

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

and on much else, parents and teachers alike will find here a great deal of wise advice.

The relation of religion to sex is certainly a 'live' subject to-day, and Freud and his followers have accustomed us to some wild exaggerations on the subject. It would be difficult, however, to go farther in that direction than the latest of these Freudian disciples. *Sex and Religion*, by Mr. Clifford Howard (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), is an example of the undisciplined imagination which in the 'newest psychology' takes the place of sober judgment. The writer sees nothing but sex everywhere. The corner-stone of primitive

Christianity was the repression of sex. St. Paul was obsessed by it. He was a neurotic. 'In his emotional reaction from what had undoubtedly been a life of self-indulgence, he attacked most earnestly that which had hitherto been his besetting vice—incontinence.' This, of course, was his thorn in the flesh. 'Eternal life through sexual denial, was his startling and arresting slogan.' 'Religious enthusiasm in itself is always symptomatic of sexual unbalance,' and so on. Religion is, it will be obvious, like the appendix, a survival which science is enabling us to do without. There is an element of unconscious humour about all this. But it is all useless and occasionally offensive.

Did Jesus use Testimonies?

BY RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., D.D., MANCHESTER.

THE question we ask and here propose to answer does not mean, 'Did Jesus make quotations from the Old Testament?' If we read it in that way, it is not a matter of question at all. How could He avoid making references to the Old Testament, and what other source of authoritative quotation or of literary illustration on His part can we point to?

We are, however, familiar with the idea that the early Christian Church was in the habit of using the Old Testament polemically against the Jews from whom they were divergent, at various points, in belief or in practice, and that the passages which they thus employed were naturally subject to classification, more or less orderly and exact, under the various heads of belief or rules of practice: so that a *Book of Testimonies* formed a part of the early Christian literature and means of propaganda.

It is easy to see, when once the right line of sight is found, that the Epistle to the Hebrews, for example, is composed on lines that are capable of immediate illustration from Cyprian's first two books of *Testimonies against the Jews*; equally clear is the fact that the Epistle to the Romans, especially the chapters from the ninth onward, is based upon a previously existing and orderly collection of Old Testament passages.

But, if we are persuaded of this, another question arises. It is clear that we cannot employ the

hypothetical Testimony Book to explain the structure and thought of Hebrews or Romans, without raising the question, whether to any degree the same hypothesis may not be a *vera causa* for the quotations of our Lord Himself. That is what we mean by asking whether Jesus used *Testimonies*.

In order to answer the question, we should probably begin by the observation that a general affirmative answer is suggested by the Gospel of Luke, in the summaries which are there made of the post-resurrection conferences between our Lord and His disciples. For example, in the exquisite story of the Walk to Emmaus, we are told that the two downcast travellers were reproached by their unrecognized companion for having failed to believe the prophetic testimonies concerning the Suffering and the Glory of Messiah. A detailed statement is then given of what is contained in Moses' Law, in the Prophets, and, generally speaking, in all the Scriptures concerning the Messiah. Such quotations, in which Christ is represented as seeing Himself in the Old Testament, constitute a body of what Papias called *Dominical Oracles*, and we can hardly escape the general conclusion that St. Luke knew of such a collection, and that he referred it to our Lord, as the first to concatenate the *Oracles of the Old Testament*. The same Lucan judgment is involved in the account

which follows of our Lord's discourse with the Eleven, where we are told that everything had to be fulfilled which was written in the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms concerning Himself, in particular the prediction of the Passion (*ὅτι παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός*), and of the Resurrection. The parallel with St. Paul's statement in Ac 26^{22, 23} and in Ac 28^{23, 24} will be sufficiently obvious to the student who will reconstruct for himself some of the *Heads of Testimonies*, and notice their constant Christological reference (Lk 24²⁷ τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, Lk 24⁴⁴ τὰ γεγραμμένα περὶ ἐμοῦ, Ac 28²⁸ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ), and the part which the Testimonies play in making the Apostles into Testifiers (Lk 24⁴⁸ ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες, Ac 26²² μαρτυρόμενος πᾶσιν, Ac 28²³ διαμαρτυρόμενος . . . περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ). But what we have chiefly to emphasize for the purpose of our inquiry is that our Lord in His farewell discourse to His disciples speaks of the Old Testament references to Himself as matters which had been a subject of discourse with them *before* His resurrection. 'These are my words,' said He, 'which I spake to you when I was still among you.' It does not seem consistent to admit the existence of *Testimonies*, and then regard them as being entirely a post-resurrection collection. In some form or another there must have been, from Luke's point of view, a pre-resurrection nucleus of *Testimonies*. This general statement can be verified at once on particular points, by examining an Old Testament quotation, first for its currency in the early Christian propaganda, and second, for its occurrence in our Lord's own teaching. We need not repeat in detail all the proof available that in the early Church Christ was constantly spoken of as the *Stone*; this name for Him appears in every early collection of *Testimonies against the Jews*, and in all the *Dialogues* based on such *Testimonies*: it occurs everywhere in the New Testament, whether we look for Apostolical statements in the Acts or find them in the Epistles; in fact, there is no earlier or better attested *Dominical Oracle*. The oracle is based on a passage in the 118th Psalm, which is quoted, in an anti-judaic manner, by our Lord Himself, and it is significant that it is a part of the Marcan tradition (Mk 12¹⁰⁻¹²). Here, then, we have the strongest confirmation that a particular instance can furnish of the accuracy of Luke's statement, that *Testimonies* from the Old Testament are a part of the traditional teaching of Jesus. Mark

even suggests that the title *Testimonies against the Jews* is involved in the quotation, by remarking that the Jewish leaders 'perceived that He had spoken the parable [of the Vineyard] *with reference to themselves*.'

Clearly it is evident that some closer inquiry needs to be made as to our Lord's use of the Old Testament in His discourses, in order that we may find out whether any other quotations betray affinity with what we know in later times as *Books of Testimonies*. Suppose we take the Gospel of Mark, on account of its known priority in the Evangelical tradition, and examine its text in an edition of either the Greek or some other language, in which the editor indicates by special type a passage from the Old Testament.

We find our first instance in Mk 4¹¹⁻¹², where Jesus uses, what we may call a favourite parable of His, a statement about 'Eyes and no Eyes': we can hardly fail to notice that this passage from the sixth chapter of Isaiah, 'Let them see and not see,' etc., is strongly reflected in the early Christian tradition. It is definitely explained in Jn 12³⁹⁻⁴¹ as being an anti-judaic testimony on the part of Isaiah, and in the last chapter of the Acts, St. Paul uses the very same passage to the Jews whom he had failed to convince by his general argument from the Old Testament Scriptures. In the early Christian literature it was, naturally, a useful weapon in their ordered armoury. *They took it out of Christ's quiver*.

We turn the pages of Mark, and the next quotation we find is again from Isaiah, and it is introduced in a definitely anti-judaic manner:

'That was an appropriate prophecy of Isaiah about you hypocrites: This people honours me with their lips, but their heart is far away from me. How idle is that reverence which consists in following human teachings and taboos' (Is 29¹³).

There is no doubt about the wide diffusion of this prophetic utterance as an anti-judaic testimony. We need only refer to Justin, to the Second Epistle of Clement (c. 3) to Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* iii. 6), etc.; but as Justin suggests that the *Testimony* was once current in a longer form, which has a further bearing on the New Testament, we may profitably spend a little time on his use of the oracle. In his *Dialogue with Trypho* he refers to it at least five times, and always in a manner hostile

to the Jews: they are a stiff-necked race, a faithless brood, who honour God (as He Himself says) with lips only (*Dial.* 27): a people void of sense, who honour God and Christ with the lip alone (*Dial.* 39): they call themselves 'children of Abraham, and confess God lip-wise, whereas He cries out that they are far aloof from Him' (*Dial.* 80). When, however, we turn to *Dial.* 78, we find a longer reference: first Justin says that Grace has been transferred from the Jews to us Christians; for, as Isaiah says, 'This people honours me,' etc. (the quotation as in Mark with slight variations), and then he goes on as follows:

'Therefore I will again transport this people, and I will take away (*ἀφελῶ*) the wisdom of their wise, and the intelligence of the intelligent I will reject.'

We are at once arrested by the similarity of thought and expression to the passage in the first chapter of 1 Corinthians (1¹⁹), and we ask, Is St. Paul, like Justin, quoting an anti-judaic testimony? At first sight the answer would be 'Yes' and 'No.' He is arguing anti-hellenically as well as anti-judaically. Perhaps he has taken an original anti-judaic oracle and used it in a wider sense. Let us look a little closer at Justin.

In c. 78 he has added the anti-judaic word *their* before 'wise men' (*τῶν σοφῶν αὐτῶν*), and this is not a meaningless addition, but a part of the original testimony; for, when we turn to the passage in Tertullian, we find the following text:

'Auferam, inquit, sapientiam sapientum illorum, et prudentiam prudentium eorum abscondam: . . . sapientibus eorum, id est, scribis, et prudentibus eorum, id est, pharisæis' (*adv. Marc.* iii. 6).

We notice the same anti-judaic expansion as in Justin, and now are able to see why St. Paul goes on with the inquiry, 'Where is the *wise*, where is the *scribe*?'; originally they were both Jews: but St. Paul has modified the 'testimony' to cover both Jews and Greeks. We infer that St. Paul, Justin, and Tertullian are all working on the same traditional 'testimony,' St. Paul being a little nearer to the Hebrew with *ἀπολωῶ*, and Tertullian a little nearer with *abscondam*. And if they are working on the same text, it is extremely likely that the original form was the longer text as in Justin, of

which the first part is used by Mark, and the second by Paul.

In this instance, then, we can hardly refuse to take back a part, at least, of a conventional anti-judaic testimony to our Lord Himself. We notice further that Tertullian has both of the previous testimonies from Isaiah in the immediate context.

The consequence of this inquiry is important: the primitive Christian teaching was anti-judaic to a far greater degree than has generally been recognized; and it was anti-judaic because Jesus made it so. There is fundamental hostility between Christ and the Jews, in the earliest days of His teaching, and in the earliest forms in which that teaching has come down to us. It was not due, only, to a sense of reverence for the Teacher's words that His disciples incorporated into their anti-judaic propaganda His references to 'eyes and no eyes,' 'moving lips and absent heart,' and the 'rejected stone.' These sayings are all a part and are expressive of an organized antagonism, to retort the Scriptures upon those who professed to be its wardens and interpreters. And if this antagonism is primitive, it is because Jesus was the *Protagonist*.

To sum up the whole matter: we have found reason to assert that the principal use which the first Christian believers made of the prophetic and hortatory matters in the Old Testament, was to treat them as hostile to the Jewish community from which they emanated.

A comparison of the form (including arrangement and headings) in which these *Testimonia anti-judaica* are arranged in the earliest collections, with the quotations in the Acts of the Apostles, in the Epistles (Romans and Hebrews), and to some extent in the Gospels also, reveals a relationship which may be expressed in terms of heredity. Justin and Cyprian are in a direct line, as regards quotations and arguments therefrom, with the New Testament. And there are also links between the Apostolic quotations against the Jews and certain sayings of Jesus, together with summaries of His sayings and teachings, both pre- and post-resurrection, such as are suggested by Luke and found current in Mark.

The precedent for an anti-judaic use of the Old Testament came, therefore, from Jesus Himself; and the only residual question is whether our Lord's use of the controversial matter implies the exist-

ence of an orderly nexus, a vertebral column to the body of the later collection called *Testimonies*. We think we have shown that it is His method, as well as His matter, that is being followed by the early Christian believers. The conclusion would be even more certain, if we could believe, as many critics are disposed to do, that some corpus of testimonies was actually in existence *before* Jesus'

own day. Such a collection would probably be more justly described as pro-Messianic, rather than anti-judaic. There was, however, room for some hostility to conventional Judaism even on the part of those who were looking for the Consolation of Israel; and, certainly, from such a nucleus as has been suggested, the evolution of the later grouping of *Testimonies* would be natural and easy.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

But that's real.¹

'Hath made us kings.'—Rev 1^o.

THE other day when you were so dreadfully late, and breakfast was quite cold, and Mother was quite ratty, and when you did get up at last you had a horrid morning, and no time to wash more than the centre of your face, and the back settlements behind your ears got never a lick, tumbled your clothes on anyhow, bolted your food, had to sprint for it to school, arrived there hot and sticky, yet were late after all, and got lines for it too—what was it all about? Why did you do it? What were you thinking of as you lay on and on in bed? 'Oh,' you say, 'I was pretending.' Yes, I know, and I know something more too. If I weren't a minister, and if the people weren't listening, I think I could bet you sixpence that I could guess what you were pretending to be. Let's try. You were a general, and there was a big battle raging, and things were going badly till you dashed up the roads as far as you could in your great car, and then ran among the troops, and the news spread everywhere that the commander-in-chief was there himself, and the men rallied, and there was a wonderful victory. Was that it? No! Then, I am off it. But of course I get three shots! We didn't agree about that, but there are always three allowed. Well then, you were a traveller in the heart of Africa, with lions' eyes like balls of fire staring at you quite close out of the jungles, and apes hanging from the trees above you, and writhing snakes, and horrid little pigmy men who kept shooting poisoned arrows; one of them went through your hat. That

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

it? No, again! Then my last chance. You were a pirate, whose ship had just reached your treasure island, away down in the sunny southern seas, where the water is as blue as the sky is; and inside where the surf is tumbling on the coral it is as still as a mirror; and you could see the fish darting about far down, and the yellow sand at the bottom, and the skeleton of a man drowned long ago with a red cap beside it. That it? No! Ah well, then, if I weren't a minister, and if the people weren't listening, I might give you that sixpence. Of course I am only chaffing. Betting is a silly mug's game; and only a bit of an ass takes shares in it. But what were you pretending? I was a king, you say. Oh, but come now, that's not fair! You said pretending: and that's real. You are a king. What? Didn't you know? That's queer. Here is a fellow who doesn't know he is a king, and giggles when I tell him, as if I were trying to be funny. It would be awkward if King George forgot he was a king, thought he was just a private man, went out strolling, and the ministers with papers to sign looking everywhere for him, and messengers scouring the whole city; and if when they found him he waved them away;—'Nonsense, I am no king. Let me alone.' That would be a bit awkward. But you are just like that. You don't rule over England or Scotland or France, but you have a wonderful country called your life; and you can make it a rich land or else a very poor one, and it all depends on you. 'George, be a king,' his mother used to say constantly to George III. when he was young. 'George, be a king.' And you must be a king. For you are one. The Bible says so here. You must be generous and live in a big handsome way, a king's way. 'This is far too much for me