

STUDIES IN THE TESTIMONY BOOK

BY

D. PLOOIJ

I. A PALESTINIAN 'TESTIMONY' IN PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE
CORINTHIANS.

II. THE APOSTLE AND FAITHFUL HIGH PRIEST, JESUS.

VERHANDELINGEN DER KONINKLIJKE AKADEMIE
VAN WETENSCHAPPEN TE AMSTERDAM

AFDEELING LETTERKUNDE

NIEUWE REEKS, DEEL XXXII, No. 2

UITGAVE VAN DE N.V. NOORD-HOLLANDSCHE
UITGEVERS-MAATSCHAPPIJ, AMSTERDAM 1932

A PALESTINIAN 'TESTIMONY' IN PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE
CORINTHIANS

CHAPTER I

The writings preserved in our New Testament, though they are the oldest extant witnesses of early Christian literature, are not its first stage. Luke says so explicitly in the Prologue to his Gospel and though we may take the *πολλοί*, the term which he uses when speaking of his predecessors, with some reserve, there are in our New Testament numerous traces of this earlier primitive literature, which fully confirm Luke's statement. We ought not to forget that our New Testament is the record of *Hellenic* Christianity, whilst the earliest Church was that of Palestine, "salvation being from the Jews". Of the literature of this primitive Church, which used Aramaic as its mother-tongue, only very scanty remains survive in the original, though we may be sure that a good deal has been preserved in Greek, submerged and unnoticed in its Hellenic form. It was however the Mother-Church of the great Apostle to the Gentiles: when he prays he does so in its language, saying *Abba*, only in the second place adding in Greek: *Our Father*. In Hellenic Christianity the most enthusiastic longing for the coming of the King was uttered in the "Maranatha" of the primitive Church¹⁾, translated in the liturgical ending of the Apocalypse: *Amen, come O Lord Jesus*, in which, even so, the Aramaic *Amen* betrays its origin.

When in this connection we use the term "literature", we have to bear in mind that the writings we denote by this term, were neither born nor designed as "literature". They are based upon the oral tradition, and born from the necessity of facts: preaching, teaching, controversy or liturgy. All these writings were anonymous at first, even if by later generations a name was attached to them, rightly or wrongly. They grew up as the living message of good tidings of which *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Κύριος*, the simplest and most primitive Christian confession, is the centre. It is literature of the community through its leading personalities.

Leaving on one side the liturgical properly speaking, we may, I think, distinguish three different kinds in this literature, growing out of three

¹⁾ cp. the liturgy of the *Didache* x. 6, and the personal note at the end of 1 Cor. which bears an entirely liturgical character. Rev. C. A. Phillips suggests that the words *εἰ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον ἢ τὸ ἀνάθεμα* are also the rendering of an Aramaic liturgical formula on account of the word-play in the words *אָנִי פִּילֵי* and *אִין אָנָּתֶמָּא*. As the whole note is built up from liturgical formulas, the suggestion is quite plausible.

different subjects, though each of them is closely related to and often interwoven with the other:

First: the Gospel, which has for its subject the word and the work, especially the passion and resurrection of the Lord. It grows from oral preaching in the Christian communities, where the stories of what Jesus said and did, were given as illustrations and examples of what He is and gives and demands. The study of the "Formgeschichte" has this process of growth, resulting in our New Testament Gospels, for its subject.

Second: the instruction of the Catechumens, preparing them for baptism. The baptismal confession in its simplest and probably primitive form was *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Κύριος*. But this simple formula contained a wealth of beliefs, hopes, historical facts and moral rules for which special teaching was necessary. It is quite probable that this teaching crystallised very early into a written form, traces of which can be detected in our New Testament, and even if only orally perpetuated, its form was none the less constant and to a great extent fixed.

Third: the appeal to the Testimony of the Scriptures. It is Dr. J. Rendel Harris, who in his two volumes '*Testimonies*'¹⁾ has drawn attention to this kind of primitive Christian literature and has proved the existence of an early "Testimony Book", a collection of primitive arguments from the Scriptures for the defence of the Christian faith against the Jews. The Old Testament was the authoritative and the only authoritative Scripture, both for Jews and Christians. Only the oral tradition of what Jesus said was added to it by the early Christians and even this was done more on account of the authority of Jesus as the recognized Master, than because consciously his word was added to the Corpus Scripturae as such. It was not until well into the second century that Marcion created a New Testament Canon from the Gospel of Luke together with a number of Pauline Epistles, a step to which he was forced because he had rejected the Old Testament and could not do without an authoritative Canon.

The first important result of the studies of Dr. Rendel Harris, embodied in his two volumes quoted supra, was the discovery that in the Old Testament passages quoted in the New Testament, we are not confronted with more or less accidental, stray quotations; on the contrary, we find all the New Testament writers using a systematically arranged collection of Testimonies from the Scriptures, directed in the first place *adversus Judaeos* (like we find the actual title preserved in later collections of the same kind), and then building up positive Christian teaching based on these Scriptures of the Old Testament. A specimen of this kind of Testimony Book, which comes nearest to the original, is for instance Cyprian's first two books, *Testimonia*, and an idea of the kind of

¹⁾ Cambridge, University Press, 1916, 1920.

controversy from which it arose and of which it probably partly retained the form, is given by the Dialogues '*adversus Judaeos*', notably by Justin's Dialogue with the Jew Trypho.

I want to lay stress on the fact, that in the extant Christian writings, we find traces of all the three kinds of primitive matter, influencing and reacting upon one another: an additional proof of their antiquity. In the Gospels the Testimony Book is used as well as in the baptismal teaching, when, for instance, it is said that Jesus Christ was *ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*, and that he *must* suffer and be crucified and rise from the dead on the third day. All this has become common property, and was so from the beginning, because the Scriptures were common property. But the selection, the arrangement, the explanation is personal, even if it should prove impossible to identify the personalities who composed the earliest Gospel or the first Catechism or the primitive Testimony Book. Nor need we even, as we shall see, assume that this basis must have been in script. The impulse has been given by the oral teaching of Jesus himself. And it is not inconceivable that, in agreement with the method of the synagogue, the first collection of Testimonies may have been in oral form. Oral tradition could as we know take to a great extent the place of what in later times the written record afforded. A possible example of what I have in mind, is given in the tradition that Mark wrote his Gospel as a '*hermeneutes*' of Peter, which evidently means that Mark in his Gospel fixed in script what Peter preached orally.

At any rate, the bulk of the matter contained in the later collections of Testimonies, is anti-Judaic. It would seem doubtful to me whether the whole material of the primitive Testimonies is covered by the title '*Adversus Judaeos*'. But at all events its character was greatly influenced by the anti-Judaic controversy, the vital significance of which, as a matter of fact, was demonstrated by the Cross. It was Jesus who first put the question: 'Did you never read?', and the leaders of the Jewish nation replied by the rejection and crucifixion of Jesus. But whatever ultimately may be shown to have been the contents and the purpose of the early Testimony Book, it is beyond any doubt that its main characteristic was the anti-Judaic contention that a New Israel, and a New Law and a New Temple and a New Covenant and a New Circumcision were not only actually in being, but had been foretold and described by the Prophets.

That the same controversy was vital also for the early Church is shown by the martyrdom of Stephen, who was accused of speaking 'against this Holy Place and the Law' and of saying, 'that Jesus, the Nazarene, would destroy this place and change the customs come down by tradition from Moses'. The Epistles of Paul, especially Rom. ii—iv, ix—xi and Gal. iii, reflect disputes of the kind described by Luke in

Acts xxviii. 23—28, when Paul summons to him the leaders of the Jews in Rome and by Testimonies from the Scriptures (*διαμαρτυρούμενος*) explains his views about the Kingdom of God and argues from the Law and the Prophets about Jesus i.e. the Scriptures are quoted as witnesses for the Messiahship of Jesus. And then when a part, evidently the majority, does not accept his argument and will not "believe", he dismisses them, again with a Testimony from the Scriptures:

Quite truly the Holy Spirit spoke to your fathers through Isaiah, the Prophet:
Go and tell this people: Hearing you will hear, but never understand, and
seeing you will see, and never perceive.

From henceforth this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles.

It was the Church of the Gentiles which thus asserted its rights as the nation of the New Covenant. In the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*,¹⁾ which preserves such a great quantity of archaic matter, the Christian says:

For concerning us from the Gentiles, there has been written thus in the Book of the twelve Prophets:

After that I will return and build again the Tabernacle of David which had fallen and its ruins I will build up (Am. ix. 11).

and again:

And the latter glory of that House will be great compared with the first (Hag. ii. 9).

But we should err seriously, if we thought that it was only the Christians from the Gentiles and their Apostle who read the Old Testament in this light. Though the speech of Stephen in Acts vii reflects in a most powerful way the argument of the Testimony Book against Judaism, and went further in its criticism of the Law and the Temple than Judaic Christianity was willing to do, in Acts xv. 16f James the Righteous quotes the Testimonies of the Scriptures as well in favour of Gentile Christianity. The attitude of James and his colleagues in the Apostolic Council is a very remarkable one, but they could not help submitting to the authority of the Scriptures in favour of the Brethren from the Gentiles.

In Rom. ix—xi we find the echo of controversies of the kind as described in Acts. xxviii. 23ff. and — in a tamer form — in Acts xv. In Rom. x. 15 ff. for instance we find first the quotation of Is. lii. 7 followed by another quotation, taken from Is. liii. 1:

καθάπερ γέγραπται· ὡς ὤρατοι οἱ πόδες
τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων ἀγαθὰ (Is. lii. 7)

where the word *εὐαγγελιζομένων* makes the connection with the Christian preaching of the Gospel and is followed by the statement that this

¹⁾ ed. Conybeare, p. 73 f.

Gospel is rejected by many. But this also was in the Prophecy, for

Ἡσάκας λέγει· κέρε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν. (Is. liii. 1)

Here the word *ἐπίστευσεν* is the connecting link with the Christian preaching, and the word *ἀκοή*, though not a word for the *κῆρυγμα* at first, later on and in this connection becomes a technical term for the preaching of the Gospel. We can observe it clearly when in Hebrews iv. 2 we find the author playing on the very same combination of Testimonies when he says:

καὶ γὰρ εἶπεν ἐν ἡγγελισμένοι καὶ ἀκούοντες· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγγέλασεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνους μὴ συγκειρασμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.

Paul goes on with the objection:

But did they hear it (*ἤκουσαν*)?

and he replies:

They did, certainly, for:

*εἰς πάντας τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ πέλατα τῆς οὐρανίου
τὰ ὄρηματα αὐτῶν.*

a Testimony from Ps. xix. 5.

This little portion of the Apostle's grand discussion of the conflict between Christ and his own nation is by itself sufficient to show that a *systematic* arrangement of Old Testament passages is at the base of his argument. To add one other example I refer to the epic opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews:

In many forms and many fashions God spoke to the Fathers in the Prophets, in this last of these days He has spoken to us in the Son, whom he appointed Heir of the universe, through whom also He created the world... whom He made to sit at the right hand of the Majesty on high, so far superior to the Angels as he has inherited a superior name to theirs. For to whom of the Angels did He ever say:

Thou art my son, to-day I have begotten thee? (Ps. ii. 7).

and again:

I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son (2 Sam. vii. 14).

Both well-known proof-texts from the Testimony Book, not only occurring over and over in the anti-Judaic literature, but occurring there in this same sequence. What puzzles us is the unexpected introduction of the Angels in this connection. Still, this introduction is intentional, for the comparison of the Son and the Angels is continued in a series of other Testimonies and is a substantial part of the author's argument for the superiority of the Son. The solution is, as Dr. Rendel Harris has proved conclusively¹⁾, in the Testimony Book, which, as we see clearly in the anti-Judaic literature had not only the same questions in its chapter: *on the Son* as Hebrews, but which contained also a number

¹⁾ Testimonies, II, 45.

which in Hebrews are only understood. When Hebrews introduces the Son as '*him through whom God has created the world*' the author is evidently thinking of the text Gen. i. 26:

ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον, faciamus hominem,

which the Christian explained as being said by God to the Son. The *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili*¹⁾ has the complete argument:

(Theophilus Christianus dixit...) dicit enim (deus): faciamus hominem, et rursus infra dicit: fecit deus hominem ad imaginem dei, masculum et feminam fecit eos.

Simon Judaeus dixit: Potuit hoc ad angelos dixisse. Theophilus Christianus dixit: Erras Judae, cui enim angelorum dixit deus: filius meus es tu. ego 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.

The argument occurs also in other anti-Judaic writings, which shows that the matter is traditional, and that all these writers are using the collection of Testimonies which is already in the hands of the author to the Hebrews and of Paul.

We must, I think, emphasize a conclusion which has been indicated already by Dr. Rendel Harris but can scarcely be overestimated: if in matters of Christology and similar central convictions of early Christianity the Testimony Book with its peculiar and intentional choice of proof-texts has been used as a guidebook from which the evolution of Christian dogma started, we shall have to pay much more attention to the way in which this Testimony Book presented these fundamental problems and their solution than has hitherto been done. It must become, in fact, an essential study for any real understanding of early Christian thought and confession.

¹⁾ ed. Bratke, p. 7.

CHAPTER II.

In our previous chapter we came to the unavoidable conclusion reached already by Dr. Rendel Harris, that the New Testament writers were already in possession of a definite collection of *Testimonia adversus Judaeos*. Another question is whether this early collection of Testimonies was an actual written document from the beginning. The question is of less importance than we would be likely to attach to it: the Jewish 'Halacha' (I use the word on purpose and come back to it later on) was circulating orally, probably for generations, before it was fixed in script, whatever the reason may have been for the objection against writing it down. Nevertheless it was constant to a degree which we should scarcely think possible, and certainly not less fixed than it has been since it was committed to writing. With regard to the Testimony Collection, the constant combination of certain passages from the Scriptures, in the same sequence and sometimes interwoven to a degree which makes it difficult to unravel the texts out of which the Testimony has been composed, points beyond any doubt to a personality as a composer, and to a collection fixed from the beginning, though liable to amplification by the marvellous ingenuity of later Christians. I do not hesitate to say even that the choice and the sequence of the Scripture passages points to a personality of high spiritual qualities and of deeply religious character, even though, at first, his exegetical method is entirely alien to our own. Ultimately the system and the impulse of reading the Scripture in this way came from Jesus himself with his queries: 'Did you never read?' And his teaching was always oral. Moreover the discussions which the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews reflect and which find a more or less adequate reproduction in the anti-Judaic Dialogue, show that somehow the Synagogue was the school where the method was taught and learned. So it is quite thinkable that the Testimony Book reflects the *oral* teaching of one of the early leading personalities of the Church. But whoever this personality may have been, whose oral teaching the Testimony Book reflected, we may be sure, I think, that early Christianity in this respect as in others was in the front of the evolution, far ahead of the conservative Jews in making use of script for the propaganda of its teaching. At any rate it did so before Paul wrote his Epistles. It is one of the most convincing results of the studies of Dr. Rendel Harris in this field, that Paul already uses constant succes-

sions of Testimonies, recurring elsewhere, though Paul could not be the source of their occurrence in later controversialists: all of them, Paul included, use a common written source. And, if we can trust this part of the second epistle to Timothy to be genuine, among the parchments left behind at Troas, a copy of the Testimony Book was certainly to be found: a Christian missionary could not very well do without that.

One of the characteristic features of the early Christian testimonies is the 'freedom' with which the texts are handled. Anything of the nature of historical exegesis is far to seek. When Paul in Rm. x. 16 quotes the testimony of Is. liii. 1

κὺριε, τίς ἠπίστανόσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν,

he quotes it as a prophecy of what has really happened, viz. that the Jews have not believed the ἀκοή, preaching, of the Gospellers, and then he reproduces the objection:

But have they really heard it (ἤκουσαν).

To which he answers: '*They did, certainly*'; and the proof he alleges is found in Ps. xix. 5:

Their voice went out over all the earth and to the end of the world their words.

Paul evidently did not worry over the fact that in Ps. xix the writer is speaking of the heavens and the heavenly bodies, but he simply substitutes for them in his thought the Gospel. Accordingly, he does not yet go so far as to introduce the supposed subject to the verb ἐξῆλθεν. Aphrahat is less scrupulous in this respect, and in his argument (*de fide* 8) that 'the faith in Christ fills all the ends of the world' quotes Ps. xix. 5 in this form:

In all the world went out the sound (כָּל הָאָרֶץ הִישִׁיעַ) of the Gospel of Christ, and I am not at all sure that this was not in his copy of the Testimony Book itself.

One of the most frequently used proof-texts is Is. xxviii. 16 of the Stone laid a foundation in Sion, where the Mass. tradition as well as the LXX reads:

and he who believes will not be ashamed.

Not only Paul in Rm. ix. 33 and so many other defenders of the Christian faith, but also some of the great mss. of the LXX (s A Q) add ἐπ' αὐτῷ, (he who believes in Him). The Christian origin of this addition is clear. Not only in this but in several other cases the LXX tradition shows evident influence of Christian interpretation and variation. Justin accuses (Dial. ch. 73) the Jews of having removed some words from

the Scriptures. The reverse is more probable, viz. that the Testimony Book introduced special exegetical matter into the proof-texts. Nor did this remain unnoticed. In the *Dialogue between Athanasius and Zacchaeus* ch. 15, the Christian interlocutor quotes Gen. xix. 24 in the form:

καὶ κῆρυς ὁ θεὸς ἔβριξεν ἐπὶ σόδομα καὶ γόμορρα θεῖον καὶ πᾶρ παρὰ κερύον
ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Zacchaeus remarks that the text is wrongly quoted:

οὐ λέγει· κῆρυς ὁ θεὸς ἔβριξεν, ἀλλὰ· κῆρυς ἔβριξεν

and he suggests that this κῆρυς does not mean *God*, as the addition θεός would make us believe, but an *Angel*: ἄγγελος ἔβρεξεν παρὰ κερύον τοῦ θεοῦ.

The Jew is quite right in his opposition to the reading: 'the addition is only read in two of Holmes' codd., viz. 56 = cod., Paris III saec. XII and 29 = Cod. Vatic. 1252 saec. XIII', says Conybeare in his edition p. 12. But, at the same time, it was in the text used by Tertullian, *adv. Prax.* 16, where it is still extant, and in that used by Justin, *Dial.* ch. 56, where it has been corrected out in the text quoted, but preserved in Justin's explanation¹).

Augustin in *Sermo* 373 says that some of the Gentiles, 'finding that Christ has been announced before by the Prophets, prefer, when we put before them the clear testimonies from the Scriptures (*de Scripturis testimonia clara*), to rely on the manuscripts of the Jews, suspicious that those testimonies may have been made up by the Christians'.

What we must bear clearly in mind is, that in dealing with Testimony matter, we have before us texts, not only quoted for a special purpose, but also arranged, explained and sometimes amplified with a view to a special exegesis. This fact can scarcely be overestimated. The Old Testament was the authority — and the only authority — both for Jews and Christians, they only differed in the explanation. When Christians appealed to the Old Testament against the elect nation to defend their right to regard themselves as the heirs of the promises and as the new, the true Israel against the Israel κατὰ σάρκα, when they found in the Prophets Jesus — *nomine apposito*, says Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* IV. xiv with regard to Zach. iii. 1 ff. and evidently Hebrews is in the same line ch. iv. 8 and ch. iii. 1 — foretold as the Messiah, and a New Law and a New Temple prophesied instead of the Old Law and the Old Temple, they find themselves refuted by the Jews with other passages from the same Scriptures, or by the same passages differently explained. In this way the Christian view not only influenced the texts they used, as we

¹) For full evidence cp. Conybeare in his edition p. 124.5 and p. 131.

saw in one or two examples, but reversely and earlier: the texts quoted influenced the Christian speculation.

This fierce controversy could of course have significance only during the time when and in surroundings where the Jewish claims were a real danger to Christianity. That is: in the whole Mediterranean until the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and afterwards in regions, where a strong contingent of the population was Jewish, for instance in Eastern Syria in the surroundings of Aphrahat. Elsewhere and in the West after 70 A.D. the anti-Judaic controversy assumes more and more a theoretical, traditional character. This is the reason why the polemic of Tertullian and later writers gives the impression of an argument of doctrinal tradition on what is no longer a living issue. On the other hand, Aphrahat's homilies against the Jews on Circumcision, on the Sabbath, etc. evidently oppose an antagonist who is still strong and to be feared.

A PALESTINIAN 'TESTIMONY' IN PAUL'S
EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS

CHAPTER III.

The problem which we have to face is, first, whether it may be possible to reconstruct the earliest collection of Testimonies. A second problem, not less important is: *where* this early Testimony Book was composed. It lies behind our New Testament, as Dr. Rendel Harris has, I think, conclusively shown. But our New Testament is Greek. And we have accordingly traces of the primitive Testimonies only in Greek. With one possible exception, namely that, if they were originally Aramaic, we might find traces of their original form in the literature of the Old Syriac Church, in the same way as we have found in Tatian's Diatessaron and in the Old-Syriac Gospels remains of the original Aramaic underlying our Greek Gospels or derived from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

If we are right in supposing that the Testimony Book was really a weapon against the Jews, we would naturally expect to find it arising in Palestine where Stephen is handling it freely and where the conflict first occurred.

But, as we have remarked, we have only remains of the Hellenic side of Christianity. Accordingly the research for the earliest anti-Judaic controversy bears the character of excavation work: we cannot expect to find anything but scattered, perhaps scanty remains, often displaced fragments, and the skilled eye and the vision of the explorer, may — at its best — be able to reconstruct the outlines of what once was a glorious temple, and to assign the detached fragments to their original place and purpose in the plan of the whole. Not all fragments have the same value in this work of reconstruction, but some bear unmistakable signs of their origin.

It is to one or two fragments of this latter kind that I should like to draw attention. In his first tract, on *Faith*, Aphrahat the Persian Sage argues that man by faith and love and hope and justification and perfection and consummation is built up until the whole building is erected and finished; then he becomes a House and Temple for Christ to dwell in¹). This conception of the Christian as a Temple and House in which God or Christ or the Spirit dwells, occurs in numerous places²). Evidently

1) கூடிய கிடைக்கும் கூடு

²⁾ cp. the index of Parisot on the words *deus*, *Christus*, *homo*, etc.

it was not only congenial to the mystic mind of the Syrian Father, to a degree, unknown as far as I am aware of in the West, but was traditional in his manner of presentation and central in his own thought; so much so, that the original idea occurs in sometimes unexpected variations and combinations. For instance: speaking on the creation of the world Aphrahat says¹⁾ that God has honoured man above all creatures:

because with His holy hands He has moulded them and from His spirit breathed into them and from the beginning was to them a house of habitation, and dwelled and walked in them

and he quotes some proof-texts on which we are presently going to speak: Lev. xxvi. 12, Jerem. vii. 4, 5 and Ps. xc. 1, 2. To quote one instance more. Speaking on prayer, he says that:

our Saviour has taught us, pray to thy Father in secret when the door shall be shut... Which is the door which he tells you to shut? If not thy mouth, because thou thy self art a temple in which Christ dwelleth as the Apostle says: You are a Temple of the Lord.²⁾

The quotation from Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 16 is not quite correct, for Paul says: *you are the Temple of God*; but we shall presently find the reason for this variant and see how Aphrahat mixes up the original Testimony on which his conception is based with the reflex of it in Paul.

The clearest passage is that with which I began: *de fide* 3. After having stated that after all the preparation by faith and so on the believer becomes a House and a Temple for Christ to dwell in, he continues:

According as Jeremiah the Prophet has said:

The Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple are you of the Lord, if you make good your ways and your works (Jer. vii. 4. 5.).

And again he says by the Prophet:

I will dwell in them and will walk in them (Lev. xxvi. 12).

and also the Holy Apostle says thus:

You are the temple of God and the Spirit of Christ dwelleth in you. (1 Cor. iii. 16).

And Aphrahat quotes the same testimonies from Jer. vii. 4, 5 and Lev. xxvi. 12, besides here and in the passage (I. 793²⁰ ff.) quoted above, in several other places. For instance in his tract *on the Grape* ch. 47 (II. 92²³ ff.):

and the Apostle testifies:

if in any of you the Spirit is not, that one is not His.

and again he says:

The Temple are you of God and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.

and the Prophet says:

I will dwell in them and I will walk in them (Lev. xxvi. 12).

¹⁾ ed. Parisot, I. 793²⁰ ff.

²⁾ ed. Parisot, I. 157¹⁴ ff.

And in numerous other places the Syrian Father, though not explicitly quoting the passages, evidently has them in his mind.

Now in the passage of *de Fide*, ch. 3 Aphrahat quotes Jer. vii. 4, 5 in a form which at once arrests our attention:

The Temple of the Lord are you if you make good your ways and your works.

In the Mass. text the passage belongs to Jeremiah's Temple sermon (in which occurs, vs. 11, the passage quoted by Jesus at the Cleansing of the Temple Mt. xxi. 13 par.). He warns those who come to worship and rely upon 'words of falsehood' saying: 'The Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord are these' pointing to the buildings of the Sanctuary. And the Prophet continues:

On the contrary, if you really better your ways and your works... I, the Lord, will make you to dwell in this land.

Aphrahat, however, does not give any heed to the context; he changes the appositive *these* into *you* and makes the immediate connection of the saying: *You are the Temple of the Lord*, with the following not as contrast but as condition: *if you make your ways and works good*.

We find the same textual form in the Old Testament Pešitta, though, of course, without the connection made by Aphrahat between the two verses 4 and 5. In the Pešitta vs. 5 belongs as in the Mass. text to the following verse.

It is a quite common phenomenon to find the context neglected in the Testimonies. But evidently, here a variant reading is used in favour of an explanation of the passage which is essentially different from, if not contrary to, the original meaning. I have not been able to find any other trace of the crucial reading: *vos estis* l. *haec sunt* either in the LXX or elsewhere. But somehow or other it seems to underlie the Targum. In Paul de Lagarde's edition of the *Prophetae Chaldaice* (Lipsiae 1872) we find Jerem. vii. 4 paraphrased as follows:

Do not rely upon words of prophets of falsehood who say: Before the Temple of Jahve you serve, before the Temple of Jahve you offer, before the Temple of Jahve you pray, three times a year you appear before Him.

Clearly the sense of the original and of the context has been preserved in the Targum, but somehow it is paraphrasing a text, now lost, which contained the words *vos estis* instead of *haec sunt*. As no Greek or Hebrew text seems to contain the reading, the tradition upon which both the Old Testament Pešitta and the Targum are based, must be of Aramaic origin. The possible assumption that the variant might be of *Christian* origin, must be abandoned here on account of the Targum. And accordingly the Testimony

quoted by Aphrahat and used by him in the peculiar sense we observed, is not of Greek origin, but has been born in Aramaic speaking regions.

But the convincing proof has as yet not been found, because the text on which both the Targum and the Testimony are based is absent, and can be only reconstructed by hypothesis.

We find however Aphrahat going on:

And again he said by the Prophet:

I will dwell in them and will walk among (in) them.

The 'prophet' quoted is Lev. xxvi. 12 and both by the introduction *and again* and by the qualification of the Testimony as a 'prophecy' (instead, as, for instance, *Moses*, or the *Law*) the quotation is clearly characterized as being taken from the Testimony Collection, and not directly from the Old Testament. The textual form given by Aphrahat differs from the Mass. text as well as from the Pešitta and the LXX.

The Mass. says:

I will walk in your midst and I will be for a God unto you and you shall be for a people unto me.

The Pešitta and LXX are exact renderings of this Hebrew text. No trace of the addition: *I shall dwell in them*. And exactly in this addition lies the whole point of the argument of Aphrahat, who quotes the passage to prove that God dwells in the believers as in a Temple. So it is excluded, that this addition can be a pure invention on the part of Aphrahat.

Now however, we look up the Targum. The Palestine Targum paraphrases the passage as follows:

The Glory of my Šekina shall dwell among you (and my Word shall be unto you a redeeming God and you shall be unto my Name for a holy people).

The Onkelos Targum:

And I will make my Šekina to dwell among you (and I will be to you Eloha and you shall be a people before me).

The Targum of Palestine goes a little further in avoiding anthropomorphisms than that of Onkelos, but it is quite clear that both have the missing reading. They use the paraphrase:

I (the Glory of my Šekina) will dwell among you;

instead of the Massoretic:

I will walk among you.

The variant is evidently due to the Targumic shyness of anthropomorphisms. They did not object to saying that God *dwells* among His

people, a conception implied already in the term *Šekina* as a substitute for God, but wanted to avoid the anthropomorphism that God should be said to *walk* among men. Aphrahat's reading combines the two forms.

It is accordingly, I think, beyond any doubt, that the origin of the variant in question in the text of Lev. xxvi. 12 lies in Targumic, i.e. in Palestinian Jewish circles. That this is really the case, is obvious from the fact, that we find Philo, where Christian influence is absolutely excluded, paraphrasing the same Targumic tradition. He quotes (*de Somn.* I 48, M. 643) Lev. xxvi. 12 in the form:

περιπατήσω ἐν ἑμῖν καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός,

a correct rendering of the Massorah. But in his explanation of the passage, he says:

ἔσονται καὶ κακῶν ἀκατόρθων στήλη, ὥτα εἰς ὃ ἀγαθός
εἰσορατίζεται . . . αποδέσσει οὖν, ὃ ψυχῇ, θεοῦ αἴτιος γένεσθαι.
ἄρῶν ἄγιον, ἐνδιαίτημα κάλλιστον.

Both Philo and the Targum suppose the same underlying Midraš, and we are accordingly absolutely safe in concluding that it is a *Jewish* Midraš of the text, which in Aphrahat's Testimony has been combined with the Massoretic original.

We may remark in passing that the Targumic substitute for God, *Šekina*, used in the paraphrase of Lev. xxvi. 12 brings this passage in close resemblance with Ezek. xxxvii. 27 in the Massoretic text, and nearly verbally parallel with its Targumic rendering. Ezek. xxxvii. 27 runs in the Massorah:

And my Tabernacle (משכני) shall be with them and I will be unto them for a God and they shall be unto me for a people.

The Targum says in a paraphrase which is entirely regular and in tune with the Targumic views:

And I will make to dwell my *Šekina* (ואשרי שכינתי) among them and I will be unto them for a God and they shall be before Me for a people.

We shall have to come back to this passage again; for the present we merely observe its close resemblance with the Targumic form of Lev. xxvi. 12.

The next Testimony quoted by Aphrahat is taken from Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. iii. 16. We shall come back to it presently but first turn to 2 Cor. vi. 16:

ἡμεῖς γὰρ πρὸς θεοῦ ἴσμεν ἕδωτος,
καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι·
ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω
καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεός
καὶ αὐτοὶ ἕσονται μου λαός.

Paul goes on quoting other Testimonies for the special purpose of his argument in the context. We may leave them aside; for we find to our astonishment, that Paul evidently quotes the same Testimonies as Aphrahat did: Jer. vii. 4 followed by Lev. xxvi. 12, in the very same sequence and in the same textual form as Aphrahat. The conclusion is obvious, and, it would seem to me, unavoidable:

Paul is quoting the involved testimonies from the same source as that from which Aphrahat quotes them i.e. from a collection of Testimonies based upon the text of the Targum and accordingly of Aramaic-Palestinian origin.

At the same time we remark that their form both in Aphrahat and in Paul, though undoubtedly founded upon a Targumic base, is handled by a Christian. The *you* of the text in the Targum and in the Massora (*I will dwell in you*) is changed into *them* (*I will dwell in them*) in exactly the same way as in Acts ii. 17 and ii. 39 the 'Western' text, so often influenced by Testimonies, alters the *ὑμῶν* and the *ὑμῖν* of the quoted Old Testament passage into *αὐτῶν* and *αὐτοῖς*, in order to make it clear that not the Jews, but the Christians, the New Israel, are meant. And it is not the Pešitta which Aphrahat is quoting, for the Pešitta has in Lev. xxvi. 12 the ordinary reading. Accordingly both Paul and Aphrahat quote the collection of Testimonies; and the origin of the readings we discussed shows clearly that it is an *Aramaic* Testimony Book which both of them use, i.e. a book which has been arranged and edited in the beginning of the Christian Church in Palestine. ¹⁾

¹⁾ I would observe that the only witnesses for the reading *I will dwell* in Lev. xxvi. 12 I have been able to find besides Aphrahat and Paul (and the other early Christian, Greek writings where the reading is presupposed for instance Barn. vi. 14 f.) are the Old-Latin Fathers Ambrose (*et inhabitabo in illis et inter eos ambulabo*), Augustine, Hilary (*habitabo in his et in illis ambulabo*). They are evidently quoting the Testimony Book (cp. *in illis* l. *in vobis*) and not immediately the Old Testament.

CHAPTER IV.

The importance of the discovery discussed in our previous chapter, is obvious and can scarcely be overestimated. It takes us back into the first score of years of the rising of Christianity and to Palestine, the Mother Church both of Paul and of Hellenic Christianity. If that primitive Church possessed already a collection of Testimonies used in the controversy with the Jews, and explained in the way of a Christian Midraš, the debt to it of Hellenic Christianity in general and of Paul in particular is far greater than generally has been supposed. For, as we shall observe, the christological ideas and the conceptions of the Church etc. of early Christianity are based upon the Testimonies and their exegesis. But let us see whether the discovery is confirmed.

There are two other passages where Paul expresses the same thought, 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17 and 1 Cor. vi. 19. The first runs as follows:

οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἴστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν οἰκεῖ;
εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθειρεῖ, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός, ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ
θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οὗτινές ἴστε ὑμεῖς.

Evidently the same sequence of Testimonies, Jer. vii. 4, Lev. xxvi. 12 are the basis of the words of the Apostle, and in the exact wording of the Testimony Book. But we make two important observations. Instead of saying: *God dwells in the believers*, Paul says here: *The Spirit dwells in them*, and we are reminded at once of the Targumic paraphrase in which 'the Šekina' is substituted for 'God'. We are evidently in the sphere of the substitutions, so common in the Testimony Book where Christ, Word, Spirit, Wisdom, Power, etc. are freely interchanged, a system with which Paul here is evidently well acquainted, when he simply substitutes πνεῦμα θεοῦ for what from the Targumic tradition he received as the Šekina of God. The exegetical method of the Christian Testimony Book proves to be that of the Jewish Targum, the difference being merely that the conclusions drawn from the Old Testament text were diverse. If, therefore, we want to find a real parallel to the early Christian speculations on Christ, on the Spirit and so on, we must look first, not to the Stoa or to the Gnostics, but to the Midraš and the Targum. There historically lies their basis. By saying this, however, we do not want to deny the equally obvious fact, that, as soon as Christianity migrated to Hellenistic centres, Hellenistic thought and

speculation and belief also were involved in the evolution of Christian dogma.

The other passage where Paul uses the same Testimony is I Cor. vi. 19:

οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔχοντος πνεύματος ἁγίου;

Though the context is entirely different, the argument is the same. It is very significant, that both times, in I Cor. iii. 16, 17 and I Cor. vi. 19, Paul's quotation of the Testimony is introduced by οὐκ οἴδατε. We shall come back to it presently. Here I only observe that no reference is made to the source from which the Testimony is derived. Accordingly Aphrahat, who does explicitly quote Jeremiah and the 'Prophet', has not borrowed from Paul; he does not even notice that, in quoting Paul in the sequel of his argument, he is actually only duplicating the Testimony.

We find other traces of the same Testimony in our New Testament. First of all Hebrews iii. 6

χριστὸς δὲ ὡς οἶκος (scil. πιστὸς) ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ οὗ οἶκος ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς.

I do not think that anybody will doubt that the same Testimony from Jer. vii. 4 is involved here. But it is significant, that the word used here is not ναὸς but οἶκος. As I intend to show in the following study, the Testimony under discussion belongs to a series of Testimonies on the Temple and its Builder which are partly quoted, partly understood in the first part of Hebrews iii. To that series belonged, for instance, not only Jer. vii. 4 but also Num. xii. 7, 1 Sam. ii. 35 and 2 Sam. vii. 12—16. In all these places mention is made of *the House*, which will be built in the future. Accordingly we find for instance in Cyprian, *Testimonia*, I. xv a chapter headed:

Quod domus et templum dei Christus futurus esset et cessaret templum vetus et novum inciperet.

And in the same way we find in Aphrahat frequently the same combination, for instance in the passage from which our study started, *de Fide* 3 (Parisot, I, 9¹⁶):

domus et templum habitationis Christi (cp. supra p. 15).

Hebrews iii. 6 shows that this interchangeability of *domus* and *templum* is original Testimony method.

The same may be said of 1 Petr. ii. 5. There also the Testimony Book is used and the same section: that on the House, the Cornerstone of which has been rejected by the Builders, but on which the New House (Temple) is being built up from living stones, which form the οἶκος πνευματικός in which πνευματικαὶ θυσίαι, such as are εἰς προσέλευσιν before God, are being offered (in contrast of course with the Old Temple and the Old Sacrifices).

One passage more in the New Testament may be mentioned. In

Apoc. xxi. 3 a voice is heard from the throne when the New Jerusalem is descending from heaven:

ἰδοὺ ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων
καὶ σκηνώσιν μετ' αὐτῶν
καὶ αὐτοὶ λαοὶ αὐτοῦ ἔσονται,
καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔσται.

Nestle, in the margin of his invaluable edition, rightly refers to Ez. xxxvii. 27. But again it is not the Massoretic text nor the LXX which is reproduced. The Massorah has:

My Tabernacle shall be with them.

the LXX:

καὶ ἔσται ἡ κατασκήνωσις μου ἐν αὐτοῖς.

No trace of σκηνώσει as in the text of the Apocalypse. Nestle also refers to Zach. ii. 10 (LXX vs. 14) where we find:

καὶ κατασκηνώσει ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.

But, though this passage may have exercised side influence, it is clear that in this case as in the others we discussed, the quotation is based upon the Targum which paraphrases:

I will make to dwell my Šekina among them.

Only as is so often the case in Testimonies, the wording is influenced by and combined with other Testimonies, in this case by the Testimony taken from Lev. xxvi. 12 (Onkelos):

And I will make my Šekina to dwell among you and you shall be a people before me and I will be to you Eloha. ¹⁾

And accordingly in Apoc. xxi. 22 follows:

καὶ ναὸν οὐκ εἶδον ἐν αὐτῇ·
ὁ γὰρ ναὸς ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ναὸς αὐτῆς ἐστίν
καὶ τὸ ἄρτον.

¹⁾ Perhaps I may draw attention to the probable influence of the Testimonies for the indwelling of the Spirit in the Gospel of John. In the course of his argument on the House and Temple, for the inhabitation of God, Aphrahat says (*de fide* Ch. 9, Parisot I. 211^f): The Spirit of God, which dwelled on Christ in its seven operations **שְׁכִינָתוֹ** as says Isaiah the prophet (Is. xi. 2): *On Him will rest and dwell the Spirit of God*, etc. The addition *and dwell* is not in the Massorah nor in the LXX. But it is in the Pešitta. In the Targum תִּישָׁב, *will dwell* is used instead of the Hebrew נָח. So here again we have a case of conflation of Massorah and Targum as in the Testimony from Lev. xxvi. 12. And we are at once reminded of the stress which the Gospel of John lays on μένειν said of the Spirit: 'remaining in Christ' Joh. i. 32 f. because μένειν is used in Joh. i. 38 in the sense of *habitare*. The influence of the Testimony from Ezek. xxxvii. 27 in its Targumic form may be seen in Joh. i. 14 ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν.

With the variation which in the Testimonies is so frequent, the Old Temple is gone here, but the New Temple is not now the Church of Believers, but the *Κύριος* Himself, a parallel of which we found in the heading of ch. xv of Cyprian's Testimonies I:

Quod domus et templum dei Christus futurus esset.

I drew attention just now to the remarkable fact that in two of the three cases in which Paul refers to the Testimony:

You are the temple of the Lord,

he introduces it by the interrogatory formula: *οὐκ οἶδατε*. The formula occurs about a dozen times in the Pauline Epistles. Sometimes instead of it we find the question: *ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε* (Rom. vi. 3) or the positive: *οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν* (Rom. xi. 25, 1 Cor. x. 1) or *θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι*. At first we should be inclined to take it simply as a common apostolic manner of introducing a sentence. But when we look more closely into the cases in which Paul uses it, we find that it either refers to something which belongs to his own teaching, or to something which ought to be common property in the Christian Church. For instance 1 Thess. iii. 3, 4 refers to the fact which Paul has taught the Thessalonians (*προσελέγομεν ὑμῖν*) that tribulation is one of the things a Christian ought to expect quite naturally. In 1 Thess. iv. 2 he refers to the instruction for Christian life he had given in that Church. In other cases he refers to baptismal teaching, Rom. vi. 3. And so on. When going over the whole series of passages where the formula occurs, we shall find that it refers to the teaching in the Church almost without any exception. And the teaching referred to we find to be based largely upon the Testimonies.

For instance: 1 Cor. vi. 2 Paul asks:

ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν κόσμον κληρονομοῦσιν;

The reference in Nestle's margin is first to Dan. vii. 22, quite rightly:

τὸν κόσμον ἔδοξε τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῦ ἐπιθέσθαι.

The other references, Sap. Sal. iii. 8 and Apoc. iii. 21 are less to the point, but Apoc. xx. 4

καὶ πόρτα εἰσόδου αὐτοῖς

evidently refers to the same Testimony. However not only Dan. vii. 22 is involved but also Enoch, the book which has been read and quoted

much more by New Testament authors than is commonly supposed. Enoch i. 9 runs in Conybeare's translation¹):

and behold:

He comes with ten thousands of His holy ones,

To execute judgment upon all. . . .

And to destroy all the ungodly.

The passage is quoted also by Jude 14, 15 and *independently* from Jude, by Ps.-Cyprian, *ad Novat.*, ed. Hartel, III 67 and Ps.-Vigilius, ed. Migne, P.L., LXII 363²). Accordingly the passage belongs to the Testimony Book of early Christianity. But also in the next verse, 1 Cor. vi. 3 equally introduced by Paul with οὐκ οἴδατε Enoch is involved:

οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἀγγέλους κρίνομεν :

The reference is to Enoch xci. 15. Vs. 14 says that:

the right judgment shall be revealed to the whole world,

and in vs. 15 follows:

. . . . the great eternal judgment in which He will execute vengeance among the angels.

Evidently the Testimony Book combined these two passages, the one referring to the judgment of the world by the holy ones and that referring to the judgment on the angels, and it is to this combination of Testimonies belonging to the regular teaching in the Church that Paul refers.

Without reviewing in particular all the passages which Paul introduces by the formula οὐκ οἴδατε; or by similar phrases, we may, I think, safely conclude that in 1 Cor. vi. 16, 1 Cor. iii. 16 f. and 1 Cor. vi. 19 he is evidently quoting from an Aramaic Testimony Book and that this Testimony Book afforded the matter which was used for teaching in the Christian Church. The method was derived from the Jewish synagogue and the teaching was based upon the Jewish Targumic tradition. The same method of exegesis was used, though with opposite results, and these results of the Christian 'halacha' were the subject of the fierce controversy between Jews and Christians during the first score of years after Jesus himself started the new teaching. I use the expression Christian 'halacha' on purpose. The Jewish 'halacha' is really the most natural and close parallel to the Christian method of teaching and con-

¹) This passage is also involved, I think in Mt. xxv. 31 "angels" and "holy ones" being alternative in Enoch.

²) For a full discussion of the passage in Enoch, cp. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*, in *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Sem. Ser. pt. XI pp. 5 and 7.

troversy. In 1 Cor. iv. 17 Paul writes to the Corinthians that he is sending Timothy to Corinth:

ὃς ἡμᾶς ἀναμνήσει τὰς ὁδοὺς μου τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ (Ἰησοῦ) καθὼς πανταχοῦ
ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ διδάσκω.

It was, I think, Bousset, who first paralleled the expression *τοὺς ὁδοὺς μου* with the Jewish 'halachoth', and, no doubt, he was quite right.

The accompanying words: *ἀναμνήσει* and *διδάσκω* are a characteristic parallel for the Jewish customs of teaching and we are fully justified, I think, in following Bousset in his illuminating suggestion that the word *ὁδοί* used by Paul is merely the Greek rendering of 'halachoth', a word which has first the meaning of 'ways', and then of 'synagogal explanation of the Law', and 'legal custom'. In its *διδασχῇ* as well as in its liturgy the Christian Church followed the tradition of the Synagogue. In his teaching Paul is indebted primarily not to the Stoic Diatribe or to whatever Greek teaching we may adduce, but to the Synagogue and to the primitive Palestine Church. Probably the expression *ἡ ὁδός* used so often in Acts for the Christian teaching is merely the translation of the Jewish word halacha.

I may now come back to the question whether this early Palestinian Testimony Book was in script from the beginning. The parallel with the Jewish halacha shows that this is not so self-evident as we, in modern times, should be inclined to assume. It may be that the tradition was in the beginning merely oral. We might even be inclined to believe it to have been so for Paul also, when we examine the expressions used by him in 1 Cor. iv. 17, though it seems unlikely. The impression we certainly get from the way in which Paul quotes his Testimony collection is that he had it in script already. But whatever the answer to this question may be, there is no doubt that a solid basis of fixed tradition must be assumed and that a great personality of the primitive Church in Palestine is its 'author', even if we cannot attach to it a definite Christian name. The starting point, as we remarked, is in Jesus himself. But one great disciple with a highly spiritual mind and a deep insight into the fundamental truths of the Gospel, has developed Jesus' suggestions into a system of Scripture passages, which has deeply influenced the early Church from the very beginning.

It is needless to say how great the consequences are, if the preceding pages are right in their main thesis. The early Christian dogma, especially its conceptions regarding Christ, the New Temple, the New Circumcision and so on are not based upon Hellenistic speculations, but find their origin in the primitive Christian Church, where the Bible was read with

its Targumic rendering and interpretation. The Logos for instance of the early Christian Church is not to be derived primarily from Stoic teaching, but from the Targumic tradition, and so on. I wish to repeat: This does not exclude the obvious fact that on Hellenic soil the early Christian dogma had to become acclimatised; but the real explanation comes from Palestine and from the Jewish traditions. And we shall have to re-study the whole material from this point of view.

Another result of minor importance is, that the 'radical' theory which placed the Corpus Paulinum as a pseudepigraphon in the second century collapses beyond retrieve. We scarcely needed another proof of the impossibility of this theory, but it is lost beyond rescue in view of the fact that Paul uses Aramaic Palestinian material in his teaching. That in the second century a Christian anti-Judaic Testimony should be built upon the Targum is absolutely excluded.

THE APOSTLE AND FAITHFUL HIGH PRIEST, JESUS

THE APOSTLE AND FAITHFUL HIGH PRIEST, JESUS.

Among the most illuminative, and stimulating results of the studies of Dr. Rendel Harris in the field of Biblical research is the discovery that behind our New Testament lies a 'Book of Testimonies', i.e. a collection of Scripture passages, selected, arranged and in some cases explained by slight additions or alterations and little touches of an exegetical character. Its purpose was to vindicate for the New Israel the promises of the Old Testament, and to show that Israel *κατὰ σάφεια* by rejecting the Messiah prophesied in the Scriptures, and whose very name had been given in the pages of the Old Testament, had forfeited its rights and privileges as the chosen people. In its place the New spiritual Israel had inherited the promises as God says in Hosea (ii. 25)

I will call (those who were) not my people, my people (Rom. ix. 25).

The discovery is far reaching and its bearing upon the history of early Christianity is far from being exhaustively explored. Nor has — it would seem to me — the discovery been sufficiently recognized in its importance for the exegesis of the New Testament. The Testimony Book sprang from the fiercest struggle of the new faith for its existence; and though a part of the early Christian Church hoped, and for some time succeeded, in making Jewish Christianity live peacefully together with Judaism, it soon appeared that there could not be peace between Judaism and Christianity: the latter struck at the roots of what Judaism regarded not only as its national existence but as its calling for the world. And so James the Righteous followed Stephen the defender of Gentile Christianity in martyrdom. Of this conflict the Testimony Book is the oldest written document, reflecting controversies of the kind described for instance in Acts vii and Acts xxviii. 23 ff.

We find the Testimony Book quoted over and over again in the pages of the New Testament, and if duly studied, it spreads a flood of light on many passages otherwise only very imperfectly understood. The importance of the discovery is still greater when we realize, as I think we should, that the Testimony Book was extant and in use in the primitive Aramaic speaking Church of Palestine.

In the preceding study I have been able to show — I think conclusively — that it was read in its original Palestinian dress by Paul. This means that the collection in its definite character and 'tendenz' influenced

and moulded the early Christian conceptions from the very beginning, and if we really wish to understand early Christian speculation on Christ and his Church, and the early Christian ideas on the New Law, the New Temple, the New Circumcision and so on, we should begin with studying the passages adduced in the Testimony Book in the relation and order in which they were collected there and in the textual form in which the Testimony Book quotes them.

In course of time the original Testimony Book was translated into Greek and the marvellous ingenuity of the early Christians enriched it with other passages and proof-texts. Collected from the Bible used in Palestine i.e. from the Aramaic Targum, even though the Hebrew original remained in evidence, the text of the Testimonies in the Testimony Book differed often from the Massorah as well as from the Septuagint, a fact which affords an obvious explanation for the otherwise puzzling variants in the Old Testament passages quoted in the New. We need not wonder at finding that generally the Septuagint version is the nearest parallel to the textual form of the 'Testimonia' in the New Testament: the earlier versions always and everywhere influence the later. But we certainly cannot say simply that the Testimonies are Septuagint.

It is to a passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews which is hitherto, I think, insufficiently understood and which receives full light from the Book of Testimonies, that I should like to draw attention. The Epistle to the Hebrews is not only full of Testimonies taken, not directly from the Old-Testament, but from the Testimony Book of the primitive Church, but its whole thought and style has been built upon it.

I may perhaps be allowed to give an example of what seems to me a decisive proof of the use of the Testimony Book in Hebrews. The opening chapter, beginning with a statement, which could without any change have been taken from the introductory section of the Testimony Book, in vs. 2 with the words

οὗ οὐ καὶ ἐποιοῦν τοὺς αἰῶνας

refers to the disputes on Gen. i. 26

Let us make man,

and then goes on with a reference to Ps. ii. 7 as a proof that Christ is the Son. Another quotation to the same effect follows, taken from 2 Sam. vii. 14. We notice however that this quotation, as we see in Cyprian and Lactantius, properly belongs to the Temple Testimonies. Then Hebrews goes on:

ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκονομίην λέγει· καὶ προσκυνῶσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ.

The latter Testimony is a conflation of Deut. xxxii. 43 (LXX) and Ps. xcvi. 7, and even so is not entirely identified. The main difficulty of this 6th verse of the first chapter is the unexpected 'bringing of the First-born into the world' and the question why and in what sense this is here spoken of. The *παλιν* — as we now gradually have learned to see — suggests that the following words should refer to a Testimony which however is not really quoted but just alluded to. That we are on the right track appears from the corresponding section in the *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili*.

We find there (ed. Bratke, p. 7), first, the reference to Gen. i. 26, which the Judaic interlocutor explains as said of the angels. The Christian replies :

Thou errest, Jew, for to whom of the angels did He ever say: *filius meus*
es tu, ego hodie genui te.

So far the *Altercatio* completely corresponds with the textbook on which Hebrews evidently is working. Then, however, it omits the reference to 2 Sam. vii. 14 as it certainly should do, because that is a Temple Testimony, which Hebrews accordingly just quotes as a supplementary proof-text; but then it goes on :

rursus in psalmo dicit:
ponam principem illum excelsum prae omnibus regibus terrae; angelis autem
jubet ut christum adorent.
et iterum in Cantico Deuteronomii dicit:
laetamini gentes, cum eo,
et adorent eum omnes angeli dei.

We find here, first, the proof-text alluded to by Hebrews. For the quotation from the Psalm is referring to Ps. lxxxviii. 28 and should be read :

ponam primogenitum illum excelsum prae omnibus regibus terrae.

It is in the section of the Testimony Book dealing with 'the Creation' into which the Son 'is introduced' by the words: *hodie genui te* and then with the word from Ps. lxxxviii. 28 'the *πρωτότοκος* is placed above all the kings of the earth'. It is, I think, quite clear that it is this sequence and argument of the Testimony Book to which Hebrews i. 6 is referring, and that this verse and the whole opening section of Hebrews can only be understood if we see the Testimony Book as the text-book on which Hebrews is commenting.

We see also in the *Altercatio* that the text Dt. xxxii. 43 is only partly quoted by Hebrews and in the *Altercatio* is taken immediately from the Testimony Book itself, including rather awkwardly the 'et iterum' of the text-book.

We find accordingly in the first chapter of Hebrews and in the corresponding page of the *Altercatio* used what seems to be the opening chapter of the Testimony-Book: 'On the Son the first-born of all Creation' (Col. i. 15).

One of the most important sections of the Testimony Book, which has influenced early Christian thought fundamentally and in many directions, is that which deals with the New Temple to be erected according to the Prophets. In the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* (ed. Conybeare, p. 73f.) the Christian interlocutor says:

περὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἐξ ἔθνων, οὕτως γέγραπται ἐν τῷ βιβλῳ τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν·
μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν δαυὶδ τὴν πεπωκυῖαν
καὶ τὰ κατεσκαυμένα αὐτῆς οἰκοδομήσω (Am. ix. 11).
καὶ πάλιν·
μεγάλη ἔσται ἡ δόξα τοῦ οἴκου τοῦτον ἢ ἡ ἐσχάτη ἐπεὶ τὴν πρώτην (Hagg. ii. 9).

It should be noted that the identity of the Gentile Church with the New Temple (περὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἐξ ἔθνων) is taken for granted: it is the thesis from which the whole controversy on the side of the Christian Church starts:

quod domus et templum dei christus futurus esset et cessaret templum vetus
et novum inciperet,

as the heading of Cyprian's *Test.*, I. xv says.

The starting point is evidently to be found in the words of Jesus:

I will destroy this temple made with hands and in three days I will build
another not made with hands (Mc. xiv. 58).

The idea of the New Temple which would be built instead of the Old Temple evidently was constantly in the mind of Jesus when he spent the last days in Jerusalem. After the Cleansing of the Temple, when the leaders of the Jewish people ask him by what authority he acts in 'those things', he tells the parable of the vineyard given to others, and concludes with the question (Mt. xxi. 42)

Did you never read in the Scriptures:
'the Stone rejected by the builders has become the head of the corner?'

And we may, I think, be certain that the witnesses at the trial who said:

We heard him say: 'I will destroy this temple made with hands and build
another not made with hands in three days',

spoke the truth, even if the accusation was not one, on which the judges could condemn Jesus to death.

The example shows us how Jesus handled the Old Testament and that his disciples learned from him how to handle the Old Testament Testimonies for their new faith.

In studying the circle of ideas connected with the building of this New Temple and its evolution in early Christian dogma, we should bear in mind that from the beginning the two words *House* and *Temple* are synonyms, as they should be on Semitic soil. At the Cleansing of the Temple Jesus quotes Is. lxi. 7:

γέγονεν ὁ οἶκος μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται.

In the heading of Cyprian, *Test.*, I. xv quoted above, the words are combined: *domus et templum dei*, and we shall find the same combination in Aphrahat and elsewhere. Cyprian quotes as proof-text for the cessation of the Old Temple and the beginning of the New 2 Sam. vii. 5, 12—14a, 16a in a peculiar form of text, which with the same introduction: *in Basilion (libro) secundo* recurs in Lact., *Div. Inst.*, IV. xiii and in the *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili*, ii. 2. The text is in the mind already of the author of Acts vii. 46; parts of it recur in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and as a proof-text it is of such special importance for the argument of the present paper that I quote it in full from Cyprian:

In Basilion secundo:

Et fuit verbum Domini ad Nathan dicens: Vade et dic servo meo David: Haec dicit Dominus: 'Non¹⁾ tu aedificabis mihi domum ad inhabitandum: sed erit cum impleti fuerint dies tui et dormieris cum patribus tuis, suscitabo semen tuum post te, qui erit de utero tuo et parabo regnum eius. Hic aedificabit mihi domum in nomine meo²⁾ et erigam thronum eius in saecula et ego ero ei in patrem et ipse erit mihi in filium et fidem consequetur³⁾ domus eius et regnum eius usque in saecula in conspectu meo.'

Cyprian continues:

Item in evangelio Dominus dicit: Non relinquetur in templo lapis super lapidem, qui non dissolvatur et post triduum aliud excitabitur sine manibus.

The latter 'Testimony', taken from Mc. xiii. 2, is one of the most convincing examples of a Gospelttext influenced by the Testimony Book. We find it in the same form in the Gospel codex Bobbiensis (*k*). As one of my gifted pupils, Miss Bakker, is going to publish a special study of this text, I may for the present refer to her forthcoming publication (in the 'Festschrift' for Dr. J. Rendel Harris).

It is clear from the quotations from 2 Sam. vii that in the Testimony Book *House* and *Temple* are used synonymously, or even occur combined, as in the heading of Cyprian's chapter and for instance in Aphrahat, *de fide*, 3 (ed. Parisot, I, 9) and elsewhere: *domus et templum habitationis Christi*. It is evident also that the expression *templum habitationis*

¹⁾ This is the LXX reading, instead of the interrogatory *Num* of the Massorah.

²⁾ This seems the right reading though both here and in Cyp., *Test* II. xi and in Lact., *Div. Inst.*, IV. xiii the reading *nomini meo* (sometimes *nomine meo*) has strong support.

³⁾ LXX: πιστωθήσεται, rendering the Massoretic בִּיתִי בְנֵי.

Christi which not only here but passim occurs in Aphrahat ¹⁾, is based ultimately on 2 Sam. vii, though as we shall see, the Testimony Book combined this passage very ingeniously with other Testimonies. In this New Temple God *'will make his Šekina to dwell'* as was once the case in the times when the *σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου* was among the Fathers in the desert (Act. vii. 44) and as was also the wish of David when he desired to find *σκήνωμα τῷ οἴκῳ* ²⁾ Ἰακώβ (Ps. cxxxii. 5, Acts vii. 45). One day, in the New Jerusalem, this wish is going to be fulfilled, when a loud voice will be heard from the Throne:

Behold, the *σκηνή* of God is among men, and God Himself will make His habitation (*σκηνώσει*) amongst them. (Apoc. xxi. 3).

whilst in this New Jerusalem no Temple will be seen any more (Apoc. xxi. 22). These quotations show how the new idea spread and fructified.

The Epistle to the Hebrews works out one of the prominent aspects of the New Temple; in this Temple Jesus, the Son of God, is the Great High Priest (iv. 14) after the order of Melchisedek (v. 5). The combination of the Sonship and the High-priesthood, is intentional as we shall see presently, and the argument leads up to that from the beginning. The first Chapter deals with the Son greater than the Angels, and then the argument goes on until in ch. v. 5 the author says that this glorious position as High Priest has not been attained by usurpation (*οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γεννηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα*), but has been bestowed upon him by Him, who has said to Him:

Thou art my son, to day I have begotten thee (Ps. ii. 7).

and then in another place:

Thou art priest in eternity after the order of Melchisedek (Ps. cx. 4).

both passages wellknown proof-texts from the Testimony Book. The second has been taken from Ps. cx, the Psalm quoted by Jesus in his controversy with the Pharisees (Mt. xxii. 44), and the third verse of which in the peculiar form

ante luciferum genui te

¹⁾ For instance in his tract *'on the Grape'*, II. 121¹³:

Thou hast made us temples of habitation for Thy Glory.

²⁾ The reading is doubtful. It probably is a very early error, as Hort conjectured, for *κ22*, *σκήνωμα*. This seems quite probable if we take it, as it really is, as a quotation from the Testimony Book, corroborating the other Testimony from 2 Sam. vii, where the reply to the wish of David from Ps. cxxxii. 5 is given in the words:

Haec dicit Dominus: non tu aedificabis mihi domum ad inhabitandum.

Christ is the *σκήνωμα* meant by the Testimony Book, and he is *σκήνωμα Ἰακώβ* as well as *σκήνωμα David* (Matth. xxii. 43 f.).

is quoted, both in East and West in the early Christian Church, as a proof-text for the praeexistence of the Son¹).

The *auctor ad Hebraeos* in ch. iii and following chapters is evidently concerned mainly with the Priesthood of Christ, but we should, if we are to understand his argument rightly, bear in mind that this Priesthood depends on the Sonship, as is clearly indicated by the quotation of Ps. ii. 7 before Ps. cx. 4. We find the argument more elaborated in the *Dialogue between Athanasius and Zacchaeus*.² The Christian quotes Ps. cx. 1—4 to prove that Christ is called by 'the Prophet' *κρίτος* and *ιερεὺς*. The Jew suggests that the words

ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν μελχισέδεκ

apply to Solomon, but on the reply that this is impossible because Solomon has died, and therefore cannot have been called an eternal priest, he agrees that the Christ is meant in the Testimony quoted. But how can it be said, he asks, that

'he will be sitting at the right hand of the Lord?'

The Christian interlocutor says:

"It is in his capacity as *υἱὸς μονογένης τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ πατρὸς*." Evidently the connection of the Sonship with the Priesthood has been made already by the Testimony Book, a result which we shall presently find confirmed in Hebrews itself. We ask: how was the connection made of Jesus, the Son, with the High Priest?

Dr. Rendel Harris has suggested, that not only Melchisedek is a type of Christ as High Priest in Hebrews, but that also Joshua the Son of Josedeck, mentioned in Haggai and Zachariah, is in the mind of the author when he describes Jesus as the *great High Priest*.³ The suggestion is brilliantly confirmed, not only by the fact that the identification of Jesus the Christ with Joshua ben Josedeck is actually found in the anti-Judaic writers and their Testimonies, quoted by Dr. Harris, but by the Epistle of the Hebrews itself, as we shall see presently.

For the moment we note only that the title *ἀρχιερεὺς μέγας* used in Hebrews, is an evident conflation of two renderings for the Hebrew *כהן גדול*: *μέγας ἱερεὺς* found in Justin, *Dial.* 115 and elsewhere, and *ἀρχιερεὺς* which is the ordinary rendering. The conflation *ἀρχιερεὺς μέγας* is found also outside the Testimony literature, for instance 1 Macc. xiii. 42 and Philo, *de somn.* i. 219.

¹) cp. Rendel Harris, *Testimonies*, I. 14 ff., where we may add: Lact., *Div. Inst.*, IV. xiv and Aphrahat, ed. Parisot, I. 803.

²) ed. Conybeare, p. 45 f.

³) Rendel Harris, *Testimonies*, II. 54 f.

The identification of Joshua ben Nun in Hebrews iv. 8 with Jesus the Christ is, I think *in concessis*. I only would endorse the argument of Dr. Rendel Harris in his *Testimonies*, i. p. 53, that it is not on the proper name that the emphasis should be laid in the explanation of the passage, but on the unbelieving Jews. The context, as Dr. Rendel Harris is quite right in arguing, certainly demands this. The Ἰησοῦς son of Nun in the testimony, is really for the author to the Hebrews and for the Testimony Book he is using, Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστός. They are simply identified, for God testifies through the Scriptures, in this place also, to Jesus, the Son. And it is only due, I think, to our distinction of the Old Testament form *Joshuah* and the New Testament form *Jesus*, that we are in danger of overlooking the real identity of the two names and persons for the early Christians. We are still inclined too much to apply our standards of historical sense to the entirely different method in which early Christianity read the Old Testament. To early Christianity the Old Testament was *direct* divine witness to Christ and His Kingdom. As an illustration I would quote Lactantius, *Div. Inst.*, IV. xvii. 9.

Item Jesus Nave successor eius:

Et dixit dominus ad Jesum: Fac tibi cultellos petrinus nimis acutos et sede et circumcide secundo filios Israel. Secundum circumcisionem futuram esse dixit, non carnis, sicut fuit prima, qua etiam nunc Iudaei utuntur, sed cordis et spiritus, quam tradidit Christus qui verus Jesus fuit. Non enim propheta sic ait: Et dixit Dominus ad me, sed: ad Jesum, ut ostenderet quod non de eo loqueretur sed de Christo, ad quem tunc loquebatur. Christi enim figuram gerebat ille Jesus ¹⁾.

Evidently we do not do full justice to the New Testament writers, when we say that in the Old Testament they found *parallels* to what had been fulfilled in the New Dispensation: the Old Testament Testimonies rather were a prophetic *description* of what happened in the fullness of the time. The Scriptures are prophetic in the sense that they afford testimonies of the Spirit in advance (προμειμαρτυρούμενον, 1 Pet. i. 11) regarding Christ.

Joshuah the son of Nun in Hebrews ch. iv. 8 and Joshuah the son of Josedech in ch. iv. 14 are types of Christ. This at once provides us with the key to another passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which remains obscure until we have seen that. In ch. iii. 1 the author exhorts us as μέτοχοι, those who have part with Christ in the heavenly calling,

¹⁾ The argument shows that the Testimony is not taken from the Old Testament directly. The quoted 'prophet' is *Jesus Nave*, and he is speaking not of what has been said to him, but to Jesus. The argument gets rather confused for us, but for a reader of the Testimony Book it was quite clear.

to look upon the *Apostle* and *High Priest* of our confession, Jesus. The reference is to the Testimony from Ps. xlv. 7, quoted in ch. i. 8f:

Therefore, O God, Thy God has anointed Thee with oil of gladness above
Thy μέτοχοι.

Christ and Christians¹⁾, both 'partake of this heavenly calling'. The word is familiar to him, he repeats it in ch. iii. 14: μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ χριστοῦ γεγονάμεν. He uses it alternatively with ἀδελφοί, (equally taken from, or rather based upon a testimony, this time Ps. xvii. 12) in ch. ii. 11f, 17. The exhortation to look upon the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Jesus, is preceded in ch. ii. 17 by the argument that for this reason

he had to become like unto his ἀδελφοί, in every respect in order that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest, ἐλεήμων καὶ πιστὸς ἱερχιεὺς.

The argument which follows in ch. iii. 1ff is obscured as long as we read in vs. 1 and 2:

Let us look upon Jesus, who is faithful to Him who made him, as was Moses also in all his house.

We do see why Moses is called *faithful in all his house*. It is based upon the Testimony Num. xii. 7 (LXX):

οὐχ οὕτως ὁ θεράπων μου Μωσῆς·
ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστὸς ἔσται.

The argument is that Moses was indeed *faithful*, πιστός, but merely as θεράπων, a servant, i.e. as belonging to the 'house', being a part of the house. But we fail to see why Jesus is called πιστός here, why in this connection he is called High Priest. And still less why he is evidently described here as the Builder of the House, ὁ κατασκευάσας τὸν οἶκον. And yet, this is the point of the argument, without which the whole passage becomes confused.

We may remark, first, that the designation of Moses as πιστὸς θεράπων belongs to the terminology of the Testimony Book. Three times over Justin without any further explanation or any special reference to

¹⁾ I wonder whether this is the reason for the curious reading Cypr., I. xvii:

transibit in conspectu Christorum meorum omnibus diebus.

Num. xii. 7 refers to Moses as 'the faithful servant'¹⁾: the title is *reçu*²⁾. We do not however see which house is meant in the context. Certainly not the Tabernacle, which has not been built by Jesus. We might think, says Windisch in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, i.l., of the Church founded by Jesus or of the World created by the Son. We might do so certainly, and if we had to choose, the former suggestion would seem preferable. But why should this be so? And what is the reason why the auctor ad Hebraeos is speaking in this way and is making the comparison with Moses?

In trying to find the explanation we may begin with vs. 6:

χριστός... οὗ οἶκος ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς

It takes us at once into the sphere of the Temple Testimonies, for it is evidently based upon the same Testimony from Jer. vii. 4 to which Paul, without explicitly quoting it, refers in 1 Cor. vi. 16, 2 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19. And it is evidently this *House and Temple of habitation* to which the statement refers, that in that House Jesus is the faithful High Priest, of which House he is at the same time said to be the Builder.

The explanation is in Zach. vi. 11ff. It is the passage in which the Word of the Lord says to the prophet (I quote the LXX):

¹¹ καὶ λήψῃ ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον καὶ ποιήσεις στεφάνους καὶ ἐπιθήσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ἰωσεδὲκ τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ μεγάλου, ¹² καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτὸν· Τάδε λέγει Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ· Ἴδοὺ ἀνὴρ Ἀνατολῆς ὄνομα αὐτῷ καὶ ἐποκάτωθεν αὐτὸν ἀνατελεῖ καὶ οἰκοδομήσει τὸν οἶκον Κυρίου ¹³ καὶ αὐτὸς λήμψεται ἀρετὴν καὶ καθιεῖται καὶ κατάρξει ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ βουλή ἐλεητική ἔσται ἀνὰ μέσον ἀμφοτέρων.

Here is, at any rate the first part of the explanation of the argument in Hebrews. I have not as yet found this passage quoted in the Testimony literature. That the passage was understood as referring to the Messiah would be certain, even if we had not the proof of that in the Targum as we shall see presently. Several other passages from Zachariah are frequently quoted, especially Zach. iii. 1ff. For instance in Cyp., *Test.* II. xiv as a proof of the humility of Christ at his first coming (*quod humilis in primo adventu suo veniret*). Also in Lact., *Div. Inst.*, IV. xiv who quotes the whole passage up to Zach. iii. 8:

audi itaque, Jesu, sacerdos magne.

¹⁾ *Dial.*, 46; 56; 130.

²⁾ cp. also Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, IV. xxx. 4: *propter hoc et in fine educens eam* (i.e. ecclesiam) *hinc* (i.e. ex Aegypto) *in suam haereditatem quam non Moyses quidem famulus Dei sed Jesus filius Dei in haereditatem dabit.*

And Lactantius argues how blind of mind (*capti mentibus*) the Jews must have been, when they, having read and having heard this, laid their hands on their God. And he goes on saying that

those err or are deceived who believe that this has been said of Jesus son of Nave or of the priest Jesus son of Josedech. Nothing of what the prophet says applies to them. They never wore unclean clothes nor suffered any adversity. Locutus est igitur de Jesu filio dei ut ostenderet eum primo in humilitate et carne venturum, haec enim est vestis sordida, ut pararet templum deo.

The latter argument shows, that we were right in assuming that also Zach. vi. 11ff belongs to the Testimonies: it is Jesus who will build the Temple.

Even though we do not know the exact form in which the passage was reproduced in the Book of Testimonies, it is clear that it is full of testimonial matter: The parts printed in spaced type speak clearly enough. They afford a parallel to the ἐστέφανωσας of Ps. viii. 6 quoted in Hebrews ii. 7, to the κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου of Ps. cx. 1 quoted in Hebrews i. 13, the βουλή ειρημική reminds of the βασιλεὺς ειρήνης of Hebrews ch. vii. 2. We find here moreover the title and the name of Jesus the Great Priest and the messianic title ἀνατολή occurring in Lk. i. 78.

Nor was the messianic interpretation of the passage of Christian origin. The Targum renders Zach. vi. 12 in this way:

And you shall say to him: Thus says Jahveh Zebaoth: This man, Mešihā is his name.

הא גברא משיחא שמיא

and it goes on

and he will build the Temple of Jahveh and he will bear glory and he will sit and reign on his throne and he will be serving Priest on his throne and there will be a counsel of Peace (מלכא דשלמא) between those two.

The 'counsel of peace' which without a change of one letter could be read as: *King of Peace* is another proof that the passage of Zach. vi. 11ff is in the mind of the auctor ad Hebraeos who explains the mystery of Melchisedek as the *King of Peace* to his readers in ch. vii. 2.

We may ask before going further, why this proof-text disappeared from the collection.

It may be lurking somewhere, but we do not find it where we certainly should expect it in Cyprian or Lactantius. I may just venture a suggestion. Ἰησοῦς, who is denoted in the passage under consideration as the *Messiah* and the *High Priest* and the *Builder of the Temple*, wearing the *Crown of Glory*, is explicitly denoted as a *man*, in the Massorah,

the Targum and the LXX. It is a title which is given to Jesus in the tradition of the Testimonies: Cyprian quoting in his Test., II. xix the Testimony of John the Baptist (John i. 26f.) quotes it thus:

Post me veniens homo ante me factus est.

The addition *homo* is unique; but *vir* is read instead by ff₂ / Ambrose¹⁾. And we find, I think, a reflex in the speech of Peter on Pentecost so full of Testimonies, when in Acts ii. 22 he speaks of

Jesus the Nazoraeen, a man accredited by God.

At all events, there is no doubt that the Testimony from Zach. vi. 11ff is the proof-text on which the author to the Hebrews is working in ch. iii. 1ff. And in ch. iii. 6 when he says

οὐ οὐκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς

he has in mind, like Paul in 2 Cor. vi. 16, 2 Cor. iii. 16; vi 19, the Testimony from Jeremiah vii. 4. The connection of the Temple built by the High Priest Jesus, with the House built for a habitation of God is made in the Testimony Book by the proof-text 2 Sam. vii quoted above p. 35. This explains why it is the *Son* who is High Priest and Builder at the same time, for it is said there:

ille aedificabit mihi domum in nomine meo et erigam thronum eius in saecula et ego ero ei in patrem et ipse erit mihi in filium.

It shows how thoughtfully the original compiler of the Testimony had arranged the matter and how spiritually he explained the Scriptures, whatever objections we may have against his exegetical method.

It was also under his name Ἰησοῦς that the Testimony Book found Jesus prophesied in the Scriptures. Lactantius, for instance, quoting (*Div. Inst.*, IV. xix) Zach. iii. 1ff says:

Quis autem futurus esset cui Deus aeternum sacerdotium pollicebatur, Zacharias etiam nomine posito apertissime docuit. Sic enim dixit:
'et ostendit mihi dominus Jesum sacerdotem magnum.'

The remark *etiam nomine posito* shows at once that in Hebrews iii. 1 also we should identify τὸν . . . ἀρχιερέα . . . Ἰησοῦν with Jehoshua the Great Priest of Zach. vi. 12 and Zach. iii. 1. And we should observe, I think, that the description ἐλεήμων in Hebr. ii. 17 followed by the words

ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέποιθεν αὐτὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ
δύναται τοῖς πειρασμένοις βοηθεῖν

has been suggested by the description of Jesus as *indutus vestimenta sordida* and as *titio ejectus ab igni*. For Lactantius says that these sordid clothes mean his first coming in humility and in the flesh, and 'the brand

¹⁾ The Testimony as quoted by Cyprian is a conflation of Joh. i. 15 and Joh. i. 26f. The addition *de quo dixi* in vs. 27 from vs. 15 is in e Cypr., *de quo dicebam quoniam* in ff₂¹ and in 1027. In Joh. i. 15 e has even more clearly: *qui post me venit vir qui ante me factus est*.

plucked out of the fire' means *ut . . . ab hominibus cruciamenta perferret*.

The passage Zach. iii. 1ff is discussed also in the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila ¹⁾. The Christian says:

With regard to the name Jesus hear what Zachariah says:
and he quotes, freely, Zach. iii. 1—5. The Jewish interlocutor replies:

He said that with regard to Jesus ben Josedech.

Then the Christian goes on with an argument on Christ with which the Jew is not satisfied and the latter says:

You promised to show that what is written in Zachariah on the son of Josedech, does not apply to him. Fulfil that promise, please.

The Christian replies, much in the same way as Lactantius does, that Jehoshuah the son of Josedech never wore sordid clothes, nor any other priest until the day when God took away the priesthood from Israel; and after quoting the anti-Judaic Testimonies on the sacrifices, he then comes to speak of the New Temple:

With regard to us, from the Gentiles, it is written in the Book of the Twelve Prophets:

μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω
τὴν σκηνὴν δαυὶδ τὴν πεποικιλίαν
καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς οἰκοδομήσω (Am. ix. 11)
καὶ πάλιν·

μεγάλη ἔσται ἡ δόξα τοῦ οἴκου τούτου
ἢ ἐσχάτη ἔπερ τὴν πρώτην (Hagg. ii. 9).

He proceeds:

ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἀπόσται ²⁾ μεθ' ὁρρωμοσύας
μηκέτι ἱερατεύειν τὸ γένος ἁαρών,
ἀλλὰ τὸν νῖδν αὐτοῦ, τὸν μονογενῆ
τὸν κῆριον Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἱερατεύειν
κατὰ τὴν τάξιν μελχισέδεκ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,

quoting as Hebrews does in ch. vii. 21 the Testimony from Ps. cx. 4 and emphasizing the ὥμοσεν in the same way.

So far, I think, the result is quite lucid and clear: Hebrews is using the section of the Testimony Book 'on the Son being the Builder and High Priest of the New Temple', as is prophesied in Zach. vi. 12f *nomine posito*. The argument is clear also in this respect, that the contrast is between Jesus the High Priest, Builder of the House, and Moses the Servant in and part of the House, which is one side of the argument in ch. iii. 1ff. There is however not only a contrast between Moses and

¹⁾ Conybeare, p. 73 f.

²⁾ The word used by Paul Rom. xi. 1 quoting the Testimony Book for the supposed rejection of Israel.

Jesus according to Hebrews; there is also clearly an agreement: Moses is called in the Scriptures πιστός, as Θεράπων, Jesus is called πιστός, as ἄρχιερεύς, ch. ii. 17. If the argument is to be complete, this qualification also should be taken from the Testimonies.

We find that it is and that it belongs to the section of Temple-Testimonies with which we are dealing:

Cyprian has in his *Testimonia* I. xv the heading:

Quod domus et templum dei Christus futurus esset et cessaret templum vetus et novum inciperet.

Followed in I. xvi by

Quod sacrificium vetus evacueretur et novum celebraretur.

In the next chapter he deals with the New High Priest:

Quod sacerdotium vetus cessaret et novus sacerdos veniret qui in aeternum futurus esset;

i.e. the same circle of ideas as we found in the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*.

The first Testimony for the new Priesthood is Ps. cx. 3b, 4:

in psalmo cix:

Ante luciferum genui te;

juravit Dominus et non poenitebit eum:

tu es sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedek.

i.e. the proof-text, quoted in Hebrews ch. v. 6 for the eternal priesthood of Christ. Then Cyprian goes on:

item in Basilion primo Deus ad Heli Sacerdotem:

Et suscitabo mihi sacerdotem fidelem, qui omnia quae sunt in corde meo faciet et aedificabo ei domum fidelem et transibit in conspectu christorum meorum omnibus diebus; et erit qui remanserit in domo tua veniet adorare in obolo pecuniae et in pane uno;

The same proof-text, also after the quotation of Ps. cx. 3b, 4 in Lact., *Div. Inst.*, IV. xiv. The quotation is from 1 Sam. ii. 35f. with some remarkable variants. For the present it may suffice to state that there evidently is the origin of the title πιστός ἄρχιερεύς given to Christ in Hebrews. The emphasis evidently is on πιστός in the Christian sense. I do not deny, of course, that πιστός retains in Hebrews also its sense of 'faithful' and 'trustworthy', but it is quite in agreement with the way in which the Testimony Book reads the Old Testament to find in the word *fidelis* of 1 Sam. ii. 35 a reference to the *Christian* High Priest. Πιστός is also used as denoting the Christian believers, for instance Acts x. 45. Therefore the Testimony is all the more applicable to the New Covenant, because not only the *Sacerdos* is *fidelis*, but the promise is also: *aedificabo ei domum fidelem*.

That this really is the direction in which the Testimony Book went in its explanation of the Old Testament is shown by Lactantius. He quotes ¹⁾ 2 Sam. vii. 4, 5, 12—14, 16 ending:

et ego ero ei in patre et ipse erit mihi in filio et fidem consequetur domus eius et regnum eius usque in saeculum.

and then says:

domus, quam (Solomon) aedificavit, non est fidem consecuta sicut ecclesia quae est verum templum dei, quod non in parietibus sed in corde ac fide hominum qui credunt in eum et vocantur fideles.

Finally in ch. 14 of his fourth Book of Divine Institutions he concludes his long exposition of the New Temple and its High Priest with the following very remarkable statement which summarizes the argument of his Testimony Collection:

ille vero exhibuit deo fidem: docuit enim quod unus deus sit eumque coli oportere, nec unquam se ipse deum dixit, quia non servasset fidem si missus ut deos tolleret et unum assereret, introduceret alium praeter unum. Hoc erat non de uno deo facere praeconium nec eius qui miserat, sed suum proprium negotium gerere ac se ab eo quem inlustratum venerat, separare, propterea quia tam fidelis extitit, quia sibi nihil prorsus adsumpsit ut mandata mittentis impleret et sacerdotis perpetui dignitatem et regis summi honorem et iudicis potestatem et dei nomen accipit.

We recognize in this summary not only headings which recur in the Cyprian Testimonies, but several of the subjects of dispute in the Dialogues, for instance the opening objection in the Dialogue between Athanasius and Zacchaeus:

You, Christians, err first because you think that there are other gods besides the One and Only God, the Scripture saying everywhere that there is only One God

(referring to Dt. vi. 4) ²⁾.

We cannot now go into a discussion of the various subjects which are involved in the passage quoted from Lactantius. One, however, is of special importance for the study of the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews in which we are engaged. Three times over Lactantius refers to the *mission* of Christ. Especially noteworthy is the expression: *non servasset fidem, si, missus ut etc.* This at once reminds us that the title of Christ in Hebrews is not only *πιστός ἀρχιερέυς* but also *ἀπόστολος*. The title occurs not only in Hebrews iii. 1 but also in Justin, 1 Apol. xii and lxiii. In the first passage Justin speaks of

θεοῦ εἰδὸς καὶ ἀπόστολος ὢν Ἰησοῦ Χριστός,

¹⁾ Div. Inst. IV. xlii.

²⁾ cp. also *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili*, ii. 1.

in the latter he says:

ὁ λόγος δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ὁ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ὡς προφητεία, καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος.

Evidently ἀπόστολος belongs to the standing titles of Jesus in the earliest Christian tradition, which however very soon got out of use because the title ἀπόστολος was reserved to the preachers of the Gospel, and later to the twelve ἀπόστολοι κατ' ἐξοχήν among them.

The idea of Jesus 'being sent' is of course, one of the most prominent and familiar in the Gospels. It is the text of his first 'sermon', Is. lxi. 1, Lk. iv. 18; he speaks of himself as in the line of the prophets who were sent; in the fourth Gospel it is the chief authority for all his works and words, that cannot be stressed or repeated too often, till it culminates in the passage where he passes on that authority: 'as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you'. But at the same time the actual substantive word ἀπόστολος, is never used.

The following data afford, I think, a solution. In the *Dialogue with Tryphon*, ch. lxxv, Justin, evidently working on the Testimony Book, argues in the following way:

'In the book of Exodus has been equally declared mysteriously (ἐν μυστηρίῳ) through Moses what, he says, has not been revealed to Abraham nor to Jacob: that the name of God himself was also Ἰησοῦς, and we have understood that also. For thus has been said:

And the Lord said to Moses: Speak to this people:

Behold, I send my angel (ἄγγελόν μου) before thy face that he may keep thee on the way, that he may bring thee into the land which I have prepared for thee. Give heed to him and listen to him, be not disobedient to him. For certainly he will not forsake thee: for my name is upon him'.

The name of Christ is according to Justin not only God, Θεός, but also Ἰησοῦς. For it is of Ἰησοῦς that he finds spoken here.

'Who is it', he goes on, 'who brought your fathers into the land? Then understand at last that by that name Ἰησοῦς was called the same who formerly was called Ἀβρᾶμ. If you understand that, you will know also that the name of him who spoke to Moses (for: 'my name is upon him') was Ἰησοῦς.

So this is the first identification: Christ was called God, and God's name was Ἰησοῦς.

Then Justin goes on:

'That however the prophets sent to announce the things from His part τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ, are called also ἄγγελοι καὶ ἀπόστολοι is shown in Isaiah. For Isaiah says: ἀποστείλον με, send me.

The argument is not very clear. Reference should be made to the preceding Testimony: *Behold I send my angel before thy face*. But Justin speaks of ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπόστολος as the two titles given to Christ as well as to the Prophets, but the proof-text he quotes gives only the

title ἄγγελος which as a matter of fact is one of the titles given to Christ in the Testimony Book.

For instance in Cyprian, Test., II. v:

Quod idem angelus et deus Christus.

We notice that, here also, in the Cyprianic Testimony Book as in Justin the titles *God* and *Angel* are combined. The proof-texts quoted by Cyprian are Gen. xxxi. 13, Ex. xiii. 21 (*deus praeibat*), Ex. xiv. 19, Ex. xxiii. 20f; the last being the testimony also quoted by Justin. In none of these passages is there any other word used by either the Massorah, or the Targum or the LXX except מַלְאָךְ ἄγγελος. But if we look up the Samaritan Targum, we shall find that in Ex. xxiii. 20, 23 it has instead of מַלְאָךְ, which is used in all the other places quoted by Cyprian, the reading חַשְׁמַי *my Apostle!*¹⁾

So the Testimony from Ex. xxiii. 20 as it was in the Testimony Book used by Justin, combined the original מַלְאָךְ with the Targumic rendering חַשְׁמַי of Samaritan version. And it would seem that Hebrews, or the Testimony Book used by Hebrews, had avoided the title ἄγγελος on purpose, using the alternative rendering ἀπόστολος in its stead. Nor need we wonder that the early Testimony Book did so: the opening section evidently rejected the suggestion of the Jews that in Gen. i. 26 God might have been speaking to the Angels, and explicitly emphasized the different name given to the Son compared with the Angels.

Later on, as the passage in Justin shows, the original form was restored in the text but the rendering ἀπόστολος survived in his comment, combined with the rendering ἄγγελος of the text. It may be observed that the rendering ἀπόστολος in the Samaritan Targum, is another proof of the Palestinian origin and very early existence of the primitive Testimony Book.

Before concluding this study of that beautiful passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews the meaning of which has, I hope, now become lucid and clear, I would quote from Lactantius, *Div. Inst.*, IV. xiv a passage which seems an excellent summary of the argument of the section, *On the New Temple* in the Testimony Book, and add one or two general remarks:

Quibus ex rebus apparet prophetas omnes denuntiasse de Christo, fore aliquando ut ex genere David corporaliter natus constitueret aeternum templum deo, quod appellatur ecclesia, et universas gentes ad religionem veram dei convocaret. haec est domus fidelis, hoc immortale templum, in quo si quis non sacrificaverit, immortalitatis praemium non habebit. cuius templi et magni et aeterni quoniam Christus fabricator fuit, idem necesse est habeat in eo sacerdotium sempiternum, nec potest, nisi per eum qui constituit, ad templum et ad conspectum dei perveniri.

¹⁾ The same rendering of מַלְאָךְ by חַשְׁמַי in the Samaritan Targum Ex. xxxii. 34 *Behold, my Apostle shall go before thee*; Ex. xxxiii. 2 *and I will send an Apostle*. In all the other passages the rendering is מַלְאָךְ

The early Testimony Book was a description of the personality of Jesus in the words of the prophecies. If we have looked carefully to the choice and the wording of the quoted proof-texts, we cannot but admire the spiritual grandeur and the complete devotion to the "Pioneer of our Faith" displayed in the collection. The exegetical method is not ours; but it would be childish to criticize for that reason the great composer of the Testimony Book. He found Jesus the Messiah in the prophecies, and the Christ he found there is of more imposing greatness *and reality* than the numerous 'Jesusbilder' reconstructed by representatives of what we call the historical-critical method of the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century.

Nor should we fall into the trap which caught a special school of theologians of the beginning of this century. The Testimony Book is the description of Jesus the Messiah interpreted by the prophets of the Old Testament. The school I have in view, would draw the conclusion that the 'Jesusbild' of this Testimony Book was merely an ideal person made up from these proof-texts without any reality in history. In the paper which Dr. Rendel Harris has contributed to the subject ¹⁾, he shows undubitably, I think, that the real result is exactly the reverse. The Testimony Book is the homage paid by early Christianity to the historical Founder of our Faith. And it merely shows how great this personality really was, that nothing could be too great in heaven or on earth to be laid at the feet of Him in whom those early disciples had met with God's real presence and all-embracing love. The Hellenic Church did so when submitting all Wisdom of the Greeks and Power of the Romans to Him whom Paul calls 'the Power of God and the Wisdom of God.' The early Palestinian Christians did so when applying the highest which the Old Testament prophecy contained to 'Jesus the Messiah, the Son, the Apostle, and the faithful, merciful, eternal High Priest of our confession'.

¹⁾ Evergreen Essays, number two: *Josephus and his Testimony*, by Rendel Harris, Cambridge, 1931.