruch iii. 36 ff. with the prefatory phrase, "Item per Hieremiam." That was the prefatory phrase known to Irenaeus as his *Apostolical Preaching*, 97 shows, and that which the Cyprianic *Testimonia* copied, "item apud Hieremiam prophetam," ranged under the heading *Quod Deus Christus*. M. Babut, when commenting on this cardinal matter in the thought of Priscillian, describes him as possessing "une naïve théologie du cœur," or, in another place, as teaching a "modalisme spontané²." What *naïveté* there is about this man's thought as concerns the principal category in his Christology, it appears is the *naïveté* of the first century thought. It is his

¹ Priscillian, *Tractatus*, I. 32.

² Babut, *Priscillien et le Priscillianisme*, 1909, 108. 8, 109, 277

“pan-Christism,” as it has been described¹, which is away from that thought and its literary sources. The above harmony of the Cyprianic *Testimonia* and Priscillian’s *Tractatus* might lead to the conclusion that the borrower and the borrowed had been shown. But Priscillian’s *Testimony* text was independent of the Cyprianic writing, as we may see from his Balaam material; and by comparing the considerations arising from his treatment of Baruch with that in texts which inherit first century standpoints, such as the *Dialogue between Athanasius and Zacchaeus*, 21. It is, however, a feature of Jude that he quotes Enoch; and that Priscillian cites Jude as quoting that apocryphal work (I. 14, III. 56). After his second citation of Jude 14, he asks the question: “Quis est hic Enoch quem in testimonium profetiae apostolus Judas adsumpsit?” It is not likely that Priscillian could have read Jerome’s *de Viris Illustribus*, IV., though, as Schepss has pointed out, there is some coincidence in language. Time would be against his reading Jerome. Then it is a possible suggestion that he is leaning on Hegesippus himself, since Eusebius who inherits much from the latter writer does not help to illumine Priscillian by his notice of Jude.

It has been shown already that Enoch should have a place in the earliest *Testimonia* texts. Jude’s quotation from a Moses apocryphon may also have place in those texts. Moses has been made a prophet by the *Testimony* mode; therefore certain very early apocryphal matter concerning him could have received consecration to the ends of the first view of Christ. Fresh information on the apocryphon may come from the increasing store of Coptic documents, or by the recovery of the *Responsio* of Remigius, which Ziegelbauer tells us dealt with this subject². It appears to find its analogue in the several apocryphal writings which are given Jeremiah’s name in *Testimony* texts which are filiated with what we may find to be a primary textual tradition—Firmicus Maternus, *de Errone*, 20 ff., or Irenaeus, *Apostolical Preaching*, 79, are interesting examples of this order of text.

By the time of Justin Martyr (1 *Ap.* xx. 44) a most interesting addition has been made to the ranks of the prophets in the persons of the Sibyl and Hystaspes. The *Testimonia* with which Lactantius worked had the Sibyl as a prominent contributor, and Hystaspes as a lesser contributor in the company of Hermes Trismegistus, e.g.:

¹ Chapman, *Notes on the early History of the Vulgate Gospels*, 1908, 243. Cf. e.g. Priscillian, VI. 93, “dum in oblationes suas dies menses formas pecorum, etc.”

² *Hist. rei Literariae Ordinis S. Benedicti*, 1754, IV. 186.

Quare cum hæc omnia uera et certa sint prophetarum omnium consona adnuntiatione prædicta, cum eadem Trismegistus, eadem Hystaspes, eadem Sybillæ cecinerint, dubitari non potest quia spes omnis uitæ ac salutis in sola dei religione sit posita (*Inst. Epitome*, 68 (73); cf. *Div. Inst.* VII. 15. 19, VIII. 18. 1). And though it is in his fourth book that Lactantius makes full use of the *Testimonia* in which excerpts from the Sibyl occur, it cannot be a sign of wider reading in him to include Hystaspes, when Justin already has a *Testimonia* text in which both the Sibyl and Hystaspes are cited. It is natural to expect a very early draft of the *Testimony Book* should expand the simple dramatic consequences of its own Christology as these embody what technical language calls the "Last Things," into a more definite eschatology. It is thus Justin uses the Sibyl and Hystaspes:

καὶ Σίβυλλα δὲ καὶ Ὑστάσπης γενήσεσθαι τὴν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν διὰ πυρὸς ἔφασαν¹.

The historic tendency of development along this line of eschatology could scarcely leave the text of the *Testimonia* untouched. The literary rise of the Sibyl and Hystaspes into the ranks of those from whom stone and precious things are taken, for the building of an Interpreter's house to receive the meanings and values of Jesus Christ, is best accounted for on the above lines; namely, by means of a natural expansion of what material was in the *Testimonia* amenable to the growing eschatological emphasis.

If the *Testimony Book* offers a natural solution to the question of the rise of the Sibyl into prophetic favour, it appears also an equally attractive and natural solution for the rise of certain writings into a place of authority, but unto which later canonical recognition was not given. Wisdom, Sirach, writings with the name of Jeremiah, Enoch—these among others were thus honoured. These writings were contributory to the *Testimonia*. Their place there, and the influence of the accepted prefatory phrases which gave them indistinguishable authority with the Hebrew prophets, would account with naturalness for their rise into honour. It was long before the Councils of the Church were thought about that the early followers of Jesus Christ realised how the "canonicity" of certain Semitic and allied writings, depended upon their place in the document which was used by the Evangelists and Apostles of Him whom they would explain to the world.

¹ Cf. Theophilus of Antioch, *ad Autolycum*, II. 3, 31, 38; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* VI. 5.

CHAPTER XI

PAPIAS AND THE TESTIMONIES

IN our first volume we tried to show the probability that the lost Five Books of Papias on the *Dominical Oracles* were commentaries upon the *Book of Testimonies*, and we suggested that this *Book of Testimonies* might also be fivefold, each division furnishing text to a corresponding division in the work of Papias. We even went so far as to suggest that the *Testimonies in five volumes* might be extant, with some variation in order and compass, in the latest known works of the Greeks against the Jews. In one such work we found some verses prefixed which assigned its composition to Matthew, and it was asked whether this might not intimate that the original *Book of Testimonies* came from the hand of Matthew, the Apostle and Publican, assuming, that is, that the verses were from an ancient hand.

It must be admitted that the argument was adventuresome, to the outside limits of a pioneer's audacity. It required to be carefully tested by the detailed examination of the ms. from which the verses came; and the whole argument as regards Papias and his Five Books was sharply challenged by Prof. Bacon, who put forward an alternative view of the Five Books of text underlying the Five Books of Commentaries, to which we now propose briefly to refer.

Prof. Bacon, strange to say, accepted the weakest part of my theory: he conceded the antiquity of the verses, the point I was myself most in doubt of; he admitted that Matthew was the actual Matthew of the New Testament but he denied that the *Testimonies* had anything to do with Papias. His theory was that the Gospel of Matthew, as we actually know it, is divisible into five sections, each marked by a definite formula, and that it is these five sections which are the subject of Papias's Commentaries. It will be seen that we have not, at this point, to defend the antiquity of the Greek verses (*Ματθαῖος εἶργει κτέ*); it is conceded; nor to justify our own want of logical faculty, in saying that five books of Commentary pre-suppose (or at least suggest) five books

of text; for Prof. Bacon finds the five books of text for us, and so, as far as logic is concerned, *cadit quaestio*.

Let us, then, examine the proposed dissection of the Gospel of Matthew into the five books of a new Pentateuch.

It was pointed out by Sir John Hawkins that, when the Birth stories and the Passion are removed from the Gospel of Matthew, what is left breaks into five sections, which are indicated by the formula "It came to pass when Jesus had finished these sayings," or something equivalent: the places where these subdivisions occur are marked by Nestle on the margin of his New Testament, in each case the four parallels being marked against the fifth. They are as follows:

Book i	...	Matt. iii.-vii. fin.
Book ii	...	Matt. viii.-xi. 1.
Book iii	...	Matt. xi. 2-xiii. 53.
Book iv	...	Matt. xiii. 54-xviii. fin.
Book v	...	Matt. xix. 1-xxvi. 1.

We proceed to test the agreement of these sections with the supposed Five Books of Papias: but first we clear away what might be a misunderstanding, though it is not really a vital objection to Prof. Bacon's theory. It will be said, if we assume with Prof. Bacon the required subdivision of Matthew into five books, then the formulae which mark the divisions should be definitely Matthaean. Cf., for example, Matt. vii. 28, 29 with the Synoptic parallels. But now look at Matt. vii. 28 by the side of Luke vi. 49-vii. 1.

Matt. vii. 28.

καὶ ἦν ἡ πτῶσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη· καὶ
ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν κτέ.

Luke vi. 49.

καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ ῥῆγμα τῆς οἰκίας
ἐκείνης μέγα.

Matt. viii. 5.

εἰσελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰς Καφαρναούμ
κτέ.

Luke vii. 1.

ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα
αὐτοῦ...εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ.

Here, then, Luke has one of the dividing sections of Matthew; they are no longer Matthaean, but appear to be taken from Q, the common source of Matthew and Luke. Then it should be Q and not Matthew that supplies Prof. Bacon with the *Dominical Oracles*.

A further difficulty arises: when we turn to the concluding section in the assumed Pentateuch, we find that it runs:

καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, εἶπεν τοῖς μαθη-
ταῖς αὐτοῦ, Οἶδατε κτέ.

Thus the fifth concluding formula presumes a sixth section, and

the new Pentateuch has now become a new Hexateuch. Prof. Bacon meets these objections by allowing that the first instance of the use of the formula is from *Q*, but claims the other four for Matthew; he admits also that the fifth formula is anticipative of the Epilogue.

Now let us see how the matter stands in relation to Papias.

We are all agreed that the story of Judas the traitor, in some form or other, lay before Papias. It should then occur in the text of Matthew upon which Papias comments. Unfortunately its place in Matthew is outside the five sections into which Hawkins, Nestle and Bacon divide the book. But this is not all that we know about Papias and the Judas legends. According to Apollinaris of Laodicea, as quoted by Oecumenius in his commentary on the Acts, the Judas-story stood in the *fourth* book of the *Dominical Oracles*; *i.e.* according to Bacon, between Matt. xiii. 54 and the close of the eighteenth chapter. It seems quite impossible to find Judas there, or his apostasy, or his death.

Here is another Papias landmark, not quite so easy to recognise.

In the first book of Papias stood the statement that "those who practised Divine innocency (of life) used to be called children (*παῖδες*)," and it has been usual to compare this statement with Matt. xviii. 5, or Matt. xix. 14. Of these passages the first is the fourth Baconian division, the second is in the fifth.

The famous story in Papias about the vines and grains which multiply at the rate of 10,000 for one is known to have stood in the fourth book of Papias. Can we find a text to suggest this miraculous fertility in the Gospel? We think, naturally, of the passage in which Jesus speaks of the grains producing some 30, some 60, some 100. It is just possible that such a passage might provoke Papias to millennial exegesis, along with the Blessing of Isaac in the Old Testament. But this passage stands in the third of Prof. Bacon's sections.

So far, then, as we are in a position to test the matter, the extant references to the fragments of Papias do not furnish any support to the theory of Prof. Bacon.

It may be asked whether our own hypothesis will fare any better under criticism. It can hardly fare any worse. The Judas-story was, in the Gospel, accompanied by proof-texts of the nature of *Testimonies*. We have already referred to the quotation in Matthew from Zechariah-Jeremiah. In Mark the use of a *Testimony*

is not so obvious, but it is there. In Mark xiv. 18 Jesus speaks of being betrayed by *one that eats bread with him*, and a little later Jesus shows that he is consciously quoting Scripture by saying that the Son of Man goes his way *καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ*, the reference being to *ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ* which has preceded. When this incident recurs in the Fourth Gospel (John xiii. 18) Jesus says definitely, "The Scripture has to be fulfilled."

This is not taken from Mark, nor is it in the LXX. It is a case of an independent translation, and so is one more proof of the use of the *Testimony Book*.

When Greg. Nyss. quotes the Psalm, he follows the LXX (see chap. v. p. 306), and the same is true of Timothy and Aquila (p. 71). The matter in Greg. Nyss. is evidently from a more extended collection of passages on the Betrayal; he assigns a chapter, and gives—one quotation. Eusebius points in the same direction; in his *Demonstratio Evangelica* in ten books he devotes one whole book to the prophecies of the Betrayal.

We need have no hesitation that the Judas-story was told in Old Testament language, and that it was found in the books of fulfilled prophecies.

In the Athos ms. to which we referred in our first part, the prophecy of the thirty pieces of silver is in the *fifth* book. According to the tradition of the Papias fragments, it should have been the *fourth*. We must, therefore, leave the matter undecided; so far as the assigned numbers go, the evidence is against identifying the tradition of our ms. with the Papias Oracles.

It will be seen that one result of the present enquiry into the antiquity of the Christian collections of *Testimonies* is to put the Papias question somewhat into the background.

It does not really matter to the interpreter of the New Testament what book Papias used in making his commentaries, for we have discovered material for a much earlier date than Papias on which commentaries could be made. For this reason we do not propose to lay too much stress on the Byzantine anti-Judaic writers and the Greek verses which they incorporate. We will put the Athos ms. and other related mss. into an Appendix. It may be that continuity can be established between their texts and a primitive Matthew-book; it is comparatively easy to show that they incorporate blocks of primitive quotations; but we are no longer dependent upon the Byzantine writers for the key to the problem of *Testimonies*;

the New Testament itself has, with the assistance of early Patristic writers, yielded up the secret. That is the net result of the present volume. The same reasons which relegate Papias to a secondary place in our argument allow us to desist, for the present at all events, from further discussion of the views of Prof. Bacon.

In the *Expositor* for April, 1918, Dr Bindley challenges Dr Bacon's interpretation of the statements of Papias with regard to the *Dominical Oracles*, and points out that "Papias nowhere says that the λόγια which he proposes to interpret will be found in the well known Apostolic Gospel (of Matthew)": and he asks pointedly enough, whether Dr Bacon is prepared to maintain, what his position demands, that our first Gospel is a translation from a Hebrew (Aramaic) original. As we have said, in our judgment, the final decision on these points about the *Oracles* will be more easily made when we have settled the character and priority of the *Oracles* themselves.

CHAPTER XII

DID JESUS USE TESTIMONIES?

LET us now proceed to investigate briefly the relation of the *Testimony Book* and its teaching to the actual statement of Jesus himself, as reported in the Gospels. Let us ask the question whether Jesus used *Testimonies*, and define first what we mean by the question, in order that we know whether we are giving the right answer.

If by *Testimonies* we only mean Quotations, it is obvious that our Lord constantly quoted from the Old Testament, and indeed we do not know of any other literary source from which He could have quoted. This is not, however, the sense in which we have been using the word *Testimonies*. Our quotations have been such as have been collected and arranged for polemical or catechetical purposes; they are the propaganda material of a new religion, divided roughly into two groups, those namely which are directed against the Ancient Religion, and those which are occupied with the Person and the work of the Founder of the New Religion, the Testimonies against the Jews and Testimonies concerning the Christ. The two groups are, naturally, not to be understood as mutually exclusive.

When, therefore, we ask whether Jesus used *Testimonies*, we mean, Did Jesus use the Old Testament in an anti-Judaic manner? such as we find to prevail among his first disciples? and, Did Jesus employ the Old Testament writers in exposition of his own personal claims or character or being? these are the questions which require our attention. To put it in a more concrete form, did Jesus ever depict the Jews as a people fallen from Divine favour? And did Jesus ever speak of Himself as the Wisdom of God in the so-called Sapiential writings? If these questions should be answered in the affirmative, it would be easy to see how books of written Testimonies should have arisen, such as we find in use by St Paul, or in collections like those of Cyprian. The impetus for such a literary development would come from the Master himself.

To take a special case: we have proved that one of the oldest Testimonies concerning Christ is that in which he is described as Stone of Stumbling and Rock of Offence (λίθος and πέτρα). Here are two primitive titles for our Lord, taken from the Old Testament; with them we find associated a passage from the Psalms, concerning the Stone which the Builders rejected, which can be traced in the Gospels to Jesus' own words. The passage is used anti-Judaically, it is also employed to indicate his own approaching honour and glory ("the head of the corner"). In this sense we may say that all the Stone and Rock Testimonies, and they are many and early, go back to a Saying of Jesus which incorporated a Saying of a Prophet or Psalmist. It is Jesus, if we may say so, who sets the Stone rolling. It was an anti-Judaic Stone, rolled down upon his opponents and critics. Did you never read this? was his enquiry. We may not be able to give the date when the doctrine that Christ was λίθος and πέτρα first became a part of a text-book, but we may be sure that when it did become so, it was a part of an anti-Judaic document. A good illustration may be found in 1 Cor. x. 5, where Paul explains that the Rock in the Wilderness was Christ, and then goes on to point out that with the greater part of the people of Israel God was displeased; their desert-strown limbs are a proof of the Divine anger. This again is anti-Judaic testimony, and it recurs in Heb. iii. 17. So we infer that one whole line of Christian testimonies (the line of the Stone of Stumbling and of the Rock of Offence) was directed against the Jews, and the initial momentum came from Jesus Himself¹.

It seems clear that the early Church believed that their method

¹ The student should study carefully the Synoptic presentation of Ps. cxviii. 22, 23. Mark will tell us that the Jewish leaders knew that Jesus had been speaking against them. The parable was a parable against the Jews and the Psalm was a *Testimonium adversus Judaeos*. But Matthew and Luke bring it out even more clearly, by telling what would happen if one should fall on the Stone, or if the Stone should fall on him. Here the word λικμήσει betrays a contribution from Daniel in the story of the Stone cut out of the mountain (Dan. ii. 44). This shows that some one had been quarrying Stone in the Old Testament in the same way that Cyprian does, before the time of composition of the common source of Matthew and Luke.

The importance of the foregoing considerations will be evident. Here is a scrap of a *Testimony Book* tacked on to a testimony quoted by Jesus. In one of the *Testimony Books* which incorporate the foregoing sayings, we have actually the means of correcting the Gospel text in Matthew, against all existing authorities. The *Dialogue between Athanasius and Zacchaens* (p. 35) tells us that "the Vineyard shall be taken from you," which is a much better reading than "the Kingdom of God," and restores continuity to the text: cf. also, "bringing forth the fruits thereof."

of teaching by *Testimonies* could be traced back to the Lord: for we have definite statements by Luke to the effect that one of the duties discharged by Christ Risen to his disciples was that of opening their eyes to understand the Scriptures and of making them see what was written in the Prophets, the Law and the Psalms concerning himself; it is not possible to reduce this statement to a lower meaning than that the early Church believed that they had supreme authority for their method in dealing with the Old Testament, and that this authority thus given to the method must have covered, in part, the matter and the arrangement.

We see, then, that we have the same right to test Jesus for anti-Judaism as we have to test St Paul or St Peter. The great quotation which in Mark iv. 12 describes the Jewish people as "Eyes and no-Eyes" is certainly a primitive *Testimony*; equally is a *Testimony of Jesus*.

The same thing is true, as we have shown elsewhere, of Mark vii. and the people whom Isaiah foretells, as the "Folk of the Lip-service and Far-away-heart." Here also we have the anti-Judaic Jesus coming clearly to light. Cyprian and Justin are in direct sequence to the Gospel, and a first comment upon it: their anti-Judaic interpretation has its roots in the first pages of the Christian story.

The foregoing considerations help to understand what is naturally a more difficult question, both historically and theologically: when we know what He said about the Jews we may be able to find out what He said about Himself. The question whether Jesus called Himself the Divine Wisdom has far-reaching consequences. It is easier to answer it in the affirmative (in spite of the fact that many thoughtful people have instinctively answered it in the negative) when we find that other parts of the *Testimony Book* depend upon statements of his own. In the particular case before us we have shown elsewhere the abundance of the traditional evidence that Christ was described as the Wisdom of God. About this there is no difficulty: where the difficulty occurs is in passing from what the disciples said about Him to what He said about himself. In view of the consequences which result from the affirmative answer, it is well to be cautious and to move slowly. We may, however, say that if the value of a hypothesis consists in what it clarifies and explains, the supposition that Jesus said He was the Divine Sophia will throw light on a number of passages in the

Gospels. The two principal passages are (a) the so-called "erratic block" in Matt. xi. 28-30, where Jesus has been challenged for using sapiential language, his "Come unto me" being Wisdom's call, and his "yoke" being Wisdom's yoke; (b) the passage in Matt. xxiii. 34 and Luke xi. 49, in which Matthew makes Jesus send prophets to be rejected by the Jews, and Luke makes the Divine Wisdom send them. It is obvious that much of the difficulty which a hyper-criticism has imported into these places disappears, if Jesus and Sophia are the same speaker: and here also we have one more proof that the Sophia who speaks is anti-Judaic.

Whatever may be the final answer to the question whether it was Jesus or his immediate disciples that first identified Him with the Divine Wisdom, there can be no doubt that the appellation once made was persistent. We have shown that when Logos was substituted for Sophia in the Christology, it was common for the two terms to still subsist side by side, so that the one can hardly be described as replacing the other. Indeed, the description of Jesus as the Divine Wisdom continues to our own days, without any need for a reference to St Paul's epistles. It passed into the rituals of the Church and it is still to be found in them. Few English Churchmen are aware that it is in their own Prayer-book, and that it came there by way of the Roman Breviary. A glance at the Calendar attached to the Prayer-book will show, against the date December 16, the mysterious words,

O Sapientia.

A reference to Humphry, *Treatise on the Books of Common Prayer*, p. 99, will show the following entry:

Dec. 16. O Sapientia. These words are the beginning of an anthem in the Latin service, which used to be sung in the Church at vespers from this day to Christmas eve. Eight other hymns were sung at Advent, which begin, O Adonai, O radix Jesse, O clavis David, O oriens splendor, O Emmanuel, O Virgo Virginum, O Thoma Didyme.

This is not a clear statement: they are not anthems nor hymns, but antiphons. Moreover it is clear that they do not constitute a series of nine antiphons, though they are found together, for the antiphon to the Virgin and the one to St Thomas do not belong here; they are an excrescence, and when we remove them we have a series of seven antiphons which we shall show to be all addressed to Christ. They were known to Englishmen as the great O's.

If we turn to an early Roman Breviary before the Quignon

Revision or the Tridentine edition, we shall see this clearly. Take for instance the Roman breviary printed at Nonantula in 1480; here we find the antiphons for the time immediately preceding Advent as follows:

O Sapientia.
 O Adonai.
 O Radix Jesse.
 O Clavis David.
 O Oriens splendor.
 O Rex gentium.
 O Emmanuel rex et legifer noster.

No reference is made to the Virgin or to St Thomas. Then follows:

Istae septem antiphonae suprascriptae ultimo die ante vigiliam nativitatis domini complentur.

That appears to decide the number of the antiphons¹.

That they constitute a group with a single motive appears upon a closer scrutiny. Each one is an invitation to some one to come who is expected, and it is easy to see that this is the reason why they are in the Advent service for the week before Christmas. The key-word is *Veni*, and the person addressed is Christ. Here are the seven antiphons in the Roman form:

O Sapientia, quae ex ore altissimi prodisti, attigens a fine usque ad finem fortiter, suaviter disponens,

Veni ad docendum nos viam prudentiae.

O Adonay et dux domus Israel, qui Moysi in igne flammae rubi apparuisti, et ei in Syna legem dedisti,

Veni ad redimendum nos in brachio extento.

O Radix Jesse qui stas in signo populorum super quem continebunt reges os suum, quem gentes deprecabantur,

Veni ad liberandum nos, noli tardare.

O Clavis David et sceptrum domus Israel qui aperis et nemo claudit, claudis et nemo aperit,

Veni et educ vinctos de domo carceris sedentes in tenebris et umbra mortis

O Oriens, Splendor Lucis Eternae, et Sol Justitiae,

Veni et illumina sedentes in tenebris et umbra mortis.

O Rex gentium et desideratus earum, lapisque angularis qui facis utraque unum,

Veni salva hominem quem de limo formasti.

O Emmanuel rex et legifer noster, expectatio gentium et salvator earum,

Veni ad salvandum nos, domine deus noster.

¹ The Mainz Breviary of 1474 has four antiphons added, but not the one to St Thomas, viz. *O virgo virginum*, *O Gabriel nuncius celorum*, *O rex pacifice*, and *O mundi domina*.

There is not a doubt as to the unity of these antiphons; they belong together and are a part of a common scheme. The same person is addressed throughout, and the Sapiientia of the first antiphon is Christ.

It is interesting to observe further the scriptural language in which the Divine Wisdom is described; she comes forth from the Mouth of the Most High; this is Sirach, c. xxiv. 3, and is one of the proof-texts in Cyprian's *Testimonies*; this is followed by a statement that Wisdom extends from marge to marge radiantly, and that she administers graciously; this is from the Wisdom of Solomon viii. 1. The prayer is made that Wisdom will come and teach us the way of prudence. It appears that in the great O's Christ is defined as Wisdom in the terms of the Sapiential books, much in the same way as we found in our study of *Testimonies*. The impression produced is that these Advent antiphons are of great antiquity. This impression is confirmed when we look at the other members of the group, which follow the appeal to Wisdom. They are pro-ethnic in a remarkable degree. Christ is the root of Jesse, who stands for an ensign of the peoples, the one to whom the Gentiles appeal. He is the King of the Gentiles, the Desire of the Gentiles, the Expectation of the Gentiles and their Saviour. The term "King of the Gentiles" is interesting; it is the correct reading in Apoc. xv. 4.

Then we notice also that Christ is appealed to as the Stone, the Corner-stone, and we have shown abundantly how characteristic such a term is of the early years of Christianity.

On the whole we conclude that the "O Sapiientia" of the Calendar in the English Prayer-book is a bit of early ritual, broken away from its primitive setting, and with its meaning so obscured by the rust and dust of time that there is probably not an Anglican living who knows the interpretation of the vocative vocable in his Church Calendar. Even if he knew the story of the Great O's, he would not be able to tell why the Church said "O" in the first instance, nor why she said "O" to Wisdom.

CHAPTER XIII

SACRIFICES, CIRCUMCISION AND THE SABBATH

As soon as we have sufficiently proved that a body of early anti-Judaic testimonies was in existence before any of the Books of the New Testament, we are in a position to draw some conclusions with regard to the primitive Christian theology and the attitude of the earliest Christian teachers in their propagation of that theology: and the first thing that we notice is that any such statement of Christian belief as is involved in a book of prophetic testimonies must necessarily undergo a re-statement after the fall of Jerusalem. Take, for example, the question of sacrifices. It is probable that the Christian hostility to Jewish sacrifices is, in some senses, primitive; we may even have to raise the question whether Jesus Himself was not anti-Judaic in this respect¹; but whatever conclusion we may come to on that point, we shall certainly have to admit that the argument against special sacrifices at a central sanctuary will be far more forcible when the sanctuary itself at which the sacrifices are to be offered has disappeared. The challenge will at once be made as to what the unfortunate expatriated Jew proposes to do in the case of ceremonies restricted by legal emphasis to one particular spot. We should, therefore, expect that those testimonies which dwell upon the impossibility of fulfilling a Divine requirement in the matter of sacrifice will be later, as a general rule, than those which simply affirm, in the language of the prophets, the displeasure of God with sacrifices that are actually being offered. It may be quite primitive Christian theology to argue that it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin; but the argument will change its form when the blood of bulls and goats is no longer being shed. When the machinery of redemption has broken down before the eyes of the whole nation, it is hardly worth while to labour the point that the machinery itself was inadequate. We should,

¹ The Ebionite Gospel represents Jesus as saying: "I am come to put an end to sacrifices, and unless you cease from them, the anger [of God] will not cease from you."

therefore, attempt in our studies of the anti-Judaic testimonies to make a distinction between the form of the *Testimony Book* before A.D. 70 and the form which it takes subsequent to that date. The chronological barrier is, as we know for other reasons, of theological importance.

Something similar needs to be said with regard to the cult of the Sabbath Day. Here we have many suggestions of early Christian hostility; we find prophecies quoted to prove that God detests the Jewish Sabbaths, and the associated new moons, and we naturally wish to know how far such hostility goes back. Can it be traced to the Founder of the religion? There are many things in the Gospels which seem to point that way; on the other hand there are traces of traditional nervousness with regard to the holy day. The breaches of its sanctity are affirmed to be trivial, a mere matter of the plucking of a few corn-stalks, or the carrying of a sleeping mat, and the like. A roundabout proof on the part of Jesus that David broke the law when he eat the sanctuary bread seems hardly to be worthy of the Speaker, who is discussing the Sabbath Law, until we see that it becomes a lever for introducing the splendid generalisation that "the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath," and for the affirmation of the authority of the Son of Man, representatively of Man, over the Sabbath itself. It is certain, too, that the method which Jesus took to prove that the Saints of the Old Covenant broke divine laws with impunity, was followed by the early Christian teachers, who appear to have collected strings of broken Sabbaths from the Old Testament, and sometimes went so far in their anti-Judaism as to prove that God Himself never kept the Sabbath, any more than did the Sun, Moon and Stars. The Fourth Gospel involves Jesus in some such position, by reporting Him as saying that "My Father is working still and so am I."

Clearly we shall want to know, if the knowledge can be attained, whether anti-Sabbatism can be traced in the earliest years of the Christian faith and in what way and to what degree it expressed itself. In one sense the Sabbath Cult is not affected by a political disaster like the fall of the City, nor the ritual of the New Moon; but for this very reason we may expect the attachment of the Jew to Sabbatic and novi-lunar ritual to increase, when other forms of service become impossible; and as Judaic devotion increases, anti-Judaic criticism of that devotion may very well have become more

intense. Our guide in reconstruction of the earlier forms of the Christian protest will naturally be found in the existing books of anti-Judaic extracts, but the results which we arrive at will have to be controlled by the New Testament itself, considered as an anti-Judaic collection of documents.

In the volume which preceded the present one we showed that the early *Testimony Books* must have had an anti-Sabbatic section; for we found Victorinus of Pettau using the same instances of anti-Sabbatism that occur in Tertullian's treatise against the Jews, or in Aphrahat's discourse on the Sabbath, such as the story of the siege of Jericho, and the Sabbath-breaking of the Maccabee heroes.

Here is another illustration of the very same argument, which appears to involve an independent use of the same line of *Testimonies* as we find in Victorinus (*quaere* from Papias) and in Tertullian.

If we turn to the Treatise of Isidore of Seville *against the Jews* we shall at once be struck by its dependence upon the earlier anti-Judaica. He begins by saying that he is collecting *Testimonies against the Jews* from the Old Testament: "ad quorum refellendam perfidiam, quaedam ex Veteri Testamento aggregavimus testimonia." When we come to examine these passages we find ourselves on well-known grounds. For example, Isidore undertakes to show that Christ sits at the right hand of God. The proof is as follows:

In Psalmis scriptum est: Dixit Dominus Domino meo, Sede a dextris meis, donec ponam inimicos scabellum pedum tuorum. Inquirant ergo Judaei, cui dictum est a Domino, Sede a dextris meis? Numquid archangelo? Non opinor, neque angelo neque prophetae etc. (Isidore, *contra Judaeos*, I. 37.)

This is precisely the line of argument in the Epistle to the Hebrews (c. i. 13) which we have shown to be anti-Judaic and to use the method of *Testimonies*. Then we convict Isidore of dependence upon the same anti-Judaic tradition that we brought to light in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is primitive documentary stuff that Isidore is using.

In the same way, by comparing the head-lines in Isidore's arguments with those in Cyprian's *Testimonia*, we are able to establish continuity and coincidence. For example, the attitude of the Jews towards Christ is thus described:

Quem tamen, quia non essent agnitori, neque recepturi, idem Isaias alias approbat, dicens: Audite caeli. . . Israel autem me non cognovit.

Here we have close agreement with Cyprian; but the proof-text, as we have already shown, is in Romans x. 19, and is taken from a written collection of anti-Judaic passages. Thus Isidore's argument is a part of the primitive tradition. It would be easy to give similar instances, where the New Testament operates as a control to prove that the arguments and texts are primitive theology of the very first deposit. Now let us see what Isidore says on the subject of the Sabbath. It is comprised under a general heading:

De cessatione Sabbathi,

and we observe as follows:

Si crimen est, Sabbathi otium non observare, cur Deus operatur in Sabbatho....?

Cur Jesus Naue discipulus ac successor Moysi, praecipiente Domino, septem diebus continuis, inter quos utique et Sabbathum erat, exercitum et arma produxit, atque, circumeunte arca, tubisque clangentibus, Jericho muros subvertit? Quid item de Machabeis eloquar, de quibus scriptum est: et nolebant Judaei in die Sabbathi vindicare se de alienigenis. Postea consilio accepto pugnaverunt die Sabbathi et triumphaverunt de hostibus.

This is evidently the same sequence which we detected in Victorinus¹ and in Tertullian and in Aphrahat. The prefixed enquiry as to why God works on the Sabbath recalls Joh. v. 17: and the argument by question ("cur Deus operatur?" "cur Jesus Naue?") is altogether in the manner of the *Testimony Book*. We may see this in the case of the question which follows with regard to Joshua and Jericho by comparing Gregory of Nyssa's section on the Sabbath:

ἐπεὶ τοι τίνος ἔνεκεν ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ, κυκλῶν τὴν Ἱεριχὼ μετὰ σαλπίγγων ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἐσχόλασε τῷ σαββάτῳ;

It is clear that Isidore with his "Cur Jesus Naue, etc?" is following a similar tradition to Gregory of Nyssa; but can we take that back into early times? There is no allusion in the New Testament to the Sabbath-breaking of the Maccabees. Is there anything to suggest that Joshua broke the Sabbath? In that case, should we not have expected a reference in the chapter on Hebrews where the true Sabbath is expounded? There is indeed a significant reference in Hebrews xi. where the walls of Jericho are said to fall

¹ Cf. Victorinus, *de fabrica mundi*: Jesus quoque Naue, successor Moysis, et ipse Sabbathum resolvit, die enim Sabbathi praecepit filiis Israel, ut muros civitatis Hiericho tubicinibus circumirent." The coincidences in language should be noted.

down *after having been encompassed seven days*. There may be traces here of a submerged testimony but the matter is too uncertain to bear emphasis. All that we can say is that *Testimonies on the Sabbath* were collected very early, but not necessarily in or before New Testament times. There is some suggestion of them in the Gospel of John, where the question is raised whether a child circumcised on the eighth day breaks the Sabbath (Joh. vii. 23). In Gregory of Nyssa (c. 13) the question of the circumcised child has attached to it the enquiry whether a woman in labour on the Sabbath breaks the law. These are not properly Old Testament questions, nor to be decided by Old Testament quotations; they are traps to catch Rabbis. Gregory of Nyssa may have taken his question as to the circumcised child from the Gospel of John. If not, then we have a suggestion of the testimony in the Gospel, as we stated above. We observe in that case that it is put into Christ's own mouth. That may be a case of historical projection. The anti-Judaic character of the Fourth Gospel is, by this time, well established.

That the debate upon Circumcision is early we have already shown, by the submerged testimony in Hebrews with regard to Jesus, the New Circumciser with the sharp knife of the New Circumcision. It is an interesting case to study because of its prominence in Justin, Cyprian and elsewhere. The early Church had Joshua's flint knives in its historical museum, and used to invite the Jews to study them. When Justin took Trypho round the Museum he explained the matter as follows:

Our circumcision, second in order of time to yours, and revealed later than yours, is made by sharp stones, that is to say, by the words of the prophets of the chief Corner-stone, the one of whom Daniel speaks as having been cut out without hands, and this circumcision rids us of all idolatry and the sum total of villainy; and with our hearts thus circumcised from all evil, we gladly face death for the Name of our Fair Stone. (Justin, *adv. Tryph.* 114.)

It is not easy to understand Justin unless we have the *Testimony Book* at our elbow: but when we get the right point of view it is comparatively easy to follow his argument, even through developments that are not strictly logical. Christ is the New Circumciser, the spiritual Joshua; he is also the new instrument of a spiritual circumcision, for the knife is a Stone, and Christ is our Fair Stone, according to his own statement, and the earliest *Testimonies* concerning him: but this circumciser operates with this circumcising

knife, the knife and the operator being one (Stone plying stone), and it is said in Daniel that the Stone is *ἀνευ χειρῶν* ("without hands"). Then the circumcision itself is not made with hands; we coin the word *ἀχειροποίητος* to express it, and we are at once in Colossians ii. 11: "Ye are circumcised without hands (*i.e.* spiritually) by Christ's circumcision." Cyprian, who saw the connection between the passage in Colossians and the submerged *Testimonies* with regard to circumcision, goes out of his beaten track in the Old Testament to add the reference to Colossians, as thus:

Quod circumcisio prima carnalis evacuata sit et secunda spiritalis repromissa sit....

Item apud Jesum Naue: et dixit Dominus ad Jesum: fac tibi cultellos petrilos nimis acutos et adside et circumcide secundo filios Israel. Item Paulus ad Colossenses: Circumcisi estis circumcissione non manufacta in expoliatione carnis sed in circumcissione Christi.

His text of Colossians differs slightly from the current New Testament, the insertion of *sed* suggests that there should be a corresponding *non* before *in expoliatione*. Lightfoot rightly observes "it is the circumcision, not of Moses nor of the patriarchs, but of Christ." Then Christ as the Circumciser is a submerged testimony in Colossians as well as in Hebrews.

Notice that in Cyprian's head-line, *spiritalis* is the equivalent of *ἀχειροποίητος* in Colossians, and that Justin takes up the *secunda circumcisio*, either from the *Testimony* head-line or from Joshua directly.

It will probably be found that the earliest *Testimony Book* grouped together three subjects, as matters of existing controversy with the Jews, viz. circumcision, sacrifice and the Sabbath. Gregory of Nyssa preserves the original arrangement, and introduces the successive proof-texts as follows:

The Jews will all of them say, If you really worship the same God as we, why are you not circumcised, and why do you not offer animal sacrifices, nor keep Sabbath, when the Scriptures are emphatic on all these points?

We have shown reason to believe that all of the points here debated are primitive disputes, certainly in vogue before the Fall of the City. The Epistle to the Hebrews is extremely useful in emphasising this conclusion. It has its own explanations of Circumcision, Sabbath and Sacrifice, and yet there is a conventional mass of texts underlying the arguments of the Epistle. We may

take the following illustration: in the discussion of sacrifices in Heb. ix. and x. we have four times an allusion to the "blood of bulls (or calves) and goats." The marginal notes in the Greek or English New Testaments direct us to certain passages in Leviticus and Numbers for the elucidation of the argument. Very good, but the repetition of the words, in the fashion of a formula, shows that there is something more in the mind of the writer of the Epistle. Moreover, the goats in the passages quoted are an intrusion, as regards the Pentateuch narrative. Westcott had already noted this, and says; on Heb. ix. 19:

Goats are not directly spoken of in the Mosaic narrative (Exodus xxiv. 5) and Philo notices the fact.... The addition is the more remarkable because the offering of a goat (*i.e.* *τράγος*, see Dillmann on Lev. i. 10) is never prescribed in the Law except as a sin-offering, etc.

On turning to Cyprian we find:

Quod sacrificium vetus evacuetur et novum celebraretur. Apud Esaiam prophetam: Quo mihi multitudinem sacrificiorum vestrorum? Dicit Dominus: plenus sum, holocaustomata arietum et adipem agnorum et *sanguinem taurorum et hircorum* nolo: Quis enim exquisivit ista de manibus vestris?

The same extract more at length will be found in Gregory Nyss. in the section *περὶ θυσιῶν* as follows:

καὶ πάλιν· τί μοι πλῆθος τῶν θυσιῶν ὑμῶν; λέγει Κύριος· πλήρης εἰμι ὀλοκαυτωμάτων κριῶν καὶ στέαρ ἀρνῶν, καὶ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων οὐ βούλομαι.

Thus we have another instance of the operation of a submerged testimony on the mind of the writer of the Epistle, and we may be reasonably sure that Isaiah i. 11 was part of the artillery of the primitive Christian. Notice that the margin of the Revised Version has added against Heb. x. 4 the reference to Isaiah.

Enough has been said to show that many of the quotations from the Old Testament in the New are secondary in character. They do not come directly from the Hebrew or the Septuagint; they are derived from a collection or collections of texts made by primitive Christian teachers. It would be well if this could be indicated in some way either by variation of type or by variation of the marginal reference. Variations of type are not attractive to an editor, yet they may sometimes be resorted to. Imagine a text of Romans or Hebrews in which the *Testimonia* were printed in red ink. One would see at a glance that there was not much left in the way of Biblical quotation. It would, for instance, be clear

that one could be mighty in the Scriptures, without having a large library with him or a colossal memory. Apollos might come to Ephesus with the minimum of luggage, and still be able to convince the Jews powerfully concerning Jesus Christ; but without minishing the scholarship of the great rival and colleague of St Paul, we may be sure that the average Christian man and woman had a slender Biblical collection, and depended for the most part on the handbook, which was published under the name and authority of St Matthew.

APPENDIX I

CHAPTER I

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ATHOS MS.

WHEN we come to examine the text of the Athos ms. the first thing that we discover is that the heading which the Catalogue of Lambros presents is editorial. There is no title: the name Matthew has been derived from the prefixed verses, and his description as "Monk" is due to Lambros's acquaintance with the later Byzantine literature, in which a "Matthew the Hieromonachus" does appear, as a writer of anti-Judaic matter. So far, then, as the Athos ms. goes, we might be disposed simply to delete Lambros's editorial descriptions, and then to affirm, on the ground of internal examination, that the book is full of archaic anti-Judaica, and that there is no reason, *a priori*, why the prefixed verses should not be as archaic as the text. But this proceeding would be too rapid, in view (1) of the possibility that the Byzantine literature may find us the missing author, (2) that it may actually credit him with the authorship of the verses as well as the book.

Our first discovery is that we need not have gone to Mt Athos at all, nor troubled ourselves to obtain transcripts of its text. My learned friend, Joachim, the librarian of the monastery of Ivéron, might have been spared his pains in deciphering (which he did in an admirable manner) the abbreviated sixteenth century text, for which we asked his assistance. For there are two copies of the very same work in the Bodleian Library, one of which is of the same age as the Athos ms., the other at least two hundred years earlier, and a very beautiful piece of calligraphy, almost entirely free from the abbreviations and *compendia scribendi* which make fifteenth and sixteenth century mss. so hard to decipher. Let us then examine these two mss. carefully.

The first of them is Cod. Baroccianus, No. 33, and is described as follows in Coxe's Catalogue:

Cod. Barocc. 33, ff. 418, saec. xvi exeuntis.

1. Matthaei Hieromonachi adversus Judaeos libri quinque, praevia cuique capitulorum tabula.

fol. 1. τοῦ σοφωτάτου ἐν ἱερομονάχοις Ματθαίου κατὰ Ἰουδαίων λόγος πρῶτος.

Sequuntur versus isti iambici:

Ματθαῖος εἶργει τῶν Ἰουδαίων θράσος.
 "Ὡσπερ χαλινοῖς πέντε φίμωσας λόγοις·
 "Ὅστις δὲ τούτων τὴν ἐπίρρητον πλάνην
 Πλάνην ἀτέχνως ἐλέγξει (sic!) τῷ λόγῳ
 "Ἀρδὴν ἀπάσας συγκαθεῖλεν αἰρέσεις·
 Μήτηρ γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡ θεοκτόνων ἔρις.

(Note that there is a space of two letters before ἐλέγξει so that we may at once restore ἐξελέγξει.)

Tit. Cap. I. ὅτι τρισυπόστατον...προσκυνούμενον κεφάλαιον πρῶτον·

Incipit οὐδὲν οἶμαι κτέ...ἡλλοτριωμένον.

Desin. lib. v (cujus cap. ix et ult. titulus est διὰ τί μὴ καὶ τῷ διαβόλῳ χώρα δέδοται μετανόας, καὶ διὰ τί ὥσπερ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων ἄνθρωπος, οὕτω καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀγγέλων ὁ θεὸς οὐ γέγονεν ἄγγελος;) παρακινεῖν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν κρείττω καὶ θαυμασιωτέραν καὶ μόνην ἀληθῆ πολιτείαν, ὅλῳ καὶ παντὶ μετασκευάζεσθαι καὶ χωρεῖν τῷ θύμῳ.

τῷ συντελεστῇ τῶν καλῶν θεῷ χάρις. Κωνσταντίου κύριε σῶσον νυνὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ σὺ, θεοῦ ᾧ μήτηρ, τὸ τρισάθλιον σῶμα. Deinde notitia ista, μετὰ ταῦτα δέ ἐστι ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐπὶ τοῖς καλύβοις, οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφή, τί βούλεται ὁ ἐφθὸς προτιθέμενος σίτος ἐν τε τοῖς μνημοσύνοις τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ κεκοιμημένων καὶ ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἀγίων ἱεραῖς τελεταῖς.

According to this Baroccian ms., our anti-Judaic document is definitely referred to Matthew the Hieromonachus, in close agreement with Lambros's heading: it was copied by a scribe of the name of Constantius, and it has attached a further tract, referred to the same Matthew, discussing the reasons for offering roasted grain at the graves of the faithful. The important point for us to notice, and our fresh information with regard to the Athos text, is (a) the definite reference of the work to Matthew the Hieromonachus; (b) the equally definite reference of a second tract to the same author.

Our second Oxford ms. is much more important, on account of its superior age and clearness: it is described as follows in the Bodleian catalogue:

Cod. Seld. (Gr.) 44. Codex membranaceus, in fol. min. ff. 157, saec. xiv nitide exaratus.

Matthaei Blastaris hieromonachi opera, quae sequuntur scilicet.

1. Ep. ad Imperatoris συργῆν, in qua Latinorum dogmata de S. Spiritus processione redarguit: f. 1.

Tit. τῷ περιποθῇ τῷ θείῳ τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου βασιλέως, συργῆν τελεξινιάφ, ὁ ἐλάχιστος ἐν ἱερομονάχοις Ματθαῖος·

Incip. πειρωμένῳ σε πολλάκις πείσαι, κράτιστε, τῶν ἐν τέλει τοῦ Λατινικοῦ φρονήματος περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως·

2. De oppositione Cotybi, sive cocti frumenti, in officio pro mortuis: f. 21.

Tit. τί βούλεται ὁ ἐφθὸς προτιθέμενος σίτος ἐν τε τοῖς (sic) μνημοσύναις τῶν ἐν χριστῷ κεκοιμημένων καὶ ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἀγίων ἱεραῖς τελεταῖς; τοῦ ἐλαχίστου ἐν ἱερομονάχοις Ματθαίου.

Incip. ἡ θεοειδὴς τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐκκλησίας ἱεραρχία τὴν τῶν κατ' αὐτὴν ὑπερκειμένην δύναμιν μυστήριον....

3. Hymnologium, sive officia cantanda in ecclesia in hebdomadis Dominicisque per annum: fol. 276.

Tit. 1. στιχηρὰ ψαλλόμενα ἐν τῷ ἐσπερινῷ, ἀπὸ τῆς κυριακῆς τοῦ Θωμᾶ μέχρι τῶν ἀγίων πάντων, ὧν ἡ ἀκροστιχίς·

Ματθαῖος ὕμνῃ σὴν ἀνάστασιν, λόγε,
καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς τὴν χάριν τεραστίων,
τὴν ἀνάληψιν· πνεύματος παρουσίαν.

Incip. τῇ κυριακῇ τοῦ Θωμᾶ· μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν ὥφθης τοῖς ἀποστόλοις σου·

4. Refutatio errorum Latinorum: f. 54.

Tit. ἔλεγχος ὧδε τῆς πλάνης τῶν Λατίνων,

θύτου παρ' οἴκτροῦ Ματθαίου μονοτρόπου.

Incip. ἄρτι μὲν ἡ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία τῆς τῶν αἰρετικῶν δογμάτων ἀχλύος.

Desin. ὅμως οἴκτον οὐκ ἀποτίθεται.

5. Contra Judaeos libri quinque: fol. 100.

Tit. τοῦ ἐλαχίστου ἐν ἱερομονάχοις Ματθαῖος πρὸς Ἰουδαίους λόγος πρῶτος.

Incip. ὅτι τρισυπόστατον καὶ ἡ παλαιὰ τὸν θεὸν κηρύττει γραφή·

Praemittuntur versus.

Ματθαῖος εἶργει [ut supra]...Μητὴρ γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡ θ... τίνων (sic) ἔρις (correct the doubtful word to θεοκτόνων).

Desin. καὶ μόνην ἀληθὴ πολιτείαν ὀλῶ καὶ παντὶ μετασκευάζεσθαι καὶ χωρεῖν τῷ θυμῷ.

Sequitur frag. breve ex Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* VII. 37.

Here then we have again Matthew the Hieromonachus, this time as the author of five works (two of them the same as in the Baroccian ms. and one of them the same as the Athos ms.) and identified with Matthew Blastares (whose name stands on the back of the bound volume), though there is no sign of Blastares in the book itself. We notice also that there are some more Matthaean verses.

On turning to Krumbacher's *Byzantine Literature*, p. 110, we find as follows:

Nun von der ἔλεγχου τῆς πλάνης τῶν Λατίνων betitelter Schrift des Matthaeos Blastares finden sich einige Fragmente bei Dositheos τόμος καταλλαγῆς, Jassy 1698, 441–445. Matt. Blastares gehören wohl auch die unter dem Namen eines Matthaeos Hieromonachos überlieferten 5. Bücher gegen die Juden zu, eher als Matt. Kantakuzenos. In Cod. Bodl. Seld. 44, saec. 14, fol. 100–197 stehen sie bei den übrigen Schriften des Matt. Blast. gegen die Latiner.

Here Krumbacher notes the Oxford identification of Matthew Hieromonachus with Blastares, but says (for some reason which he does not further specify) that the work against the Jews has elsewhere been

ascribed to Matthew Cantacuzene (an author to whom a commentary on the Canticles is ascribed which is printed in *P. G.* 152, 997 ff.).

Krumbacher also points out that there is a further confusion elsewhere between Matthew Blastares and Matthew Camariotes. Thus in Cod. Paris. Gr. 2830, f. 201–216, a work is ascribed to Blastares, which begins,

ἀρχὴ σὺν θεῷ τῶν διαιρέσεων τῶν σχημάτων τῆς ῥητορικῆς τέχνης,

which appears to be the work of Matthew Camariotes, printed in *P. G.* 160. Such confusions are natural enough when a writer speaks of himself as Matthew the Monk without further specification.

We have now reached the point when it may fairly be inferred that the name of Matthew rightly stands on our anti-Judaic work, though we are not quite clear which Matthew it is to whom it is to be referred. Can we find any further traces of the anti-Judaic Matthew?

In Georgius Phrantzes', *Hist.* II. xii. 12 (ed. Bekker, *Corp. Script. Byz.*) is an account of a dialogue between the Emperor John and a certain Hebrew named Xenos, who was afterwards baptized a Christian under the name of Emmanuel. The emperor is supposed to be John Palaeologos the seventh, 1390–1448 A.D. The discussion begins by the King being asked by the Jew how it was possible for the Virgin to conceive. To which the King replies by counter questions as to how the virgin earth at the beginning brought forth without seed: how the rock poured out water, how Aaron's rod blossomed, etc., etc.

The Jew, who is the protagonist in the debate then asks whether, if Christ died of his own accord, he ought not to be regarded as a self-murderer. He wants also to know about the false reading of ἡ παρθένος for ἡ νεάνις in Isaiah, etc., etc. A little later he enquires as follows:

Since no one ever lived as long as a thousand years, why do you say of your assumed Messiah that he is still alive, though it is close on fourteen hundred years since he died? (μηδενός πω τῶν ἐξ αἰῶνος, ὃ βασιλεῦ, ἀνθρώπων ὑπὲρ τὰ χίλια ἔτη ζήσαντος, πῶς αὐτὸν τὸν Μεσσίαν τετρακοσίων ἐγγὺς ἤδη καὶ χιλίων παρφρηκότων ἐνιαυτῶν ἔτι ζῆν ὑπειλήφατε; ἀδύνατον γάρ·) and if he is dead, he cannot be the Messiah, for Elijah has not yet come to anoint him to that office.

(The reference to the date as being nearly 1430 A.D. is important for us to notice; it helps us to identify the Emperor.)

As the debate proceeds, a fresh figure appears on the scene: he is described as Matthew the Hieromonachus and Lord High Chancellor: he intervenes to explain to the Jew the doctrine of the Two Advents, and the relation of Elijah to these two advents. This he does at some length, and finally we are told that the conversion of the Jew was

accomplished by the radiant illumination of the Holy Spirit and the wise words of the emperor and Matthew the Hieromonachus,

λοιπὸν ἔνεκεν τῆς τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος αἴγλης καὶ τοῖς σοφοῖς ῥήμασι τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος καὶ τοῦ ἱερομονάχου Ματθαίου φωτισθεὶς ὁ ἑβραῖος τὴν ἁγίαν τριάδα ὁμολόγησε καὶ πάντα τὰ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως δόγματα, καὶ τῷ θεῷ βαπτίσματι ἀναγεννηθεὶς ἀντὶ Ἰένου Ἑμμανουὴλ ἐπωνομάσθη.

Here, then, we have come across Matthew the Monk and Anti-Judaizer; he is the Chancellor of John Palaeologos the seventh, and we have a specimen of his anti-Judaism. We are now to enquire whether he is the author of the works contained in the Selden ms. and of our anti-Judaic text in particular.

The first difficulty in the identification is the date. As we saw above, the dispute recorded by the Byzantine chronicler is internally dated as nearly 1430 A.D. The Selden ms., however, is referred to the fourteenth century, and certainly looks as if it were early fourteenth century. We may reduce the difficulty by saying that the 1400 years referred to were reckoned according to the Christian era, and not from the death of Christ. This would carry the debate back into the end of the fourteenth century. Assuming this to be consistent with the date to which the ms. must be referred, we should have to regard the Selden ms. as an autograph or contemporary product. This need not be impossible, though it is not, at first sight, likely. Supposing this difficulty to be got over, the next question would be to compare the treatment of the doctrine of the Two Advents in the Byzantine historian (*ex ore Matthaei Hieromonachi*) and the same doctrine in the Selden ms. If they are in reasonable agreement, there is still the question to be considered, whether the historian has not transferred matter which he thinks suitable to the recorded debate from an earlier source. Let us see how the problem works out.

The argument of the Chancellor, in reply to the enquiry of the Jew as to how do you explain it, that the Messiah has come, when the Tishbite (Elijah) has not come, as the prophets foretold that he should, is as follows: there are two advents of Christ, one in the past, the other at the end of the world. The Tishbite is the forerunner of the second advent; the forerunner of the first advent was John, who was called by Malachi the messenger, or angel, not only because he announced the nearness of the first advent, but because he embraced a life that was almost angelic. And Christ called him Elias, not because he was really so, but as discharging a similar service. The prophets foretell both of these forerunners: but the Jews pass over in silence the first advent, and really attack (ἀτεχνῶς ἐπιβάλλετε) the sense of the Scripture, by confining their attention to the second advent only; the prophets on

the other hand, regarded both advents. For example, Malachi refers to the first advent when he says, "Behold, I send my messenger to prepare thy way"; he regards the second advent when he says, "Who may abide the day of His coming? For He shall be like a fire." He speaks sometimes of the first advent as if it were past: for the refiner's fire may be referred to the mystical work of the Holy Spirit. Those who do not retain their baptismal purity have a fearful looking for judgment in the second advent, and to this belongs the prophecy "I will send you Elijah the Tishbite." And when it says that Elijah will turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, that means that the Jews will become reconciled to the apostolic dogmas. He goes on to say that the object of Elijah's mission is "that I may not smite the earth utterly (*ἄρδην* = Malachi iv. 6), finding you wholly given over to unbelief. He did not come to smite the earth at the first advent, but to save it. If that advent is slighted, one may find oneself at the second advent face to face with a wolf and not a shepherd, and be in the ranks of the Antichrist instead of the Christ. Such a hostile power as Daniel calls by the name of the beast, who will be delivered up to the river of fire that flows from under the throne of the judge; that Antichrist who, not being able to resist confutation at the hands of Enoch and Elijah, will destroy them like a tyrant, they thus gaining the crown of martyrdom, who had hitherto evaded death.

Such in brief summary is the Chancellor's argument, which leads up to the conversion of the Jew.

Now let us turn to the Selden ms. and see how the matter of the two advents and the coming of Elias is treated. We will translate this time, instead of paraphrasing, as the argument is not drawn out at such length, as in the Byzantine historian's report. The section runs as follows:

The (Jews) say, that the Scripture proclaims that the Messiah is to come and that Elijah is to come first; and now how do ye say that the Messiah is come?

Two advents of Christ are announced by the prophets; one of which has already occurred, and one in the future, which is to appear at the end of the world. And of the second advent they say that Elijah is to be the forerunner, but of the former John, whom the prophet Malachi described as messenger (angel) as being a herald, and one who was to embrace the angelical life. And Christ called this one Elijah, not because he was Elijah, but because he discharged fully the same service, and lived a life similar to his. And the prophets make mention of both these advents and announce those who are to be forerunners of each. But ye (sc. the Jews) pay attention (*ἐπιβάλλετε*) to the one advent (sc. the second) and hide away the former. And now listen to Malachi, how he speaks of the first advent, and then of the second. For behold, he says, I will send my messenger before thy face, and he shall regard

(ἐπιβλέψεται, LXX) a way before my face; and suddenly the Lord shall come to His temple. By the temple he described the human nature, which God the Word took on Him. And over and above the first advent, he also attaches to it the second. Behold the Lord Almighty cometh, and who shall abide the day of His entrance? or who shall stand at the sight of Him? For the implacable (ἀδυσώπητος) Judge shall descend, rendering to every man according to his deeds. And then he teaches again the things that happened at His former dramatic coming. For He enters as a melting furnace and as fuller's grass; and He comes down melting and purifying the silver and the gold. And by these things He intimates the purifying of the Holy Spirit, which the Word, in His divine-human life bestowed upon us. And again he turns to the second advent. Lo! I will send you Elijah the Tishbite; and to intimate the time, he adds further, Before the great and notable day of the Lord; that He may restore the heart of the father to the son, and the heart of a man to his neighbour; and brethren shall prepare to regard brethren, lest I come and smite the earth utterly (μὴ ἐλθὼν πατάξω τὴν γῆν ἄρδην—Mal. iv. 6).

Now if we compare this passage from the Selden ms. with the Byzantine historian's debate between the emperor (assisted by his Chancellor) and the Jew Xenos, it is clear from the concurrence of the arguments and the coincidence of the language, that the close of the debate, at all events, is a mere repetition of the discourse in the Selden text. The debate is simply one more dramatisation of an existing series of testimonies. Just as Aristo of Pella dramatised the original Palestinian Testimonies, being invited thereto by the interjectory matter addressed to the imaginary and representative Jew, so the writer of the Byzantine story has made himself a dramatic dialogue between Xenos the Jew and the emperor: and it follows that Xenos is an imaginary figure brought on the stage to make the argument from Testimonies more vivid and more interesting. But if Xenos is imaginary, what of the chancellor Matthew? In one sense he is imaginary also, since the debate is a literary fiction; and our supposition that we had discovered Matthew in the Emperor's chief official is negatived. He has, however, a measure of reality in that he is the literary ancestor of the dialogue. The curious feature in the dialogue, according to which the emperor suddenly turns the argument over to his chancellor, in order that he may explain about Elias and the two advents, is due to the fact that there has been a change in the literary sources of the debate, whose author has turned from the book which he has used in the first part of the argument, and has taken up a volume which bore the name of Matthew the Hieromonachus. So he introduces Matthew and makes him talk Matthew! Accordingly, we are thrown back again on the Selden ms., and we need not trouble ourselves any further about assigning dates and authorship to the fictitious dialogue. As far as the dialogue is concerned Matthew the Monk has disappeared,

and John Palaeologus, the emperor, with his Jewish enquirer, has disappeared also.

We now return to the Selden ms. in order to find out whether any further light can be obtained on the Anti-Judaic argument which it contains, and on the verses prefixed to the argument.

The ms., as we have explained above, contains five separate works, two of which are against the errors of the Latin Church, viz., the first and fourth in the series, and which deal especially with the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit. The second tract is an apology for offerings made at the graves of the faithful; the third is a *Sticherarion* for evening service from St Thomas' Sunday to All Saints¹. The fifth is the anti-Judaic treatise, with which we are chiefly concerned, containing a variety of early anti-Judaica from Justin Martyr to Eusebius and beyond, and a significant array of primitive testimonies against the Jews.

All of these treatises profess to be the work of a monk named Matthew, who describes himself variously as Matthew the least of the hieromonachi (so in (1), (2) and (5)), or simply as Matthew, or the wretched (*ἄθλιος*) Matthew, or Matthew the Monk, or Matthew the miserable (*τάλας*) (so in (3)); or Matthew the solitary (*μονότροπος*) woeful sacrificing priest (*θύτης οἰκτρός*). He dedicates his first treatise to the uncle of the emperor, whom he describes as *Συργὴν Τελεζινίας*; this appears to be a proper name; the person turns up again in the *History* of John Cantacuzene (III. 31), where, in speaking of the emperor's eparchs, he refers to

Συργὴν Ντελουζίας τὸν βασιλέως Ἀνδρονίκου ἀνεψιόν, Κύπρου ῥηγὸς υἱόν κτέ,
who is evidently the person to whom the dedication was made². It is difficult to resist the conclusion that we have this time caught a real monk of the name of Matthew, and if the five treatises are by the same hand, then we have found an author for the fifth and anti-Judaic treatise, a conclusion which is reached with reserve, until we can examine the internal evidence of the successive writings.

Matthew was a poet as well as an author; he prefixes verses descriptive of his activity to three of his compositions, as well as to a number of sections of his hymnology. It will be convenient to give a conspectus of these poetical effusions, some of which have been already noted: we can then compare them *inter se* and with the Byzantine poetry of the later age of the Greek Church.

¹ This also has an anti-Latin element in it; e.g. on f. 33 *a* the Paraclete is said to be *πατὴρ δὲ μόνου πρόβλημα*.

² See *P.G.* 153, 881, D. The date of John Cantacuzene may be set approximately at 1375 A.D.

In (3)

Ματθαῖος ὑμνεῖ σὴν ἀνάστασιν, λόγε,
καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς τὴν χάριν τεραστίων,
τὴν ἀνάληψιν, πνεύματος παρουσίαν,

to which we may add the following in the body of the hymns:

- f. 33b. Ματθαῖος ὑμνεῖ σὴν ἀνάστασιν, λόγε· μοναχός.
- f. 35a. Ματθαῖος ᾄδει δεύτερον Χριστῷ μέλος· μοναχός.
- f. 38a. Χριστῷ μέλος τέταρτον ᾄδει Ματθαῖος· ἄθλιος.
- f. 40b. πέμπτον φέρει σοι, Χριστέ, Ματθαῖος μέλος.
- f. 41b. Ματθαῖος ὑμνεῖ σὴν ἀνάληψιν, λόγε, παθῶν ζητῶν λύσιν.
- f. 43a. Ματθαῖος ᾄδει πνεύματος παρουσίαν.
- f. 44b. Ματθαῖος πλέκει τῷ μόνῳ μακαρίῳ.
- f. 46b. Ματθαῖος ᾄδει δεύτερον Χριστῷ μέλος· μοναχός.
- f. 47a. Χριστῷ μέλος τέταρτον ᾄδει Ματθαῖος· ἄθλιος.
- f. 48b. πεμπτὸν φέρει σοι, Χριστέ, Ματθαῖος μέλος· σός.
- f. 49a. ἕκτον φέρει σοι, Χριστέ, Ματθαῖος μέλος· τάλας.
- f. 49b. Ματθαῖος ᾄδει ἑβδομον Χριστῷ μέλος· μοναχός.
- f. 51b. Ματθαῖος ὕμνον ὄγδοον Χριστῷ φέρει· μοναχός.

In (4) we have prefixed the lines

Ἐλεγχος ὧδε τῆς πλάνης τῶν Λατίνων·
Θύτου παρ' οἰκτροῦ Ματθαίου μονοτρόπου,

and then in (5) we have the six lines that interest us most, beginning:

Ματθαῖος εἶργει τῶν Ἰουδαίων θράσος.

The question is whether all these verses are by one hand: there is a superficial resemblance between them; but a closer inspection raises doubts. The versifier of the hymnologium is a very bad poet, quite as bad as and even worse than the average Byzantine scribbler, and not nearly so good, let us say, as Symeon Metaphrastes. His verses will not scan and have not only false quantities but also a distressing variation in the quantity of the same word (*e.g.* ἀνᾱληψιν, μακᾱρίῳ, Ματθαῖος).

The versifier of (4) reads Λατῖνων, and he may readily be conceded to be the same person as in the previous tract.

But the anti-Judaic verses are cast in quite a different mould from the babyish effusions which we have been examining. The resemblance which lies in the reference to the πλάνη of the Latins, and the πλάνη of the Jews is hardly a parallel to be pressed; the real parallel lies between such expressions as Ματθαῖος ᾄδει, Ματθαῖος ὑμνεῖ, and Ματθαῖος εἶργει. Is it possible that the anti-Judaic verses are earlier and have been imitated? The perplexity is a genuine one, and almost of the nature of a dilemma. On the one hand we have verses prefixed to a document which, in substance must back into the Matthæan Logia, these verses referring,

as we may suppose, to the Apostolic Matthew; on the other hand, we have the same verses assigned to a monastic writer named Matthew, who refers the verses to himself. If the first supposition is correct, then the anti-Judaic verses must be early; if the second, then they are very late. It may be worth while to examine the verses somewhat more closely. The first word that is suspicious is the term *θεοκτόνος* applied to the Jews. The Jews were very early regarded as a Deicide people, but the question is as to the currency of the word *θεοκτόνος*. There appears to be plenty of fourth century evidence for its use: *e.g.* Greg. Naz. *poem.* XIII. 177 *ad episc.* (P.G. XXXVII. 1241),

θεοκτόνος Ἰσκαριώτης·

id. *poem.* XI. *de incarnatione* (P.G. XXXVII. 466A),

παγείς ἔπειτα χερσὶ τοῖς θεοκτόνοις·

Caesarius, *Dial.* III. 118 (P.G. CCCVIII. 1004),

τὴν φρενίτιδα καὶ θεοκτόνον Ἰουδαίων φάλαγγα·

and it occurs also in Chrysostom¹.

The two adverbs in lines 4, 5, require some notice: both *ἄρδην* and *ἀτέχνως* are good classical formations; *ἀτέχνως* is in common Byzantine use; both of them occur in the dialogue between the emperor and the Jew Xenos; and in the text of the Selden ms. But *ἄρδην* has no significance, as it occurs in the quotation from the LXX of the last verse of Malachi (it is the closing word of the O.T., and was probably substituted for *ἀρᾶ* by the translators who did not want to end the Bible with "curse"). As to the use of *ἀτέχνως* in Patristic literature, it is an adverb that may bear further enquiry: but, as far as we have gone, there does not seem any conclusive reason for assigning the verses to a late Byzantine epoch. For *ἀτεχνῶς* see in the Selden text, Bk. v. c. 4:

δαιμόνων γάρ ἐστιν ἀτέχνως οἰκητήριον [sc. ἡ τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγῇ] ὅπου χριστοκτόνοι εἰσέρχονται.

The passage is rather of a rhetorical character, and it stands in the text as the head of Testimonies without any attached proof-texts; in substance it must be very early, for what would be the use of saying disparaging things by way of comparison between a synagogue and an idol-temple, when the temples had long ceased to exist. Such language is more appropriate to the days before Constantine than to the later ages of the Church. The idol-temple is implicitly the habitation of

¹ For the *idea* of the slaying of God, we may compare Melito, *Frag.* ὁ θεὸς πέπονθεν ὑπὸ δεξιᾶς Ἰσραηλιτιδος or Lactantius *Div. Instit.* IV. 18. 11: "Deus a cultoribus Dei suspensus est."

demons, in accordance with the belief in the early Church and in the New Testament; and the comparison requires some such word as ἀρέχωνς (the *real* demon-house is the synagogue). For the use of the term "Christ-slayers," note that it is earlier than θεοκτόνοι, and is implicit in a number of passages in the New Testament.

The best way to resolve the difficulty, as to the date of the iambic verses which tell of Matthew's work in his five books against the Jews, will be to find traces of the verses or of their argument in times long anterior to the time, say, of Matthew Blastares, or to the paleographical date of the Bodleian ms., which contains them. Suppose we turn to Eusebius, *Demonstratio Evangelica*. We shall find, on even a cursory perusal, that the whole weight of the argument for Christianity is laid upon the Old Testament, and that the major part of the passages quoted can be referred to the *Book of Testimonies*, or to writers like Justin Martyr, who are for our purpose practically equivalent to the traditional anti-Judaic Testimonies. All the principal Christological arguments are here, as for instance, that Christ is Sophia, and Logos and Angel, and God and Lord and Stone, and the proof-texts are practically the same as in the beginning. Eusebius calls them unvaryingly the Logia.

E.g. Book I. p. 3. ὁσημέραι τε προσδοκᾶν τῶν λογίων τὰ ἀποτελέσματα,
p. 10. τὰ παρ' ἐβραίοις ἀσπασάμενοι λόγια,
p. 11. τήν τε περὶ τὰ ἐβραίων λόγια σπουδὴν... παραστήσαντες,
p. 17. εὐλογηθήσεσθαι τῇ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ εὐλογία προσηγόρευε τὰ λόγια,

and so on continually.

Moreover, Eusebius has as his ultimate source for his collection of Old Testament passages the same kind of matter as we find in Justin, Irenaeus, and Athanasius. For instance, he makes the same mistakes as they do in referring prophecies of Jacob to Moses, *e.g.* in Book III. p. 95,

ἄκουε οἷα καὶ περὶ τούτου θεσπίζει (sc. Μωϋσῆς), οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ἰούδα κτέ,

and so elsewhere.

In the next place, Eusebius is well aware that although he is writing a book of Christian evidences, he is really writing *against the Jews*, so that his Testimonies are really *Testimonia adversus Judaeos*. He pretends in his prologue that this is not the case, by diplomatically explaining that what is proved from Jewish Logia cannot be adverse to the Jews, but must be really *pro Judaeis*, that is, if they would take the matter rightly. "The composition of this book," he says, "has been matter of care and concern to me, not to write, as one might suppose *contra*

Judaeos, Heaven forbid!; it is anything but that: if they would only be right minded, it is a book *pro Judaeis*”:

σπουδαιολογεῖται δέ μοι ἡ γραφή, οὐκ ὡς ἂν τις φαίη, κατὰ Ἰουδαίων, ἀπαγε, πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ· πρὸς αὐτῶν μὲν οὖν, εἰ εὐγνωμονοῖεν, τυγχάνει.

He then proceeds to state that the work will be beneficial to Greeks also, who think we cannot prove anything, but always lay the burden of faith on our converts. Indeed, the concordance between the Old and New Testaments, between prophecy and history, ought *to serve to confute the godless heretics also in their* erroneous opinions and blasphemies against the divine prophets:

ναὶ μὲν καὶ τῶν ἀθέων αἵρέσεων τὰς κατὰ τῶν θείων προφητῶν ψευδοδοξίας τε καὶ βλασφημίας ἀπελέγξει.

The reference to the heretics who are to be confuted by the book is a gratuitous reference: one could understand the suggestion that a prophetic argument good for the Jews might also be good for the Greeks; the heretics are brought in without any apparent motive, nor does the course of the *Demonstratio Evangelica* find a place for them. The explanation of their introduction lies in the supposition that Eusebius had at the head of the *Book of Testimonies* from which he works, and which he rearranges, the verses which tell us that the confutation of Jewish error is likewise the confutation of all heresy:

ὅστις δὲ τούτων τὴν ἐπίρρητον πλάνην,
πλάνην ἀτέχνως, ἐξελέγξει τῷ λόγῳ,
ἄρδην ἀπάσας συγκαθεῖλεν αἵρέσεις.

It is, then, by no means a difficult hypothesis that Eusebius made use of a *Book of Testimonies* with the Matthaean verses prefixed. It is interesting to note, in passing, that although Eusebius deprecates the idea that he is writing against the Jews, he tells us that in the previous volume, the *Preparatio Evangelica*, he had explained why the Christians did not accept Greek opinions about religion, and that now, in the *Demonstratio Evangelica* he is going to argue against the circumcision:

πρὸς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ὥρα νῦν φράξασθαι καὶ τὸ λείπον ἐπελθεῖν σκέμμα· τοῦτο δ' ἦν πρὸς τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς.

It will be seen how closely Eusebius follows the lines of *Testimonia adversus Judaeos*.

The investigation has been somewhat long, and we may sum up the results as follows:

(1) The Athos ms. is the same book as the Selden ms. at Oxford, by which it may now be replaced.

(2) The Selden ms. is credited as containing the works of a Matthew Hieromonachus.

(3) At first sight, this makes the Matthew verses to be a fourteenth century product, but there are reasons for doubting this.

(4) The other verses of Matthew the Monk are not as good as the six lines whose author we are in search of.

(5) And there is a strong suspicion that they were known to Eusebius, and therefore are at least as old as, say, the third century.

We shall now summarise important parts of the anti-Judaic treatise in the Selden ms.

APPENDIX I (*continued*)

THE SELDEN MS. AND ITS CONTENTS

THE first book is divided into the following three chapters:

(α) That the Old Testament (as well as the New) announces the tri-personality of God, who is worshipped as Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

(β) That in the Old Testament the Son of God is not only called Lord and God, but also Angel.

(γ) That the Old Testament declares the Son to be begotten of the Father before all ages (*προαιωνίως*), and that he is co-eternal with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and is the co-artificer (*συνδημιουργόν*) of the Creation.

A long introductory preface affirms the necessity that those who have the truth should illuminate those who are devoid of it; for the absence of truth from the soul is like the absence of the soul from the body. Our discourse is on God and we invoke His aid and that He will direct our hand and keep us from a bad failure in our argument, and that those who look at worship in a different way from our own may give a tolerant and sympathetic attention, so that we may carry off from the conflict something more than ridicule.

As to the other heresies than the Jewish, which may from time to time arise, we shall leave it to others to overthrow them, as the grace of the Spirit may raise up defenders of the faith, for the sower of the evil seed does not scatter all his seed at once. Our argument and concern is with the Jews. (Note the allusion to other than Jewish heresies; it does not exactly follow the lines of the metrical summary, and it looks as if some change had been made in the sources from which the writer is working, which should at least contain something about non-Jewish heresies.)

The Jews have the advantages of the natural law *plus* the written law; they should be led to the gospel, because Christ is the goal of the law to the believer. The cultivation of the seeds in the law is the harvest of a perfect faith in Christ. They should more than all the Gentiles have recognised Christ announced by the law and the prophets and should have run towards Him. But they went from ignorance to ignorance. They did not search out the spiritual meaning of the Scriptures, nor press to the full growth of a spiritual nature, but clung to the breast after child life was over, pushing away the solid food from them.

Thus they lost the good things which God had prepared for them, the knowledge of the Divine nature, the intimations of the Incarnation of the Second Person of the Trinity, etc.

For consider the wisdom and the accuracy of the law-giver Moses. When he begins to record the process of creation, and to affirm dogmatically the unity of the maker of the Universe, how greatly and secretly does he proceed, as though by very gentle sounds he was striking the music of the duality of the persons. He might have said that all things that appear came forth at the command of God; but he shapes his argument otherwise, and introduces a second person to the voice of the first.

When God said (Gen. i. 26) "Let us make man," etc., the Scripture was not, as some suppose, imitating the style of those in great authority who use the plural and say "We enjoin," "We write." When God *said* (εἶπεν) we have the unity of the Divine Nature; when He said "Let *us* make" (ποιήσωμεν) we have the duality of the persons. We have also the common appellation of the Father and the Son, when God says, not "Make thou" (ποίησον) as to one of inferior rank, but "Let *us* make." For the Son is as Isaiah says (Is. ix. 7),

the Angel of the Great Counsel, the Only-Begotten Son of God, the Mighty God, the one with Authority, the Prince of Peace, the Father of the world to come.

The Jews, in order to avoid the admission of the One have brought in the Many, and rejecting the Son have made the Angels who serve take the title of Counsellor, and those who are our fellow-servants to be responsible for our creation. But it is no part for angels to play to participate with the Lord and Master; their part is to fulfil their service, as Isaiah says the Seraphim do, with fear and great amaze. God was not speaking to the Angels, any more than He was speaking in a plural of majesty or talking to Himself.

(The argument is older than Justin. In *Trypho* c. 62 we have the denial that God spoke to Himself, or to the elements, or to the angels, or that the human body is the work of the angels. It was Sophia to whom he was speaking. The argument is dramatised in *Athanasius and Zacchaeus* c. 5:

Athan. God was certainly talking to someone when He said, "Let us make man after our own image and likeness."

Zacch. He was talking to Himself.

Athan. But it does not say "I will make," but "Let us make."

Zacch. He was talking to the angels.

Athan. You say, then, that the angels are God's fellow-workers?

Zacch. What is wrong with that?

Athan. Then it is no more true that He made all things by Sophia?

So in *Timothy and Aquila* (p. 67), the Jew says:

When He said, Let us make man, He was speaking to His angels.)

When God made man, for the sake of the Monad He made him, in the image of God: He did not say "in His own image," but in the image of the whole Divinity. The Father was clearly talking to the Son and the Spirit. So also in the case of the evil conspiracy of Babel, God says (Gen. xi. 7 [Greg. Nyss. 1]), "Come, let us go down and confound their speech." The word "Come" (δεῦτε) is the address of a single person to at least two other persons.

In the same way God appeared to Abraham in three persons: for the Scripture says, "And God appeared at the oak in Mamré." Behold! there is one God. "And he looked up and saw three men standing over him." You see clearly the three persons of the Trinity. And Abraham said, "O Lord, if I have found grace before thee, pass not away from thy servants": he spoke in the singular when he said, "O Lord." "Let water be brought and let them wash your feet, and eat ye bread, etc." Again it has expressed not merely the three persons, but the equality in honour of the three, so as to avoid the supposition that one of the three was God and the other two were angels. "And God said, Do as thou hast said." The singular again, you will observe, and so again in the speech to Sarah, "*I* will return," etc. "And the men arose and looked towards Sodom": and what does it mean that "the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven"? Does it not clearly intimate the Son of God, bringing down those incendiaries upon the ungodly?

(The reference to the destruction of the Tower of Babel is made in Greg. Nyss. 1. "Who was it said to whom, Come, let us go down and confound their speech?" The story of the three angels who came to Abraham is a *locus classicus* in anti-Judaic, *i.e.* in Christian theology. Justin reverts to it over and over, to prove that there is a second power under the supreme God, who is called *Angel* and *God and Lord*. See *Dial.* 56, etc. The favourite question to put to the Jew is based on "The Lord rained from the Lord," etc. "Which Lord from which Lord?" *e.g.* in *Athanasius and Zacchaeus*, c. 15.)

The argument next takes us to Moses and the burning Bush, and to his enquiry as to the Name of God that is to be communicated to the Hebrews.

And God said (Ex. iii. 6):

I am the Existing One; and thou shalt thus say to the children of Israel, the Existing One, the Lord God of your fathers has sent me to you. The God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.

Have we not in this passage a perfect theology of the Trinity?

At this point the argument becomes confused and obscure. Apparently a distinction is drawn between "The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" and the "God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob."

When Moses took the second pair of tables of the law into the mountain, we are told that the Lord passed before his face, and called by the name of the Lord; and the Lord God, merciful and pitiful, spake. Here the Lord calls upon the Lord, one Lord on another who shares his name. And again in Numbers, in the high priest's blessing, we have

The Lord bless thee and keep thee, the Lord make His face to shine upon thee and give thee peace.

Apparently this is also a proof of two Lords.

So also in Job, the theology of the Trinity is involved in the words (Job. xxvii. 3, cf. Greg. Nyss. c. 22):

The Lord who thus judgeth me and the Almighty who hath embittered me, and the spirit divine who remaineth in my nostrils: *ζῆ γὰρ Κύριος ὁ οὕτω με κρίνων καὶ ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὁ πικράνας μου τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ πνεῦμα θεῖον τὸ περιὼν ἐν ῥισί μου.*

Again in Deuteronomy Moses says: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, etc."

The proof having been made from the Mosaic utterances, that the Son shares the counsel of the Father, and is consubstantial with Him and enthroned with Him, the prophet Isaiah adds the passage which says "Unto us a Child is born" (which involves the reference to the Angel of the Great Counsel); let us see if Moses knows any thing about this Angel.

It says in Genesis, "The Angel of the Lord called to Abraham out of heaven, etc." Jacob, too, called by the name of Angel, the Son of God whom he saw on the ladder. For Jacob says (Gen. xxxi. 11):

the Angel of the Lord spake unto me in a dream and said, Jacob, Jacob. And I said, What is it? And he said, Lift up thine eyes and see the sheep, etc. For I have seen all that Laban doeth unto thee. I am thy God that appeared to thee in the place of God where thou didst anoint the pillar, etc.

And in the description of Jacob's vision, it says that

the angels of God were ascending and descending the ladder, and that the Lord stood firm upon it and said, I am the God of Abraham, etc.

(The argument follows the line of Justin Martyr and of Eusebius. In *Dial.* c. 58 Justin recites the whole of the vision of Jacob, with the introductory remark that it was written by Moses that the one called God who appeared to the patriarchs is also called *Angel* and *Lord*.)

Eusebius' employment of the passages in question in the *Demonstratio Evangelica* is particularly interesting, because he goes over the matter twice at different points of the book, and the comparison makes it clear

that he is using an already existing series of *Testimonies*. It is instructive to compare *Dem. Ev.* Bk. i. p. 10 with Bk. v. p. 235. In the first passage again Moses addresses the one who appeared to God's friends, and often gave them oracles that have been recorded, sometimes as God and Lord, and sometimes as Angel of God, setting forth clearly that it was not the God who is over all, but a second person who is addressed as the God and Lord of the friends of God, and the Angel of the Most High God Himself. Then after certain quotations which we have before us, Eusebius continues,

this one who appeared to Jacob as God and Lord he calls the Angel of God. The proofs from Genesis follow.

In Book v. he reverts to the theme of Jacob's vision and says,

The one who is here at length entitled God and Lord, you will find as you proceed further to be called the Angel of God, in the passage where Jacob says to his wives, etc.

So we see that the same person is addressed as Angel of the Lord, and God and Lord. This Angel is the one whom Isaiah describes as Angel of the Great Counsel. The two points established, that Christ is God and Lord, and that Christ is Angel are two separate sections of the Cyprianic *Testimonies*.)

Further, there is the story of Jacob's wrestling when he was called Israel, clearly showing here the Son of God; for the divine Moses calls the wrestler both God and man: and Jacob said he had seen God face to face. But the prophet Hosea calls this story to mind, and says that Jacob prevailed with the angel and was strong. Thus we see the same person called God and Angel, and we learn that it was the Only-Begotten Son of God, who appeared to Jacob. And Isaiah says the same thing in the passage, "Unto us a Son is given," etc. The same thing comes out in the story of Moses and the Burning Bush. Here the Angel of the Lord calls to Moses (the passage is quoted at length), and is addressed as Lord; and the Lord declares himself to be the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. Observe that the one whom previously he calls Angel, he here describes as God, which agrees with Isaiah, so that we see that the Son rejoices in being called not only God and Lord but also Angel.

(It is worth while stopping at this point and turning to Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*. After Justin has gone over the proofs from the Vision of Jacob that one had appeared to him who was known as Angel and God and Lord (c. 58) he opens a new chapter by saying:

Bear with me while I show you from the book of Exodus that the very same person, who appeared to Abraham and Jacob, as Angel and God and

Lord and Man and Human Being, appeared also to Moses and talked with him.

The passages in Exodus are then gone over carefully, and the conclusion again reached that it was not the supreme God who was seen, but one who serves the God that is over all, and is himself God and Angel and Lord. The parallelism in the treatment is evident; and it may be noted that Justin constantly speaks of quoting *Testimonies*, and that when he goes on to the next chapter he begins with

I will give you a further testimony from the Scriptures.)

Our text now turns to the story of Balaam and the Ass, and relates how the Ass saw the angel standing in the way to oppose the prophet. The story is told at some length, chiefly by quotation, and we are shown how God put into Balaam's mouth the words that he was to speak, God who had previously been described as Angel. And we are to understand the Son of God to be the person described, for such things are never said of the Supreme God.

The writer then makes a rapid summary of the evidence of David for the Trinity: such passages as,

By the Word of the Lord are the heavens made,
and

Ps. cxix. 89. For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven.

Ps. cvii. 20. He sent his word and healed them.

Ps. xxxvi. 9. In thy light we shall see light.

Ps. xlii. 2. My soul thirsteth for God, the strong, the living one, etc., etc.

Some of these passages are at once recognised from Justin, Cyprian, etc., as being primitive testimonies: but there is also an admixture of later matter, which is of a different type from the primitive arguments; there is a childish fondness for finding the Trinity in everything that is trine; the writer suggests that when Elijah poured water three times on the sacrifice, he was intimating the Trinity in the worship of Jehovah! He ends the chapter in proof that Christ was God and Lord and Angel as follows:

Isaiah says (Is. liv. 5):

Fear not that thou wast put to shame, for the Lord who maketh thee, the Lord, the Lord is His name.

Is. xlviii. 12, and elsewhere:

Hear, O Israel, when I call. I am the first and I am for ever. My hand hath founded the earth and my right hand hath made firm the heaven.

And a little later (Is. xlviii. 16, 17):

The Lord hath now sent me and His Spirit. Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel.

Who are the senders and who the one sent? Just as the Lord is the sender, so the sent is the Lord. And the prophet Zacharias is in harmony with this when he says:

Thus saith the Lord, the Almighty: After his glory he hath sent me to the heathen that made you a prey, for I will bring my hand upon them, and they shall be a prey to them that made them a prey, and ye shall know that the Lord Almighty hath sent me.

Note the duality of the Divine Persons: he continues:

Rejoice and be glad, daughter of Zion, for behold, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord, and many nations shall flee to the Lord in that day, and they shall be to Him for a people, and they shall dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord, and they shall know that the Lord Almighty hath sent me unto thee.

(Apparently the argument is that the Lord is the speaker ("thus saith the Lord" and yet says "the Lord hath sent me"). Thus there are two Lords, one of whom sends the other. Q.E.D.)

The next chapter is concerned with the eternal generation of the Son of God. It begins with passages from the Psalms.

Ps. ii. 7. The Lord said unto me: Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee.

The word "to-day" implies a begetting subject to time (ὕπὸ χρόνου): for the "Father" appropriates these also (οἰκείουται γὰρ ταῦτα ὁ πατήρ). (The comment of the writer is obscure, and at first sight Arian, in making the generation of the Son subject to time. The allusion of the Father as appropriating these also, belongs to a part of the psalm which has not been quoted, but follows immediately "I will give thee the heathen for thy inheritance." Cf. Eusebius, *D.E.* iv. p. 163.

οὐκέτι γοῦν μόνον τὸν δίκαιον καὶ διορατικὸν Ἰσραὴλ, οὐδέ γε μόνον τὸν οἰκεῖον κληρον, πάντα δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔθνη...ὕπὸ τὴν οἰκείαν ὑποβαλὼν ἐξουσίαν κτέ.

So Justin, *Dial.* 123: "All of this passage refers to Christ and the Gentiles." This verse of the Psalm is one of the primitive testimonies for the calling of the Gentiles. The writer has apparently abbreviated the matter on which he is working.) He continues (Ps. lxxii.):

Give the King thy judgement, and thy righteousness to the King's Son.

Here the Holy Spirit discourses to the Father and discloses the Trinity and the bodily and the continual incarnation of the Son (ἐνσαρκον τοῦ υἱοῦ οἰκονομίαν):

All the day they shall bless Him. His name shall be blessed for ever. Before the Sun His name abideth.

These extracts from the 71st (72nd) Psalm are peculiarly interesting. The Psalm was certainly a part of the primitive *Anti-Judaica*. Justin

quotes the whole of the Psalm as referring to Christ (see *Dial.* 34) and disputes its reference to Solomon:

You Jews say, because Solomon became King, that the Psalm was spoken about him: but the language of the Psalm is express in its proclamation of the Eternal King, *i.e.* the Christ: for it is Christ that is King and Priest and God and Lord and Angel and Man and Commander-in-Chief and who became passible in his first advent, etc.

With this chapter, so reminiscent of testimony matter, we should take its dramatisation in *Athanasius and Zacchaeus* (c. 99 sqq.).

Zacchaeus said "What has the Psalm to say of your Christ?"

Athanasius. Read and you will discover.

Zacchaeus. I read and find that it speaks of Solomon.

Athan. "O God, give thy judgements to the King." Who is the speaker?

Zacc. David, who is asking God to give his Son the power to judge well, *i.e.* to Solomon.

Athan. "And thy righteousness to the King's Son"?

Zacc. He meant "to my son," for the Kingdom belonged to David when he prayed to God, that he would Himself give righteousness to Solomon.

Athan. Follow the matter up in the fear of God. "Let the mountains bring peace to the people and the hills righteousness; he shall judge the poor of the people: and he shall save the sons of the needy and humble the sycophant."

Zacc. All this it says of Solomon.

Ath. And shall we see what comes next?

Zacc. Go on.

Ath. "And he shall abide along with the sun, and before the moon for generations of generations." Will Solomon do so?

Zacc. His name will so abide in the sun. For see! Even you Christians all over the world remember his name as that of a wise man. And for generations the glory of his name will abide.

Ath. And was his name before the moon, for generations of generations?

Zacc. God knew about his name, even before the moon.

Ath. Listen to what follows:

Zacc. Go on.

Ath. "He shall come down like rain into the fleece," etc. (quoting to the end of the Psalm as Justin does).

Zacc. This is confessedly said of the Christ: but in any case he has not now (*τέως*) come.

Ath. What is there unfulfilled of the prophecy?

Zacc. Everything.

Ath. Listen to what the prophet says: "and I took thirty pieces of silver, the price of the priced one whom they priced of the sons of Israel: and I gave them for the potter's field as the Lord commanded me." You see that the traitor gave away even the thirty pieces of silver when he received them; and the field was bought and the prophecy was fulfilled; and how do you say that Christ is not yet come?

[It is not at first sight clear why Athanasius diverges from the Psalm

to another very early Testimony, which is older than Papias and earlier than the Gospel of Matthew. Apparently he was led to it by the words in the Psalm, "His name shall be precious (*ἐτιμιον*)."]

Zacchaeus replies:

I know that the prophecy says these things, but not about the Christ.

Ath. In his advent it was fulfilled; and if he comes whom thou dost look forward to, he would find everything fulfilled which was foretold.

Zacc. And of the predictions, what is fulfilled?

Ath. He has obtained dominion from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth: before him the Ethiopians shall fall down, and you, his enemies, eat the dust: and all kings of the earth shall worship him: all nations shall serve him: and in him shall all tribes of the earth be blessed.

[The foregoing extracts from Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* and the *Dialogue between Athanasius and Zacchaeus*, are very instructive as independent adaptations of the matter of the primitive *Testimony Book*. It has shrunk to a very small compass in the Selden ms.]

After a brief reference to the 110th Psalm, "The Lord said unto my Lord," the argument goes to the most famous of all Testimonies, the Wisdom passage in Prov. viii., as follows:

"And Solomon: The Lord created me beginning of His ways": *i.e.* the God and Father established me (*κατέστησε*), for this is what is meant by "created" (*ἐκτίσσε*); as in the passage, "Create in me a clean heart, O God," where he does not contemplate the bringing into being of a heart not existing, but its restoration to its original form: so also the word of the Apostle "that he might create (two) unto one new man," which intimates the unity which comes from accord. So also Sophia: by a certain natural and inexpressible reason, I arise from the co-eternal Father, the creative and providential beginning and cause of His ways: for she was not only the cause of the derivation, but also of the permanence of the Universe: and in order to correct the inference from the word "created," as being the Wisdom of the Father before the worlds, the Scripture adds that "before all the hills He begets me," and "before the world He founded me"; as the cause and groundwork of these creations he laid my foundations. For just as all things consist by the Son, so also through him they are held together and remain. And "I was with God," she says (*συμπάρην τῷ θεῷ*) when He was preparing the heaven, to adjust and compose the accompanying harmony and order of created things. . . . Now since the Hebrew text has *Adonai Kanai*, which the accurate interpreters have rendered "possessed me" instead of "created me," the blasphemy of the word "created" has disappeared. When, for instance, the Scripture says "I have acquired a man through God," it will not "create" a man, but "beget" him.

(Evidently the writer has come under the influence of Eusebius's correction of the LXX¹ and even more closely he follows the language of Basil²: *e.g.* *Contra. Eunóm.* II. c. 20.

ἄλλοι τῶν ἐρμηνέων, οἱ καιριώτερον τῆς σημασίας τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν καθιζόμενοι, 'ἐκτίσατό με' ἀντὶ τοῦ 'ἐκτίσεν' ἐκδεδώκασιν· ὅπερ μέγιστον αὐτοῖς ἐμπόδιον ἔσται πρὸς τὴν βλασφημίαν τοῦ κτίσματος. ὁ γὰρ εἰπὼν 'ἐκτισάμην' ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐχὶ κτίσας τὸν Καὶν, ἀλλὰ γεννήσας, ταύτη φαίνεται χρησάμενος τῇ φωνῇ·)

The next section is devoted to Daniel and proves by quotation that there is no one like to the Son of God; and then goes on to the vision of the beast, the Antichrist, and the coming of one in human form, who is brought near to the Ancient of Days. From his coming upon the clouds of heaven it is argued that there was an eternal pre-existence of the Son and a participation in glory with the Father as the Beloved Son. As there seems no doubt that Daniel's visions had a prominent place in the original collections of *Testimonies* and have left a broad mark on the New Testament itself, it would be very interesting if we could trace the use that was made of them in the First Statements of the Faith, for they have an extraordinary creedal value. At this point we content ourselves with a few extracts from our latest *Testimony Book*.

We are told concerning the Second Advent as follows:

He sees another in human form, not walking on the earth, but carried on the clouds of heaven, to make plain to us the eternal pre-existence of the Son and how he comes unhindered before the very Judge Himself, thus establishing his possession of supreme honour. And He came to the Ancient of Days, *i.e.* he was participant in the glory of the Father, and honourably seated with Him as His Beloved Son. For indeed there was given to Him the rule and the honour and the Kingdom, and the whole world thereafter is to serve Him, and His authority is eternal and shall never pass away and His Kingdom shall not be destroyed. Who then is this that comes on the clouds when the coming of the Judge is already at the doors?

(A similar question will be found in *Athanasius and Zacchaeus*, c. 117:

Ath. And who is the Ancient of Days? Tell me if you know.

Zacc. I say that it is God: for to whom else do thousands of thousands do service, and before whom myriads of myriads stand, except God?

Ath. Well said: and *who was it came on the clouds in the likeness of the Son of Man?*

Zacc. The Christ.)

The first book closes with a recitation of the prophecy of Habakkuk (Hab. iii. 1, 2, and ii. 1-3): stress is laid on the words ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἤξει καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ, and upon the passage which in English appears as

In the midst of the years make known,

¹ See Eusebius *c. Marcel.* III. 2, p. 153.

² And in part his mistake in referring to Adam a speech of Eve.

but in the LXX is,

In the midst of two living creatures thou shalt be seen,

upon which the writer remarks:

ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων, ἡγουν τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ νέας διαθήκης· ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν τὰ ἔτη ἐπιγνωσθήσῃ· ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι τὸν καιρὸν ἀναδειχθήσῃ· ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ Θαιμὰν ἥξει· Θαιμὰν ἐρμηνεύεται νότος· νότιον δὲ μέρος πρὸς τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἢ Βηθλεέμ. ὄρος δὲ ἅγιον ἢ μακαρία παρθένος· ὡς πασῶν ὑψηλοτέρα τῆς κτίσεως· κατάσκιον δὲ ὡς ἐπισκιαζόμενον τῇ τοῦ Ὑψίστου δυνάμει· δασὺ δὲ διὰ τὸ τῆς παρθενίας ἄβατον· εἰ καὶ καθ' ἱστορίαν τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἕτεροι εἶπον·

It may be doubted whether any of this belongs to the earliest strata of *Testimonies*. Parallels can be found, however, for most of the explanations which the writer here gives.

Reviewing the contents of this first book of the *Anti-Judaica* in the Selden ms. it is clear that almost all of it comes from the earliest Christian literature, and belongs to the collected arguments and proof-texts of the early Church.

APPENDIX I (*continued*)

THE SELDEN MS. (*continued*)

WHEN we come to the second book of the Selden Anti-Judaica, we have a subdivision into the following chapters:

- (α) Διὰ τί μόνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς διαρρήδην ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἐκηρύττετο;
- (β) καὶ διὰ τί τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα γυμνώτερον ὠνομάζετο ἢ ὁ υἱός;
- (γ) ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὁμοούσιον καὶ ὁμοδύναμον ἢ γραφὴ τῷ πατρὶ δοξάζει καὶ τῷ υἱῷ.
καὶ ἀπὸ συλλογισμῶν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς τρισυπόστατός ἐστιν.
εἰκόνες ἐκ τῶν ὁρωμένων τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος.

The writer now forsakes for a time the original *Testimony Book* in order to show that the Holy Spirit, like the Son, is consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father. He is to expound the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, because the doctrine of the Spirit is a later stage of theological evolution than the doctrine of the Son. This does not mean that there is no Holy Spirit known to the first interpreters of the Old Testament: but it is not matter of contention, until the questions of consubstantiality and co-eternity arise, and so does not belong to the region of anti-Judaica, at least in the first period. Indeed, the contentious matter in the theology of the Holy Spirit is always at a minimum, because when the theology of the Son as consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father was settled, the theology of the Spirit was, by implication, settled also. Anyone who will take the pains to examine the earliest traces of the Christian *Testimony Book* will verify for himself that the Holy Spirit scarcely appears at all. Cyprian, for example, has no trace of it, nor the Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus; and in Justin Martyr we are again almost at the zero point as regards dogmatic theology; indeed, Justin in one passage equates the Holy Spirit with the Logos, just as earlier theologians equated with Sophia¹.

Our author, then, raises definitely the question why the Old Testament has so little to say of the Spirit compared to what it discloses of the Son, and whereas the Son is spoken of as the Right-hand of God, and His Power and His Word and the like, it scarcely mentions the Holy Spirit by title or office. There is an oblique reference to the ancient Testimonies which identify Christ with the Hand and Arm of

¹ Cf. 1. *Ap.* 33.

God, and with His Word and Wisdom. He returns to the point in the second chapter and here he says the Son is

χειρ θεοῦ καὶ βραχίων καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις καὶ δεξιὰ καὶ λόγος καὶ ἕτερα·

where we have the *Testimonies* in an even more archaic form. No such series of headings is available for the Holy Spirit.

Indeed, the writer holds that the term "Son" is implied in the term "Father," so that even the Greeks who speak of the Divine Paternity are covertly involved in Christian doctrine, but there is no corresponding implication in regard to the Holy Spirit.

The writer is, at this point of the argument, something less than primitive. He is not, however, to be thought of as Byzantine. The nearest parallel is in Gregory of Nyssa, whose last chapter (c. 22) is devoted to *Testimonies on the Holy Spirit*, and shows frequent coincidences with the Selden text.

One of the texts will often explain the other: for instance, as a proof text that the Holy Spirit is co-artificer with God, we have as follows:

τοῦτο (sc. τὸ πνεῦμα) συνδημιουργὸν τῷ υἱῷ· ὥς,
τῷ λόγῳ κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοί·
καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν·
ὥς τὸ, ἀνατελείς, φησί, τὸ πνεῦμά σου

This passage is very obscure; the first clause does not contain a reference to the Holy Spirit; the second does not contain a reference to the resurrection. We correct the first clause by completing the quotation (Ps. xxxii. (xxxiii.) 6):

τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν.
καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν·

where "the breath of His mouth" is taken to be the Holy Spirit.

The reference to the resurrection is cleared up by Greg. Nyss. whose last testimony in the book is as follows:

καὶ ὅτι ἡ ἀνάστασις διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐνεργεῖται, Δαβὶδ λέγει·
Ἀνατελείς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκλείψουσι,
καὶ εἰς τὸν χοῦν αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέψουσιν·
ἐξαποστελείς τὸ πνεῦμά σου, καὶ κτισθήσονται,
καὶ ἀνακαινίεις τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς·

The unintelligibility of the passage arose from the careless abbreviation of a previous document, which at the point in question, was similar to the *Testimony Book* of Gregory of Nyssa. Here again there is nothing Byzantine except the blunders.

In another case the abbreviation is on the side of Gregory Nyss.

E.g. Isaiah says...And there shall rest upon him seven spirits (Greg. Nyss. c. 22),

which in our text appears as:

πνεῦμα γὰρ αὐτὸ σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως ὀνομάζει· πνεῦμα βουλῆς καὶ ἰσχύος·
πνεῦμα γνώσεως καὶ εὐσεβείας· πνεῦμα φόβου θεοῦ· (Is. xi. 2.)

Here is another curious illustration of the interdependence of the Selden text and the Nyssene *Testimonies*. In quoting the famous prophecy in Joel, our text says:

ὁ δὲ Ἰωὴλ φανερώς προμηνύει τὰς παντοδαπὰς τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος δωρεάς·
ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, δηλαδή τὴν πιστεύσασαν κτέ.

When we turn to Gregory Nyss. we find a similar limitation introduced into the body of the *Testimonies*:

Ἰωὴλ· καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ
πᾶσαν σάρκα, δηλαδή τὴν πιστεύουσιν κτέ.

We could not have a better illustration that the two documents are interrelated, and they are in direct dependence upon the traditional teaching by way of *Testimonies*.

We have been quoting one of these groups of *Testimonies* in the name of Gregory of Nyssa, reserving the question as to whether a *pseudo-* ought to be prefixed to the name. It is curious that, following the passage we have just been studying, the writer goes off into a long discussion on the nature of the Triune God, in which he actually quotes from Nyssen. The passage is as follows:

ἐν μόνῳ ἄρα τῷ θεῷ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἔστιν. ἢ εἰ βούλει αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς τὸ ἀγαθόν·
οὗτος ὁ εἷς καὶ μόνος θεός, ὡς καὶ τῷ Νύσσης δοκεῖ.

The chapter concludes with a number of illustrations, chiefly from the world of nature, expressive of the interrelation of the persons of the Trinity. In the form in which they are presented they are certainly not primitive, though they are not always to be set down as of late date. The most popular one is the assimilation of the Trinity to *the Sun, its Rays and its Light*. One not so common is that of *the Fountain, the River, and the Water itself*. These two have been evolved out of a Christology antecedent to the Trinitarian formula: they come from the identification of Christ with the Wisdom of God and so with the ἀπαύγασμα, and the ἀπόρροια of the Wisdom of Solomon. It was natural that speculation should arise as to the relation between the source of light and its ἀπαύγασμα, for such speculations were in the Greek mind under the form of λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός, the Word immanent and the Word expressed. In this simple form the physical analogy of God and His Word with the Sun and its Light or the Fountain and its Flow, is very early.

The writer concludes with the judicious caution that no illustrations

drawn from a changeful world can adequately express Divine and Eternal things. We may, however, say, if we please, that Adam is a type of the Unbegotten God, Seth of the Begotten Son, and Eve of the Proceeding Spirit (an interesting reminiscence here of the Holy Spirit as Mother!). In the same way we have Thought (ἐνθύμησις) the Mind (νοῦς), and the Soul (ψυχή) between which there is no difference except in names:

ὥσαύτως καὶ ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ ἡ ἀκτὶς καὶ τὸ φῶς, ἅπερ ἐξ αὐτοῦ προΐσχονται καὶ μέχρις ἡμῶν φθάνουσιν, ἀδιαίρετα δὲ μένουσι· τὸ πῦρ οὐ γεννᾷ μὲν ἀχωρίστως τὸ φῶς, ἔχει δὲ ἀχωρίστως καὶ τὴν τῆς θερμῆς ποιότητα, καὶ τὴν ἄκραν αὐτῶν συνάφειαν ἢ ἐπίνοια διαιρεῖ· ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ ἴρις, καὶ πηγὴ καὶ ποταμὸς καὶ ὕδωρ τὸ αὐτό· καὶ ῥίζα καὶ βλαστοὶ τοῦ φυτοῦ· καὶ ἐτέρας εἰκόνας εὗροι τις ἂν ἐξετάζων.

The analogy between the Trinity and the Fire found its way into *Testimony Books* at no late period, for Bar Ṣalibi in his Fourth Book (c. 23) introduces it as follows:

(*Jew.*) Lo! our Scripture says, the Lord our God is one Lord.

(*Christian.*) Searching concerning the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, they (sc. the Scriptures) prove one God; like the Sun and its radiance and its heat are one, so the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one.

For the rainbow as illustrating the Trinity, we may find the starting point in Basil, *Ep.* 38,

τὰς μὲν τῶν ὑποστάσεων ἰδιότητας, ὥσπερ τι ἄνθος τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἴρην φαινομένων, ἐπαστράπτειν ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ τριάδι πιστευομένων,

or in some earlier theological writer.

Enough has been said to show that the Selden ms. contain a genuine tradition of anti-Judaic writing, of which the nearest parallel appears to be the *Testimonies* ascribed to Gregory of Nyssa. The author draws largely upon Eusebius also and upon Basil, with whom he has often direct agreements. How far the matter has been over written and re-written by the Byzantine author it is difficult to say. The treatise is certainly thickly strewn with a deposit of primitive anti-Judaic testimonies. They can hardly be disintegrated from the medium in which they are contained. On the whole we conclude that it would be unwise to lay further stress on the Byzantine author whom we have been studying: the proof of the antiquity of the prefixed verses is incomplete, and although there is something to be said, as above, in favour of such a belief, the matter requires much stronger confirmation before we could use the verses as a decisive factor in the Papias-problem. One must not be too eager to grasp at the final solution of a question of such long-standing perplexity.

APPENDIX II

PATRISTIC EVIDENCE SUGGESTING THE USE OF THE TESTIMONY BOOK IN ROMANS IX—XI

(a) Origen, *In Epist. ad Romanos*, vii. 18 = Rom. ix. 25, 26.

Paul is citing Hos. ii. 25, and i. 10. Origen cites the same passages and comments as follows:

Testimonium sane hoc quod de Osea assumit Apostolus, quantum ad locum ipsum Prophetæ pertinet, non videtur de Gentibus, sed de ipso populo Israel dici.

vii. 19 = Rom. ix. 32–33, citing Is. viii. 14, xxviii. 16, x. 11.

Origen first cites the third Isaian passage and continues:

Sciendum autem est, quod in Esaia Prophetâ hoc testimonium ita scriptum est: *Ecce ego immitto in fundamenta Sion lapidem*, etc. (Is. xxviii. 16). Apostolus autem, *lapidem offensionis, et petram scandali*, de alio loco ipsius Esaiæ huic testimonio inseruit, in quo ita scriptum est: *Et non tanquam lapidi*, etc. (Is. viii. 14).

viii. 1 = Rom. x. 1–3:

Et ex initio, et procedente textu Epistolæ, diximus Paulum nunc pro Gentibus, nunc etiam pro Israel facere sermonem. Quia ergo in his quæ nuper exposita sunt, *multis testimoniis adversus Israel* usus est Prophetarum, ita ut proferat de Esaia: quoting Is. i. 9 (Rom. ix. 29), Is. x. 22 (Rom. ix. 27).

viii. 7 = Rom. xi. 8–10 = Is. vi. 9–10, Ps. lxviii. 23–24:

Cæcitatem cordis, qua reliquus Israel, hoc est, qui non credidit, excaecatus est, duobus Prophetiis testimoniis probat, uel quod ex Esaia, uel quod ex David uidetur assumptum; et in utroque unus quodammodo sensus exponitur.

viii. 12 = Rom. xi. 26 = Jer. xxxi. 33, sqq.:

Quod autem hæc illis promissa sint per Prophetas, in multis quidem Prophetiis voluminibus invenitur: ponemus tamen quod sufficiat ad præsens, unum de Jeremia testimonium, ita continens: *Si exaltetur*, etc. (Jer. xxxi. (38) 37).

(β) Theodore of Mopsuestia, *In Ep. ad Romanos*, P.G. 66, 836 B = Rom. ix. 14:

τῷ γὰρ Μωϋσεὶ λέγει· ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ κ.τ.λ. καὶ μετὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐπισυλλογίζεται ἐκ τοῦ ἐκείνων προσώπου ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος κ.τ.λ. Some few sentences lower he repeats the second citation—ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἅπαντα ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐτέρων ἔφη προσώπου· τὰς τε γραφικὰς μαρτυρίας οὕτως εἰπών·

Here the Jews are definitely introduced as objectors, and Paul speaks in their name.

P.G. 66, 836 D = Rom. ix. 14:

ἀντὶ τοῦ θαρρήσας δὲ ταῖς γραφικαῖς μαρτυρίαις, ... ἐρεῖς ὥς οὐδὲ μέμψεως οὐδὲ τιμωρίας ἄξιός εἰ.

P.G. 66, 841 D = Rom. ix. 25:

ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος ἐχρήσατο τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ, τοῦ Ὡσηέ.

P.G. 66, 841 D = Rom. ix. 25:

καὶ δι' ἐτέρας μαρτυρίας τὸ αὐτὸ πιστοῦνται· λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφήτης.

(γ) Theodoret, *Interpretatio Ep. ad Romanos*, *P.G.* 82, 148 C.

Preface to Lib. IV: καὶ σοφῶς ἄγαν διαλύει, καὶ γραφικαῖς μαρτυρίαις, καὶ παραδείγμασι παλαιοῖς εἰς καιρὸν κεχρημένος, καὶ δεικνὺς ἐναργῶς τῶν θείων ὑποσχέσεων τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

P.G. 82, 153 C = Rom. ix. 10–13:

εἶτα καὶ προφητικὴν μαρτυρίαν προσφέρει. καθὼς γέγραπται· τὸν Ἰακώβ ἠγάπησα κ.τ.λ.

P.G. 82, 160 C = Rom. ix. 25–26:

βεβαιοῖ τὸν λόγον τῇ γραφικῇ μαρτυρίᾳ, καὶ φησιν· ὥς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ λέγει· καλέσω κ.τ.λ. (Hos. ii. 25).

P.G. 82, 161 A = Rom. ix. 27–28.

Citing Is. x. 22: εἰς καιρὸν δὲ μάλιστα ταύτην τέθεικε τὴν μαρτυρίαν κ.τ.λ.

P.G. 82, 165 C = Rom. x. 10–11:

εἶτα πάλιν ἀναμιμνήσκει τῆς γραφικῆς μαρτυρίας.

P.G. 82, 165 D = Rom. x. 12:

ἁρμοδίως δὲ τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ τῇ γλώττῃ τὰς μαρτυρίας προσήρμοσε· τῇ μὲν καρδίᾳ τὸ, πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων κ.τ.λ.

P.G. 82, 172 D = Rom. xi. 5–6:

ὁ μέντοι θεῖος ἀπόστολος ἐκ τῆς γραφικῆς μαρτυρίας ἐπὶ τὸν οἰκεῖον μεταβαίνει λόγον, καὶ φησιν: and cites the verses = 1 Kings xix. 18.

P.G. 82, 180 A = Rom. xi. 23–24:

αὐτοὺς γὰρ εἰς μαρτυρίαν τούτου καλεῖ.

P.G. 82, 180 C = Rom. xi. 25–27:

τέθεικε δὲ καὶ τὴν προφητικὴν μαρτυρίαν.

(δ) John of Damascus, *In Ep. ad Romanos*, *P.G.* 95, 526 C = Rom. x. 14–15:

καὶ πάλιν λύσις ἐκ προφητικῆς μαρτυρίας· ὥς ὠραῖοι οἱ πόδες κ.τ.λ.

P.G. 95, 528 B = Rom. x. 18–19:

καὶ τοῦτο δὲ πάλιν ἐκ μαρτυρίας ἀρχαίας. ἀλλὰ λέγω· μὴ Ἰσραὴλ μὴ ἔγνω;

P.G. 95, 528 B = Rom. x. 19:

ἀπὸ μαρτυρίας τῶν παλαιῶν ἦν γνωρίζαι, φησὶν, αὐτοὺς... πρῶτος Μωϋσῆς λέγει· ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω κ.τ.λ.

- (ε) Chrysostom, *In Ep. ad Romanos*, *Hom.* xvii = III. 149 (ed. Eton)
= Rom. x. 11-13:

εἶδες πῶς καὶ τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ὁμολογίας παράγειν μαρτυρίας;

The question follows the citation of the verses, Is. xxviii. 16, iii. 22, Joel ii. 32.

Hom. xviii = III. 154 = Rom. x. 17:

εὐκαίρως τῆς μαρτυρίας ἐπιλαβόμενός φησιν (Is. liii. 1).

These are small excerpts from Chrysostom; but that he knew the *Testimony Book* is manifest also from his group of anti-Judaic homilies.

- (ζ) Ephraim Syrus, *Comm. in Epp. Pauli* (ed. Venice), p. 32 = Rom. ix. 26:

Et alius Propheta ait: In loco, ubi dictum est eis; Non plebs mea vos, ibi vocabuntur ipsi Filii Dei vivi. Resumit iterum testimonium ducere ex Isaia (x. 22).

P. 33 = Rom. x. 11:

Sed ne forte dixerint, quod fidem novam veniens praedicat ex mente sua, testimonium adduxit ex Scriptura dicente: *Omnis qui credit in illum non confundetur.*

- (η) Augustine, *Propositionum ex Ep. ad Romanos, Expositio* (ed. Paris).
LXII., Rom ix. 16-17:

Manifestum est ergo non volentis neque currentis, sed miserentis Dei esse, quod bonum operamur; quamquam ibi sit etiam voluntas nostra, quae sola nihil possit. Unde sequitur etiam de Pharaonis supplicio testimonium, cum ait Scriptura de Pharaone (v. 17).

LXV., Rom. ix. 27:

Testimonium enim Osee prophetae dictum est pro Gentibus: vocabo non plebem meam, plebem meam et non dilectam, dilectam (Hos. ii. 24) et Isaiae testimonium dictum est pro Israel (Is. x. 22)¹.

The above evidence as it stands could be said to have the power of mutual neutralisation. That is to say: That what looks like a stereotyped phrase for the citation of the Bible appears to neutralise those phrases which give the impression of either immediate or traditional knowledge of a book of Prophetic Testimonies. But such evidence must be judged in relation to the place of the testimonia so designated in the *Testimony Book* itself, whether they are being used by Paul or any of his commentators. [V.B.]

¹ Cf. e.g. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* iv. 20, 12, where Rom. ix. 9 is quoted as a prophetic testimony, which designation is used there in its proper literary sense (*Dial. between Athanasius and Zacchaeus*, 111).

GENERAL INDEX

	PAGE		PAGE
Acts of the Apostles and <i>Test.</i> <i>Book</i>	77-83	Cyprian <i>Testimonies</i> 2, 13, 14, 33, 36, 64, 73, 97, 103	
Aphrahat	55	<i>Testimony</i> headings 18, 19, 21, 25, 34, 44, 63, 65, 66, 85, 87, 100, 106, 107, 126	
Use of <i>Test.</i> by ... 23, 103, 104			
Apollinaris of Laodicea... ..	92		
Aristo of Pella	115		
Athanasius	1		
<i>Athanasius and Zacchaeus</i> ... 13, 14		Davidson, S. <i>Introduction to the Study of</i> <i>the N.T.</i> (1894 edn.), I. 317 ff.	5
Use of <i>Test.</i> by ... 19, 20, 65			
Babut			
<i>Priscillien et le Priscil-</i> <i>lianisme</i> , 1909, 108. 8; 109. 277	87 ²	Ephesians, Epistle to and <i>Testimony Book</i>	38-42
Bacon, B. W.		Eusebius	88
on Mark	29	<i>contra Marcellum</i>	62, 63
Dominical Oracles... ..	90	<i>Demonstratio Evangelica</i>	93
controversy with	90 ff.	Use of <i>Test.</i>	119
Barnabas, Epistle of		Evagrius, <i>Altercatio Simonis et</i> <i>Theophili</i>	18, 46, 47, 62
Value and teaching	35, 36		
Use of <i>Test.</i> by ... 16, 17, 20, 86			
Bar Salibi		Galatians, Ep. to, and <i>Test. Bk</i> 32-37	
Use of <i>Test.</i>	21 ¹ , 78 ¹	Analysis of Ep.	33, 34
Basil the Great	64	Geneva Version of Bible	52
Bickell		Gore, Dr, "The Argument of Romans ix.-xi." in <i>Studia</i> <i>Biblia</i> , II. p. 38... ..	19
Ed. Fayum fragment	68	Gospels and <i>Test. Bk</i>	58-76
Bindley		Problem of O.T. in	58
<i>Church Quarterly Review</i> , April 1917... ..	3	Passages interpreted by <i>Test. Bk</i>	59
Gregory's <i>Oracles of Papias</i> <i>Expositor</i> , April 1918	94	Gregory, Dr, <i>Oracles of Papias</i> 3, 4	
Bishop's Bible	52	Gregory of Nyssa	
Bodleian Library... ..	109	Use of <i>Test.</i>	2, 15, 26
Brehaut		Grotius	49
<i>An Encyclopaedist of the</i> <i>Dark Ages</i> , Isidore of <i>Seville</i> , 1912, 183 ff.	68 ³		
Burkitt		Harnack	
<i>The Gospel History and its</i> <i>Transmission</i> , 1906 ... 3, 70 ¹		<i>Texte und Untersuchungen</i> , ed. 1907, 20	35 ¹
on <i>Logia</i>	9	<i>Texte</i> , v. 4. 488 f.	68 ¹
		Harris, J. Rendel	
		in <i>Expositor</i> , 1901, 194 ff. and 246 ff.	85
		" " April, 1918	94
		" " June, 1919	12
		" " July, 1919	44, 50
		<i>Origin of the Prologue to St</i> <i>John's Gospel</i> (1917)	67, 71
		<i>Origin of the Doctrine of the</i> <i>Trinity</i>	71
		Harris and Burch	
		<i>Testimonies</i> , Part I. 1, 3, 4, 9, 60, 61, 64, 68	
		Hawkins, Sir John	
		<i>Oxford Studies on the Sy-</i> <i>noptic Problem</i>	4, 91, 92
Cantacuzene, John			
<i>History</i> , III. 31	116		
Cassells, W. R. and Lightfoot	4		
<i>Supernatural Religion</i> , 6th edn., pp. 463, 464	6, 7		
Chapman			
<i>Notes on the Early History</i> <i>of the Vulgate Gospels</i> , 1908, p. 243	88 ¹		
Cod. Baroccianus, No. 33, description of	109-110		
Cod. Paris, Gr. 2830, f. 201-216	112		
Coxe's Catalogue	108		

	PAGE		PAGE
Hebrews, Ep. to, and <i>Test.</i>		Linder, <i>Zeitschrift für Wissen.</i>	
<i>Bk</i>	43-50, 107	<i>Theologie</i> , 1900, 223 ff. ...	36
Hegesippus	88	<i>Logia</i> , discussion on	3-10
Hermes Trismegistus	88	Luke, Gospel of	
Hort	49	and <i>Test. Bk</i>	30, 58-70, 80
Humphrey, <i>Treatise on the</i>		Luther	33
<i>Book of Common Prayer</i> ,			
p. 99	98	Mainz Breviary, 1474	99
Irenaeus, <i>Apostolical Preach-</i>		Mark, Gospel of	
<i>ing</i>	67	and <i>Test. Bk</i>	2, 58-70, 93
Use of <i>Test.</i>	1, 19, 73	and <i>Papias</i>	4
Isidore of Seville		Matthew the Apostle	10, 90
Spanish Text of <i>Test.</i> ...	36, 68	Matthew Blastares	112, 119
Use of <i>Test.</i>	62, 103, 104 and	Matthew Camariotes	112
index locorum		Matthew Cantacuzene	112
James (the Lord's brother) ...	78	Matthew, Gospel of	
Jerome's Vulgate	85	and <i>Test. Bk</i>	58-70
Jerusalem Council	79	Papias Oracles	5-6
Jesus		Hawkins's division of ...	91
anti-Judaic	96, 97, 101	Matthew Hieromonachus ...	109-113
and Joshua	52 ff.	Matthew the Monk 2, 3, 109, 113, 116	
and Wisdom	97, 98, 100	Melito	118 ¹
Use of <i>Test.</i>	70, 95-100	Metaphrastes	117
Joachim, Librarian of Monastery		Moffatt, <i>Introduction to the</i>	
on Mt Ivéron	109	<i>Literature of the N.T.</i> , p. 34	10
Joel	81, 82	Monastery of Ivéron, Mt Athos	2
John, Gospel of		Moslems, <i>Test.</i> against	1
and <i>Test. Bk</i>	71-76	Mount Athos ms.	2, 3, 93, 109, 121
and Hebrews	71	and Papias	3
Nature of	70	and Judas-Story	93
anti-Judaic	105	Authorship	109-121
Use of Targum	75	Nestle	65, 91, 92
John the Baptist		In <i>Expositor</i> , 1894, 458 f.	65
Use of O.T.	71, 85	New Testament and <i>Test. Bk</i> ...	2, 11
in <i>Testimonia</i>	63-65	93-4, 107
Justin Martyr		Norden, <i>Agnostos Theos</i> ...	35
and Acts	81	Nyssen, Gregory	
<i>Apology</i>	81	and Hebrews	47
<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i> ...	13	Use of <i>Test.</i>	15, 16, 45, 46, 47,
and Gospels	97	48, 74, 80, 82, 104, 106, 107	
and Paul 14, 28, 38, 40, 41, 42		Odes of Solomon	
Use of <i>Test.</i> 1, 14, 19, 23, 24, 25,		Use of Targum	75
26, 70, 105, 106		Use of <i>Test.</i>	41
Jude		Oecumenius, <i>Comm. on Acts</i> ...	92
Text of Ep.	52	Oxford (Selden) ms.	110
and <i>Test. Bk</i>	51, 52, 86, 88		
Krumbacher		Palaeologos, Emperor John VII,	
<i>Byzantine Literature</i> , p. 110	111	1390-1448	112, 113
Lactantius		Paley, <i>Evidences of Christianity</i> ,	
Use of <i>Test.</i>	62, 64, 89	c. ix. 1, 6	5
Lambros, Cat. of MSS. on Mt		Papias, <i>Dominical Oracles</i> ...	3-6, 9, 10
Athos	2, 109	and <i>Test. Bk</i>	90
Lardner, <i>Credibility of Gospel</i>		and <i>Logia</i>	3
<i>History</i> , ed. Kipps, 1827,		Pap. Gr. 7 (6th cent. Rylands	
ii. 117 ff.	5	Library)	52
Lightfoot	106	Paul, doctrine of	13, 16, 36, 37
on <i>Supernatural Religion</i> 4, 7, 8		and Isaiah	40
<i>Comm. on Colossians</i> , 3rd		and <i>Test. Bk</i> 12, 13-14, 16-17,	
ed. pp. 47, and 173 ...	8	30, 32-34, 38, 46, 74, 77	
		Peter and <i>Test. Bk</i> 2, 12, 19, 63, 82	
		Use of Apocrypha	84-85

	PAGE		PAGE
Phrantzes, Georgius		Testimony Book	
<i>Hist.</i> ii. xii. 12, ed. Bekker,		Controversial text-book ...	1
<i>Corp. Script. Byz.</i> ...	112	chiefly anti-Judaic	12, 13, 17, 19, 20, 66
Prayer Book (Dec. 16) ...	98	Doctrinal hand-book ...	31, 52
Preuschen, <i>Antilegomena</i> , 1901,		Evolution of... ..	101, 102
19	68 ¹	Identification of ...	2, 3
Priscillian, Use of <i>Test.</i> ...	88	Importance for study of	
"Q" and divisions in Matthew	91	N.T. 29, 48, 63, 65, 78-9, 84	
and <i>Test. Bk</i>	70	Internal evidence for ...	61
Reinach, Dr Solomon	4	Nature and contents	1, 10, 33, 35, 36, 66-68, 95
Remigius, <i>Responsio</i>	88	Question of Author ...	11
Roman Breviary, Nonantula,		Use indicated by	
1480	98-99	errors of ascription ...	87
Romans, Epistle to		composite quotations	49, 78
and <i>Test. Bk</i>	2, 12-31	independent translation	93
Misplaced matter in ...	22	peculiar texts	77
Salmon, <i>Hist. Introd. to the N.T.</i>		transcriptional errors ...	1
(ed. 8, 1897, 87-90)	5	Use of Balaam	86
Sanday, <i>The Gospels of the Second</i>		Use of Enoch	88
<i>Century</i> (1876, 155-6) ...	6	Use of Sibyl and Hystaspes	88, 89
Schepss, <i>Opera Priscilliani</i> ...	87, 88	Use of Targum	75
Selden ms. = Athos ms.	120-121	and the O.T.... ..	68, 69
Description of	110	Apocrypha	84-89
Contents	116, 122-136	N.T.	2, 11
and Matthew the Monk	120, 121	Synoptic Gospels ...	58-70
Date, Author	113	Gospel of John ...	71-76
Selwyn, <i>Oracles of the N.T.</i> ...	3, 4	Acts	77-83
Septuagint 10, 58, 75, 77, 78, 79, 132		Romans	12-31
Additions in text of ...	15	Galatians	32-37
Eusebius's use of	131	Ephesians	38-42
Justin's use of	73	Hebrews	43-50
Jesus-Joshua	52	Jude	51-52
Gregory of Nyssa's use of	93	"Q"	70
Text distinct from <i>Test.</i>		Papias	90-94
text	68, 70	and Jesus	70, 95-100
Stanton, <i>The Gospels as Hist.</i>		<i>Timothy and Aquila</i>	
<i>Documents</i>	8-10	Use of <i>Test.</i> by	75
on <i>Logia</i> problem	9, 10, 36	Trent, Council of	85
Swete, <i>The Gospel according to</i>		Toy, <i>Quotations in N.T.</i> 1884	34, 62 ¹
<i>St Mark</i>	65, 66 ¹ , 67	Tyndale's translation of the	
Targum	17, 74-76	Bible	52
Taylor in <i>Expository Times</i> ,		Victorinus and <i>Test. Bk</i> ...	9, 103
1901-2, 40	85	<i>de fabrica mundi</i>	104 ¹
Tertullian, Use of <i>Test.</i> ...	36, 45, 103, 104	Westcott, <i>Canon of the N.T.</i> ...	6
Testament of Solomon	45	<i>Commentary on Hebrews</i> ...	6 ¹
Testimonium (use of word) ...	87	Zacagni, <i>Collectanea</i>	2
Testimony Book		Ziegelbauer, <i>Hist. rei Literariae</i>	
Antiquity of 1, 2, 80, 81, 101, 108		<i>Ordinis S. Benedicti</i> , 1754 ...	88 ¹
Christology of	36, 43, 52, 89		

INDEX LOCORUM

BIBLICAL

Old Testament

	PAGE		PAGE
Gen. i. 26	123	Psalms cii. 25-27	47
i. 27	58	cvii. 20	127
v. 2	58	cix. (cx.)	56
xi. 7	124	cix. 8	82
xiv.	35	cx. 38, 43, 48, 49, 76, 82, 130	
xv. 6	33, 35	cxi.	47, 59, 67
xvii. 5	16, 17	cxviii. 22	19
xviii. 4	58	cxviii. 22-23	59, 60, 66, 96 ¹
xxxi. 11	125	Proverbs viii.	130
Ex. iii. 1 ff.	66	xxiv. 12	58
iii. 6	59, 66, 124	Is. i. 9	26, 27
iii. 15	59	i. 9, 10	26
iii. 16	66	i. 11	107
xxiv. 5	107	ii. 5	24
Lev. i. 10	107	iii. 22	139
Numbers xxiv. 17	87	vi. 9, 10... ..	65, 74, 137
Deut. xviii. 15	82	vi. 10	56
xix. 15	58	vii. 14	59
xxiv. 1	58	viii. 14	137
xxxii. 21	22	viii. 23	59, 63
xxxii. 43	28	ix. 1, 2	59, 63
Jos. v. 2.	54	ix. 7	123
xxii. 4	53	x. 11	137
I Kings xix. 18	138	x. 22	31, 137, 138, 139
II Samuel vii.	72	xi.	42
vii. 14... ..	46	xi. 1	59, 62, 63
Psalms ii. 7... ..	44, 46, 128	xi. 2	40, 135
viii.	38, 49	xi. 10	63
viii. 7 (6)	59	xxviii. 16	137, 139
xi.	62	xxix. 13... ..	59
xvi. 8-11	82	xl. 3-5	59, 85
xix. 2-5	25	xl. 12	86
xix. 4	24	xlii. 1 and 4	59
xxxii. (xxxiii.) 6	134	xliii. 1	59
xli. 9	75	xliv. 21	78
xlii. 2	127	xlvi. 12	127
xliv. 7	48, 73	xlvi. 16, 17	127
xliv. 6, 7	47, 48	xliv. 6	77
liii. 4	63	lii. 5	15
lxviii.	41, 42	lii. 7	25
lxviii. 18	39	liii.	64
lxviii. 23-24	137	liii. 1	24, 62, 74, 76, 139
lxix. 26	82	liii. 4	59, 64
lxxi. (lxxii.)	129	liii. 12	69, 70
lxxxi. (lxxxii.)	73	liv. 1	32, 36
lxxxii. 6	72, 74	liv. 5	127

	PAGE		PAGE
Is. lv. 3	79	Hosea i. 23	18
lxi. 1, 2	69	ii. 24	139
lxv. 1	23	ii. 25	137, 138
lxvi. 1	86	vi. 6	59
Jer. vii. 13	25	viii. 2	21
xxi. 33 ff.	137	xi. 1	59
xxv. 4	26	Micah v. 1	59, 72
xxxi. 15	59	Hab. ii. 1-3	131
xxxi. 37 (38)... ..	137	ii. 4	14, 33, 35
Lam. iv. 30... ..	81	iii. 1, 2	131
Job. xxvii. 3	125	Zech. ix. 9	59
Dan. ii. 44	96	xi. 13	59
ix. 24-27	86	xiii. 7	59, 68
Joel ii. 32	139	Mal. iii. 1	59, 64
Amos ix. 11, 12	78	iv. 6	115
Hosea i. 10	18, 137		

Apocrypha

Wis. of Sol. viii. 1	100	Enoch i. 2	85
Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) xxiv. 3	67, 100	ix. 1... ..	85
Baruch iii. 36 ff.	87		

New Testament

Matthew i. 23	59	Mark i. 2	59, 64
ii. 6	59	i. 3	59, 85
ii. 15	59	iv. 12... ..	59, 74, 97
ii. 18	59	iv. 14... ..	65
ii. 23	59, 63, 63 ¹	vii. 6, 7	59
iii. 3	59, 85	vii. 6	97
iv. 13	63	viii. 18	59, 65
iv. 15, 16	59, 63	x. 4	59
iv. 17	63	x. 6	58
vii. 28	91	x. 27	58
vii. 28, 29	91	xii. 10	59, 66
viii. 5	91	xii. 26	59, 66
viii. 17	59, 63	xii. 36	59, 67
ix. 13	59	xiv. 18	93
xi. 10	59, 64	xiv. 27	59, 68
xi. 28-30	98	xiv. 62	76
xii. 7	59	Luke i. 37	58
xii. 18-21	59	i. 76	59
xiii. 14, 15	59, 65, 74	i. 79	59
xiii. 54	92	iii. 4-6	59, 85
xv. 8, 9... ..	59	iv. 18-19	69
xvi. 27	58	vi. 49... ..	91
xviii. 5	92	vii. 1	91
xviii. 16	58	vii. 27	59, 64
xix. 4	58	viii. 10	59, 65
xix. 7	58	xi. 49... ..	98
xix. 14	92	xx. 17	59, 66
xix. 26	58	xx. 42-43	59, 67
xxi. 5	59	xxii. 37	69, 70
xxi. 42	59, 66	John v. 17	104
xxii. 32	59, 66	v. 39	71
xxii. 44	59, 67	vii. 23	105
xxiii. 34	98	vii. 42	71
xxvi. 31	59, 68	x. 34	72
xxvii. 9, 10	59	x. 35-38	72
Mark i. 1-3	65	xii. 37-41	74

		PAGE			PAGE
John	xii. 37, 38	...	Romans	xi. 11	...
	xii. 41	...		xi. 23, 24	...
	xiii. 18	...		xi. 25, 27	...
Acts	ii.	...		xi. 26	...
	ii. 11	...		xv.	...
	ii. 21	...		xiv. 8	...
	iii. 22	...		xv. 10	...
	iv.	...	I Corinthians	x. 5	...
	iv. 25	...		xii. 8-10	...
	v. 5	...		xii. 28	...
	v. 41	...		xv. 25, 26	...
	xiii. 33	...		xv. 25	...
	xv. 14-31	...	Galatians	ii. 7	...
	xxvi. 23	...		ii. 16	...
Romans	i. 2	...		iii. 6-9	...
	i. 17	...		iii. 8	...
	ii. 17	...		iii. 11	...
	iv. 11	...		iii. 29	...
	iv. 17	...		iv. 20-31	...
	ix.-xi.	...		iv. 26	...
	ix. 9	...		v. 2	...
	ix. 10-13	...		v. 6	...
	ix. 12	...		vi. 16	...
	ix. 14	...	Colossians	ii. 11	...
	ix. 16-17	...	Hebrews	i.	...
	ix. 19	...		i. 4, 5	...
	ix. 24	...		i. 13	...
	ix. 25, 26	...		ii.	...
	ix. 26	...		ii. 6-8	...
	ix. 27	...		ii. 12	...
	ix. 27, 28	...		ii. 12, 13	...
	ix. 29	...		ii. 13	...
	ix. 32, 33	...		iii. 1	...
	x.	...		iii. 8	...
	x. 1-3	...		iii. 17	...
	x. 10-11	...		iv.	...
	x. 11-13	...		iv. 8	...
	x. 12	...		iv. 11	...
	x. 13	...		iv. 15	...
	x. 14, 15	...		v. 6	...
	x. 16-18	...		ix. 19	...
	x. 17	...		x. 4	...
	x. 18	...		xi.	...
	x. 18, 19	...	I Peter	i. 12	...
	x. 19	22, 30, 31, 104, 138		i. 24, 25	...
	x. 19-20	...		ii. 6	...
	x. 20	...		ii. 10	...
	x. 21	...		ii. 15	...
	x. 33	...		iii. 19	...
	xi.	...	Jude	vv. 4, 5	...
	xi. 1	...		v. 14	...
	xi. 2	...	Revelation	xi. 8	...
	xi. 5-6	...		xv. 4	...
	xi. 8-10

PATRISTIC

	PAGE		PAGE
Aphrahat, <i>On Circumcision</i>		Bar Salibi, <i>Treatise against the Jews</i>	
XI. 1	23	VII. 21	18
<i>De Fide</i> (ed. Parisot.)		27	29
6 ff., p. 15 sq.	61	37	25
Athanasius, <i>De Incarnatione</i>		Basil, <i>Contra Eunom.</i> II. c. 20	131
33	60	<i>Epistle</i> , 38	136
35	28		
39	86	Caesarius, <i>Dial.</i> III. 118 (P. G. CCCVIII. 1004)	118
Athanasius and Zacchaeus (ed. Conybeare)		Celsus, <i>Ad Vig. Ep. de Judaica</i>	
5	123	v.	60
15	124	Chrysostom, <i>In Ep. ad Rom.</i>	
21	88	<i>Hom.</i> XVII. = III. 149 (ed. Eton)	139
32	59	<i>Hom.</i> XVIII. = III. 154	139
35	96 ¹	<i>Hom. quod Deus Christus</i>	
38 ff.	60	VIII. 624	60
39	69 ²	Clement of Alexandria, <i>Strom.</i>	
46	82	VI. 5	81 ¹
49 ff.	45	Cyprian, <i>Testimonia</i>	
53	81	I. 2	26, 28
60	69	3	21, 60
62	54	5	14, 33, 34, 35
81	61	7	24
99 ff.	129	8	34, 55
111	139	9	50
112 ff.	60	9, 10	34
117	131	13	34, 80
Augustine, <i>Hom. in Joann.</i>		16	60
iv. 15	60	19	18, 34
<i>Propos. ex. Ep. ad Romanos</i> ,		19, 20	34
<i>Expositio</i> (ed. Paris), LXII.	139	20	32, 37
<i>Sermo</i>		21	23, 60, 79
LI. 15	60	22	28
LXXXVIII. 10	60	II.	65, 72
XCV. 4	60	1	67
CLVI. 15	60	4	75, 86
<i>Exp. Pss.</i> CXVIII. 22-23	60	6	48, 60, 72, 85
		9	59
Barnabas <i>Ep.</i>		10	69 ¹
II. 5, 6	60	11	60, 62
II. 6	35	12	60
v. 12	61	13	60
VI.	60	15	69 ²
19	35	19	61
VII. 5	35	20	36, 50
IX. 1	35	26	48, 61
3	21	28	60
XII. 10	61	Cyril of Jerusalem	
XIII.	18	<i>Catech.</i> III. 1	60
7	16, 33, 35	X. 3	61
XIV. 9	69 ¹	17	60
XVI.	86	XI. 20	60
Bar Salibi, <i>Treatise against the Jews</i>		XII. 8	61
IV. 17	60	18	60
23	136	20	60
V. 17	60	XIII. 20	69 ²
VI. 3	61	34	60
16 ff.	60	XV. 28	61
VII. 10, 11	23		

	PAGE		PAGE
Cyril of Jerusalem		Evagrius, <i>Altercatio Simonis et Theophili</i>	
<i>Catech.</i> XVI. 30	60	III. 11	60
XVIII. 11	61	12	60
34	60	IV. 15, 17	60
Ephraim Syrus		V. 18	33
<i>Comm. in Ep. Pauli</i> (ed.		20	37
Venice), pp. 32, 33 ...	139	29	18
Eusebius, <i>Contra Marcellum</i>		VI. 9	46
I. xx. p. 16	60	20	54 ¹
II. 19	61	22	69 ²
III. 2, p. 153	131 ¹	27	69 ¹
<i>Demonstratio Evangelica</i> (ed.			
Gaisford)		Firmicus Maternus, <i>De Errore Prof. Relig.</i>	
I. ii. 4	63	20	61, 88
10	63	24	61
11	63		
p. 3	119	Gislebert, <i>Disputatio Judaeicum Christiano</i>	
7	60	<i>P. L.</i> 159. 1017 c f. ...	61
10	125, 126	1020 B	60
II. i. 23	60	1025 B	61
ii. 12	60		
19	60	Gregentius, <i>Disputatio cum Judaeo</i>	
iii. 9	60	<i>P. G.</i> 86. 653 B	61
41	60		
81	60	Gregory Nazianzen	
85	60	<i>Poem XI. de incarnatione</i>	
III. i.	69 ¹	(<i>P. G.</i> XXXVII. 466 A) ...	118
ii. 39	60	<i>Poem XIII. 177. Ad Episc.</i>	
44	60	(<i>P. G.</i> XXXVII. 1241) ...	118
IV. 15, 30	69 ¹	Gregory Nyssen, <i>Test. adv. Judaeos</i> (Zacagni)	
17, 13	69 ¹	I.	124
p. 163	128	I.	45
V. 2. 6	69 ¹	I.	74, 75, 81
28	60	II.	60, 87
p. 235	126	II.	55
VII. 1. 92	60	III.	60
133	60	IV.	69 ¹
2. 46 ff.	63 ¹	V.	75, 93
iii. 28 ff.	60	VI.	60
VIII. i. 52	60	VII.	61, 68
76	60	VIII.	61
2.	60	XIII.	105
129	60	XV.	25
4. 2	60	XVI.	22
IX. 5	60	XVI.	50
8	60	XVI.	77 ²
15	60	XXII.	60, 69 ¹ , 125, 134
17	60	p. 239	46
<i>Eclogae Propheticae</i>		311	82
I. 12	61		
14	87	Hippolytus, <i>De Antichristo</i> , 26	60
17	60		
II. 4	49, 50	Irenaeus, <i>Adv. Haer.</i>	
III. 19	60	II. 30. 1	86
24	60	III. 6. 1	48
27	61, 68	10	60
31	60	11. 8	60
41	60	11. 11	64
42	60	17. 3	64
IV. 8	61	18. 1	69 ¹
20	60		
31	69 ¹		

	PAGE		PAGE
Irenaeus, <i>Adv. Haer.</i>		Justin, <i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>	
III. 19. 3	69 ¹	12	60
20	74 ¹	22	86
21. 2	60	24	23
21. 7	60	26	60
IV. 1	74 ¹	27	60
2. 6	86	32	27
3	73	32	56
10. 2	35 ²	33	60, 61
15	35 ²	34	60, 129
20. 12	139	39	28, 39, 60 77 ¹
29. 5	60	42	25
37. 1	69 ¹	50	60, 85
50. 2	60	53	68
50	60	55	27
55. 3	60	56	48, 124
56. 1	35 ²	58	125, 126
IX. 1	61	62	123
<i>Apost. Preaching</i>		64	27
24	33	66	59
35	33, 35	69	60
45	86	75	60
53	69 ¹	76	60
59	60	78	60
63	60	79	60
65	60	80	60
76	61	86	60
79	88	87	41, 60
85	61	89	60
94	37	92	33
96	60	100	60
97	87	113	54
<i>Greek Fragments</i>		114	105
XVII.	60	115	55
Isidore Hispalensis, <i>De Fide</i>		119	33
<i>Catholica contra Judaeos</i>		123	73, 128
I. iii. 7	61	124	73
ix. 1	60	126	60
x. 1	60	134	37
xxxvii.	103	140	60
lvi. 1	61		
II. i. 7	37	Lactantius, <i>Inst. Epitome</i>	
ii. 10	33	68. (73)	89
xvii. 1	60	<i>Div. Inst.</i>	
xxi. 1	60	IV. 11.	21, 28
xxii. 1	33	12	48, 60, 61
		13	28, 60, 63
Jerome, <i>De Viris Illustribus</i>		16	60
IV.	88	18. 11	118 ¹
John of Damascus, <i>In Ep. ad Romanos</i>		18. 25	69 ²
<i>P. G.</i> 95. 526 C	138	22	48
95. 528 B	138	VII. 15. 19	89
Justin, <i>1 Ap.</i>		VIII. 18. 1	89
20	88		
32	60	Melito, Cureton: <i>Spicilegium Syriacum</i> p. 53	57
37	86	Methodius, <i>Orat.</i>	
49	23	VI.	61
50	69 ²		
53	26, 32	Origen, <i>In Epist. ad Romanos</i>	
63	61	VII. 18	137
63	47	19	137
40	25		

	PAGE		PAGE
Origen, <i>In Epist. ad Romanos</i>		Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>In Ep.</i>	
VIII. 1	137	<i>ad Romanos</i>	
7	137	<i>P. G.</i> 66. 841 D	138
12	137	Theodoret, <i>Interpretatio Ep. ad</i>	
<i>In Joann.</i>		<i>Romanos</i>	
I. 23	60	<i>P. G.</i> 82. 148 C	138
41	60	153 C	138
<i>In Lib. Reg. Hom.</i>		160 C	138
I. 18	37	161 A	138
		165 C	138
Priscillian, <i>Tractatus</i>		165 D	138
I. 14	88	172 D	138
32	87 ¹	180 A	138
III. 56	88	180 C	138
VI. 93	88 ²	Theophilus of Antioch, <i>Ad.</i>	
		<i>Autolyicum</i>	
Tertullian, <i>Adv. Judacos</i>		II. 3, 31, 38	89 ¹
5	25, 60	<i>Timothy and Aquila</i> (ed. Cony-	
IX.	59, 60	beare)	
XIV.	44, 60	p. 67	124
<i>Adv. Marcionem</i>		69	60, 61, 67
III. 7	60	70	45, 60
IV. 8	63 ¹	71	60, 63
V. 5	60	73	55, 81
Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>In Ep.</i>		74	18
<i>ad Romanos</i>		77	59, 79
<i>P. G.</i> 66. 836 B	137	86	60
836 D	138	100	60