

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 *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute
OR
Philosophical Society of Great Britain

VOL. LXXIX.

1947



LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY

THE INSTITUTE, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

(Issued on the 27th January, 1947.)

*THE TEXTUAL BACKGROUND OF THE USE OF THE
OLD TESTAMENT BY THE NEW.*

By B. F. C. ATKINSON, M.A., Ph.D.

THERE are in the New Testament rather over 1,020 direct quotations or verbal allusions to the Old. Allusion of thought apart from words is, of course, not included in this computation. If it were, there would be little of the New Testament with which we should not have to deal. The exact number of allusions is difficult to ascertain because in the case of those which consist of no more than one or two words the intention of the writers to make a verbal allusion or not is sometimes a matter of judgment. I have counted 1,025. Of these approximate 1,025 the Johannine Epistles and Philemon have none at all, while the Apocalypse has about 331. Next to this the largest number for any book in proportion to its size (not absolutely) is shown by the Epistle to the Hebrews, which has about 93, and similarly the lowest number in proportion is found in the Gospel of John, which has only about 17.

A substantial majority of these quotations and allusions is taken from the LXX. It is the normal source from which quotations are drawn. At the very least six out of every seven quotations are derived from it. The proportion is probably considerably higher, because in making the calculations I have reckoned as Non-Septuagint all on which reasonable doubt can be thrown, and some of these are likely to have been wrongly excluded. If we group the books into sections, the proportion of LXX quotations differs considerably. Thus in the Gospels the proportion of Non-Septuagint allusions is between a quarter and a third and in Matthew it is about three-sevenths. In Acts at least nineteen out of every twenty quotations come from the LXX. In the Catholic Epistles the proportion is about four-fifths. In the Pauline Epistles, excluding the Pastorals, at least nine-tenths comes from the LXX, in Hebrews at least eleven out of every twelve. In the Pastorals there are only eight quotations altogether and all are from the LXX. Finally

in the case of the Apocalypse, where for reasons to be mentioned later the proportion is difficult to ascertain, I have reckoned the LXX allusions to amount to about six in every seven. Now these are precisely the results we should expect having regard to the background of the writers and to the needs of the persons for whom their books were primarily written or to whom their epistles were addressed. The writers with a Palestinian background show the highest proportion of quotations from sources extraneous to the LXX, while Acts, Paul and Hebrews show the lowest. Luke's Gospel is in a special category, the high proportion of Non-Septuagint quotations being almost entirely concentrated in the first two chapters, while the Apocalypse holds the balance. Its proportion of LXX allusions is about six in seven, identical with that of the whole New Testament.

There being no doubt that the majority of quotations were taken from the LXX, our first question must be: how were these quotations taken? Were they copied from an open Bible? It seems quite obvious that they were not, and in fact reflection upon the different circumstances with regard to quotation which obtained in the ancient world would not lead us to suppose that they were. There were no printed Bibles and no reference margins. There were no chapters and verses, though there may have been some sort of sectional arrangement. References were difficult to find except to those who had a particularly familiar knowledge of a given book. On the other hand memories were probably then rather keener. It is true that a minority of quotations appears word for word, the proportion varying from about a third in the Gospels and Hebrews to about a fifth in Acts and the Apocalypse, but a large percentage of the verbatim quotations are extremely short and were they not word for word could scarcely be recognised as quotations at all. The majority of quotations are made perfectly recognisably, but with varying degrees of inaccuracy. This clearly means that as a general rule the New Testament writers relied on their memories in making quotations. This would account for the majority of inaccurate quotations as well as for the minority of accurate ones. It does not seem possible to classify the verbatim quotations in any way except that in some of the New Testament writers at any rate quotations from the Psalms possibly have a tendency to be rendered more accurately than others. This fact is quite consistent with reliance upon memory. What mattered to the apostles was not so much the

exact words of Scripture as the meaning which lay behind the words. Though reliance upon memory was the general rule, there are some cases, as we shall see later, where quotations must have been taken from written texts, either other New Testament writers or sources on which more than one writer drew.

Before we pass on to consider the various ways in which such quotations as are not word for word were modified there is one point which should be stated. There is no evidence that New Testament writers modified the LXX in order to make their quotation conform more exactly to the original. There are plenty of quotations from extra-LXX sources, as we have noticed, and these will be dealt with later, but when writers quoted from the LXX, as they usually did, they quoted from it whether or not it was in agreement with the Hebrew. Disagreement between the LXX and the Hebrew of the Massoretic text might arise from two causes. The LXX might rest upon a different original Hebrew text or misinterpretation of the original text, or the translation might be an incorrect, inaccurate or weak rendering of the original. There are at least half-a-dozen quotations from the LXX in which the LXX is in marked disagreement with the Hebrew as we have it. Examples are the long quotation from Amos ix, 11, 12 in Acts xv, 16-18, the quotation in I Pet. ii, 9 of the additions by the LXX to the Massoretic text in Exod. xxiii, 22, and the four well-known cases in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the quotation of Num. xxiv, 6, in Heb. viii, 2, of Jer. xxxi, 31-34 in Heb. viii, 8-12, of Ps. xl, 6-8 in Heb. x, 5-7 and of Gen. xlvii, 31 in Heb. xi, 21. There are numerous cases of quotation from the LXX of passages which are at best rough and inadequate renderings of the Hebrew. Their number is of course a matter of judgment, but they constitute an appreciable minority of all the LXX quotations and are quite sufficient to show that no New Testament writer selected for quotation from the LXX only such passages as were an accurate or proper rendering of the original Hebrew. Questions of text as between LXX and Hebrew or of the accuracy of the Greek version clearly never entered the heads of the New Testament writers.

We are next to ask how the New Testament writers treated textually the passages which they selected for quotation. First of all modification arose owing to inaccuracy of memory. Inaccuracies extended to words of major importance in the sentence as well as appearing in small differences such as the substitution

of a pronoun for a substantive or of one preposition for another of similar meaning. Examples are Matt. vii, 23 ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν, where the original, Ps. vi, 8 has Ἀπόστητε; I Cor. i, 19 καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν ἀθετήσω where the original Is. xxix, 14, has κρύψω. The Pauline rendering may be a reminiscence of the μεταθήσω of the previous sentence in Isaiah. Again Heb. ii, 12 Ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, where the original Ps. xxii, 22 has διηγῆσομαι. Major differences of this sort seem to be less frequent in Acts and Paul than in the Gospels, Hebrews or the Apocalypse, though they occur everywhere. At least one such difference seems to be intentional. This is the Pauline ἔδωκεν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (Eph. iv, 8) for ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώποις of Ps. lxviii, 18. Although New Testament writers sometimes apply their quotations in ways which the original Old Testament author might find hard to recognise, they rarely alter the actual words of the quotation in so striking a way. In fact I could not indicate any other passage where it seems to me certain that any one of them has done so. We may conclude this short list of examples by pointing out the interesting fact that wherever the βίβλος ζώντων of Ps. lxix, 28 is referred to in the New Testament it is called βίβλος ζωῆς. This seems to indicate that the phrase was a current expression in apostolic and primitive preaching and teaching. Compare also the alteration by the apostle Paul both in Rom. iii, 20 and Gal. ii, 16 of the πᾶς ζῶν of Ps. cxliii, 2 to πᾶσα σὰρξ—οὗ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ another instance—possibly quite independent—of dislike of the participle ζῶν.

As might be expected, abbreviation of passages in quotation sometimes took place. Under this head I do not include quotations of a few words selected from a longer original clause, but the straightforward abbreviation of a passage which is otherwise quoted as a whole. Omissions may extend from a single word to a whole sentence. They may arise from inaccuracy of memory and so come properly under our first head. Additions of a word or two occasionally occur. But they may also arise from an intentional desire to omit part of a passage as irrelevant or as making the whole too long. Thus in Matt. iv, 6 the last clause of Ps. xci, 11 is omitted in the quotation Τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀρουσῶν σε, and I do not think the fact should be attributed to misquotation on the part of the devil into whose mouth the words are put! In

Mark there are no substantial omissions. In the quotation of Hab. i, 5 in Acts xiii, 41 the sentence *καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε* and the neuter plural *θαυμάσια* after *θαυμάσατε* are omitted. The first half of Ps. xxxiv, 18 runs in the LXX *γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι χρηστός ὁ κύριος*. This is quoted in I Pet. ii, 3 *εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστός ὁ κύριος*. The passage in Gen. xiv, 17-20 about Melchizedek is considerably abbreviated in quotation in Heb. vii, 1, 2. Substantial omissions are rare in Paul and in the nature of the case do not occur in the Apocalypse, where the majority of quotations are only of two or three words or so.

By far the most frequent form of modification of a passage in quotation by a New Testament writer is that of grammatical or syntactical adaptation. The Old Testament passage is fitted into the form of the New Testament sentence. Examples are many, but it is worth our while to have several before us, so that we can see something of the warp and woof of this weaving of the Old Testament into the New. In Mk. viii, 18 the Lord rebukes the dullness of the disciples in words taken from Ezek. xii, 2: *ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε, καὶ ἄτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε*; the original runs: *οἱ ἔχουσιν ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ βλέπειν, καὶ οὐ βλέπουνσι, καὶ ἄτα ἔχουσι τοῦ ἀκούειν, καὶ οὐκ ἀκούουσι*. Thus the person is changed and the form of the sentence turned into an interrogative. In Lev. xviii, 5 the people are told with regard to God's statutes and judgments *ποιήσατε αὐτὰ ἃ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς*. Quoting this passage the Lord says to the lawyer: *τοῦτο ποίει καὶ ζήσῃ*. The plural imperative and the aorist participle are combined in a singular imperative and the person of the main verb is changed. In describing the future blessedness of Zion the prophet Isaiah declares *καὶ πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς σου διδασκούς Θεοῦ* (Is. liv, 13). This is quoted by the Lord, *καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδασκοὶ Θεοῦ* (Jn. vi. 45), the case being altered from accusative to nominative. Moses reminds the people of the Lord's care for them: *καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ταύτῃ ἦν εἶδετε ὁδὸν ὄρους τοῦ Ἀμορραίου ὡς ἐτροφοφόρησέν σε κύριος ὁ Θεός σου* (Deut. i, 31). The Apostle Paul selects the kernel of this statement, or, it may be, the author of Acts abbreviates his words: *ἐτροφοφόρησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ* (Acts xiii, 18). The number and person of the pronoun are changed. A good example of this adaptation appears in I Pet. ii, 10: *οἱ ποτε οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες*. This is a skilful combination of Hos. i, 6, 9, ii, 1, 23 and involves a change of gender and number in the perfect participle passive and an additional change of

the participle itself to an aorist. The Psalmist says that he will run—or, as the LXX has it, ran—in the way of God's commandments, *ἔταν ἐπλάτυνας τὴν καρδίαν μου* (Ps. cxix, 32). The apostle writing to the Corinthians says (II Cor. vi, 11) *ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτνται*. This involves the change of the case of a substantive from accusative to nominative, the change of number in the pronoun and the change of voice, tense and person in the verb. *Ἰσραήλ*, says Isaiah (xlv, 17), *σώζεται ὑπὸ κυρίου σωτηρίαν αἰώνιον*. The author of Hebrews takes this wonderful expression up, but he alters the case. Christ, he says, is *αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου* (Heb. v, 9). I have multiplied examples in order to try to give some impression of what is the main method of allusion to the Old Testament made use of by the New Testament writers. Direct quotation of long passages has its place, a large place, but more powerful still is the cumulative effect of this constant weaving of the Old Testament into the structure of the New. It emphasises the unity of the two Testaments as parts of a single whole, it demonstrates the perfection of the *preparatio evangelica*, and it illustrates the importance of the part played in the Providence of God by the great Alexandrine version in preparing men's minds for the Christian revelation.

Another well-known method made use of by the New Testament writers to reinforce their teaching by reference to the Old Testament is the syncretism or conflation of two or more passages into a single quotation. This is occasionally effected without verbal alteration, but more often with more or less adaptation of the kind we have already noticed, this being sometimes necessary in the nature of the case. Thus in the course of the Magnificat we have *ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραήλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ μνησθῆναι ἐλέους*. This is a combination of Is. xli, 8 *Σὺ δὲ Ἰσραήλ παῖς μου* and Ps. xcvi, 3 *ἐμνήσθη τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰακώβ*. In his sermon in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch the apostle Paul speaks of the death of David. He says: *Δαυεὶδ . . . ἐκοιμήθη καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτοῦ* (Acts xiii, 36). This is a combination of I Kings ii, 10 *καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Δαυεὶδ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ* and Jud. ii, 10 *πᾶσα ἡ γενεὰ ἐκείνη προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν*. In I Pet. ii, 9 the apostle applies several Old Testament expressions to the Christian church. He says *ὕμεις δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτὸν, βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος*. This is a combination of Ex. xxiii, 22 with Is. xliii, 20. In the former we read *ἔσσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ*

πάντων τῶν ἔθνων . . . ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι βασιλεῖον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον, in the latter τὸ γένος μου το ἐκλεκτὸν λαὸν μου ὃν περιεποιησάμην τὰς ἀρετὰς μου διηγείσθαι. Notice incidentally the change of LXX διηγείσθαι to ἐξαγγεῖλαι similar to the change in Heb. ii, 12 of διηγῆσομαι in Ps. xxii, 22 to ἀπαγγελῶ. In Paul there is very little of this combination of passages. We get it in Rom. ix-xi—a passage which, as we shall see later, is peculiar on other grounds—twice in II Cor. vi, once in Eph. vi, two or three times in the Thessalonian epistles and once in Titus. In Hebrews also it is infrequent, but there are a few interesting cases. The Apocalypse, that museum of rough Old Testament allusions, is of course full of it, but the treatment of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse, as we shall see, is different from its treatment in other New Testament books.

Those passages in which quotations from the LXX are combined with quotations from another source are best treated later when we come to deal with non-LXX quotations.

Before we pass on to discover what light is thrown upon methods of quotation by passages which are quoted by more than one writer, there are a few quotations of special interest which might claim our attention for a few moments. We have already noticed the quotation of Ps. xci, 11, 12 in Matt. iv, 6. The uniqueness of this quotation lies in the fact that the words are put into the mouth of the devil who quotes word for word from the LXX except for the omission of a clause! It is noteworthy that both in Matthew and Luke all quotations in the temptation narrative, the three from Deuteronomy and the present one, are word for word from the LXX. Was this due in the first instance to the evangelist Matthew, who seems at an early stage to have been concerned with the correspondence between Old Testament prophecy and witness and the Gospel fulfilment? Among the many Old Testament extracts in Stephen's speech recorded in Acts vii there are three of special interest. In each of them the quotation is correct and perfectly recognisable, but the original reference of the words is different from the application made of them by the speaker. Thus in verse 7 he adds to the words of God to Abraham quoted from Gen. xv, 13, 14 the sentence καὶ λατρεύουσίν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ, which is taken from Ex. iii, 12 and was originally spoken to Moses. In verse 15 he is describing the death of *Jacob*. καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν, he says, καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. But this is an echo of Ex. i, 6, where the words refer to Joseph, not to

Jacob. Thirdly, there is the well-known passage in verse 16 in which the speaker combines in a single quotation words from Gen. xxxiii, 19, 1, 13 and Josh. xxiv, 22 in a strange version which has the added peculiarity—in Stephen's speech of all places—of appearing to reflect the Hebrew and not the LXX. Here he tells us that the patriarchs were buried in a tomb which Abraham bought from the sons of Hamor in Shechem, whereas the purchase was really made by Jacob. Now do not these three references reflect exactly the condition of mind of a man thoroughly acquainted with the Old Testament making an *extempore* speech under conditions of stress and excitement? No such phenomenon occurs elsewhere in the case of any other quotation throughout the New Testament outside the course of this speech. They are frankly slips. But if they are, what an accurate record we must possess of this speech, whether the author of Acts verified the references or not. If he did, he may have been under some temptation to correct them, but did not do so. If he did not verify them, we may be equally assured that he has passed on the summary of the speech as he received it.

It is now time to examine some passages that are quoted by more than one writer. We will begin with the synoptists, a special case, because the double or triple quotations are not entirely independent. In Mark's Gospel there are at least thirty-nine quotations from the LXX. Of these thirty-five all but four occur in parallel passages in Matthew. Of the thirty-five so occurring nineteen are identical. About two-thirds of the nineteen are word for word from the LXX. Of the remainder there are two or three from the Little Apocalypse, *δείξον τῷ ἱερεῖ* in Mk. i, 44, the abbreviation of the law against cursing parents, the statement in Gethsemane *Περίλυτος ἡ ψυχὴ μου* and the quotation from Ps. xxii *κινῶντες τὰς κεφαλὰς*. The identical quotations are scattered over both Gospels, but seem most prominent in the Little Apocalypse. This perhaps strengthens the view that that passage was in circulation in written form before the composition of the earliest Gospel. There are three cases where the parallel quotation in Matthew appears to be taken from an extra-LXX source, and incidentally one in which a combination of passages in the Little Apocalypse appears in Mark wholly from the LXX and in Matthew partially in another version. There remain thirteen cases where the parallel quotations occur with different wording in Matthew

and Mark. If we ignore the omission by Matthew of the pronoun σου in the two quotations of the fifth commandment, both of which, except for this detail, which is complicated by variant readings, are identical in both Gospels, we find that Matthew—not Mark—regularly follows the LXX more closely in these parallel cases. Of these parallel quotations twenty are represented also in Luke. Exactly half of these are identical in Mark and Luke, but they are not quite the same as those identical in Mark and Matthew. One is represented in Luke probably from a non-LXX source. Nine are different in Mark and Luke and Mark is regularly closer to the LXX. Thus we have Matthew closest of all, then Mark and lastly Luke. Now it is indisputable that Luke drew upon Mark, and we find the source closer to the original LXX than the abstract. Is the same thing true in the case of Matthew and Mark? If we may consider such a deduction—I do not press it, I leave it open—then Abbot Chapman's view of the priority of Matthew will turn out correct. In the case of quotations which do not occur in Mark but are common to Matthew and Luke most seem to be identical. An exception is the quotation of Mic. vii, 6 where they are very different and Luke is nearer to the LXX.

Here are some further passages which are either outside of the synoptists altogether or are not confined to them. Gen. ii, 24 is quoted identically in Matt. xix, 5 and Mk. x, 7 with the omission of the pronoun αὐτοῦ. It is quoted again in Eph. v, 31, but the apostle Paul changes the preposition ἔνεκεν to ἀντί. The evangelists are more accurate. Did they have a written source? Or are we to attribute this to the accurate mind of *Matthew*? Gen. xxi, 12, ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σου σπέρμα is quoted verbatim in Rom. ix, 7 and Heb. xi, 18. There is of course no need to suppose that the one took from the other. The LXX itself is the common source. The writer of Hebrews had an especially accurate memory. Ex. iii, 6 is quoted in five passages in four different ways. The original runs Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου, Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ. Quotations occur in Matt. xxii, 32, Mk. xii, 26, Lk. xx, 37, Acts iii, 13, vii, 32. Matthew adds, Mark abbreviates, Luke adapts and abbreviates. Mark is closest to the LXX—exceptionally. The two quotations in Acts, though they differ in the order of the words, change τοῦ πατρὸς to the plural τῶν πατέρων. As one quotation is in a sermon of Peter's and the other in Stephen's speech, it is likely that the hand of the author is to be seen in this version of the LXX passage.

An alternative, which seems to me less likely, is that the phrase was a common one in the plural in apostolic preaching. Ex. xix, 6 *ὕμεις δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι βασιλειον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον* is quoted in I Pet. ii, 9 and twice in the Apocalypse, i, 6 and v, 10. The Petrine passage, as we should expect, is the most accurate. The Apocalypse has *βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς τῆ Θεῷ* and *τῷ Θεῷ βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς*. The statement about creation from the fourth commandment (Ex. xx, 11) is quoted in Acts xiv, 15 and Rev. x, 6 where it is inextricably mixed up with other passages. The quotation in Acts is not verbatim but accurate.

The quotations of the sixth to tenth commandments exhibit an interesting cleavage. The Old Testament, both Exodus and Deuteronomy, has the form *οὐ* with the future indicative. This is followed by Matthew in his three citations of one or more of the commandments and by the Apostle Paul in Rom. vii, 7 and xiii, 9. Mark on the other hand has the form *μή* with the aorist subjunctive and he is followed by Luke, while the same form occurs in Jas. ii, 11. If this form was a separate version of the Hebrew, we can understand its use by James, but why does Mark use it? He was an inhabitant, if not native, of Jerusalem. Did he take it from James? And is this an indication of the early date of James' epistle? The fifth commandment is always quoted accurately, twice by Matthew, twice by Mark, once by Luke and once in Ephesians, except for the omission or addition of the pronoun *σου* made uncertain by variant readings in most cases. Ex. xxiv, 8 *τὸ αἶμα τῆς διαθήκης* is quoted accurately by Matthew and Mark with the addition of *μου* and in Hebrews (x, 29), but Luke alters to *ἡ καινὴ δωθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου* following Paul in I Cor. xi, 25, though he again does not slavishly copy—Paul says *ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι*. There is probably in this version a reminiscence of Zech. ix, 11. Towards the close of Stephen's speech (Acts vii, 44) we find a rough quotation of Ex. xxv, 40. The speaker is dependent upon memory and cites the substance of the passage. It is quoted more accurately in Heb. viii, 5, *ὄρα ποιήσεις πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει*. The writer inserts *πάντα* according to the reading of Codex Ambrosianus and changes the perfect participle to the aorist.

Interesting questions arise from the various citations in the Gospels of the first and great commandment from Deut. vi, 4, 5. This is old ground of course, but perhaps it is worth detailed

examination. Deuteronomy has ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεως σου. For *διανοίας* codices Alexandrinus and Ambrosianus, the readings of the former of which are generally, though not always, followed in New Testament quotations, read *καρδία*. Matthew has ἐν ὅλη τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλη τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλη τῇ διανοίᾳ σου Mark has ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου. Matthew is independent in changing the preposition. Otherwise he follows Mark with the omission of *ἰσχύς*, which he would not find in, or remember from, the LXX and therefore may have thought to be outside the quotation. Mark's second quotation (xii, 33), which immediately follows the first, makes confusion worse confounded. He alters *διανοίας* to *συνέσεως*. The Textus Receptus would add *ψυχῆς* in the third instead of, as previously, the second place, but the better texts omit it altogether. In the case of Luke's quotation (x, 27) we cannot be certain about the preposition. All texts read ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου. The critical texts read ἐν in the following three instances, and in this case Luke is partially following Matthew. The Received Text reads ἐξ in all four cases, which is possibly the more likely reading. The order of the nouns in Luke is *καρδία, ψυχῆ, ἰσχύς, διάνοια*. In vocabulary he follows Mark but changes the order. The introduction of *ἰσχύς* into the passage by the evangelists goes behind the LXX to the original Hebrew or perhaps rests on the Aramaic in which the Lord originally spoke. The change by Mark within two verses of *διάνοια* to *σύνεσις* shows that there was no set Christian formula to express this great commandment. It appears that attempts were made in a variety of forms to express its substance, perhaps owing to its supreme importance. Whence do both *καρδία* and *διάνοια* occur in the evangelists' forms of the quotation? Were both readings of the LXX known to them? Was the one word already a gloss upon the other? Or do both words go back, as is perhaps the more reasonable view, to the Lord's original utterance in Aramaic? If they do, it seems that it was not Matthew who in this instance took contemporary notes of what was said. Perhaps we owe the Marcan and Lucan forms to the Apostle Peter's memory. The quotation of Deut. xviii, 15, Προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμέ ἀναστήσει κύριος ὁ Θεός σου σοί in Acts iii, 22 and vii, 37 provides another example of a quotation both in a sermon of Peter's and in

Stephen's speech which is identical in both instances but differs from the Old Testament. The form must be due to the author of Acts. The variety of the quotation of Deut. xix, 15 is of peculiar interest. The original reads *ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ ἐπὶ στόματος τριῶν μαρτύρων στήσεται πᾶν ῥήμα*. It is quoted in this form with the natural omission of the second *ἐπὶ στόματος* and the second *μαρτύρων* by the Apostle Paul in II Cor. xiii, 1. In the quotation in Matt. xviii, 16 the conjunction *καὶ* is changed to *ἦ*. It is in this same form with *ἦ* that the quotation is made in I Tim. v, 19, which thus follows Matthew, not II Corinthians. Personally I should not draw from this fact the rash conclusion that the Pastoral Epistles were not Pauline, but rather perhaps that the first Gospel complete, or a written document from which some of its non-Markan portions were drawn, had come to the apostle's notice between the writing of II Corinthians and that of I Timothy. Our next quotation seems, however, to indicate that the Pastorals stand to a certain extent by themselves and separate from the bulk of the Pauline writings. In Deut. xxv, 4 the LXX has *Ὁὐ φημῶσεις βοῶν ἀλοῶντα*. This appears in I Cor. ix, 9, in the critical texts, which we may judge with reasonable certainty to be right, as *Ὁὐ κημῶσεις βοῶν ἀλοῶντα*. The quotation in I Tim. v, 18 restores the LXX vocabulary but—perhaps only for emphasis—alters the order *βοῶν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φημῶσεις*.

A surprising case is found in the quotation of II Kings i, 10, 12, *κατέβη πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτόν*. Here Luke (ix, 54) quotes from apparently an extra-LXX source, but the Apocalypse (xi, 5, xx, 9) is closer to the LXX. The quotations of Is. vi, 9, 10 in the Gospels have often been discussed. In Matt. xiii, 14, 15 the passage is quoted at length and verbatim with the omission of the genitive pronoun *αὐτῶν*. This version is followed in Acts xxviii, 26, 27 with the addition of an introductory clause not accurately quoted and like Matthew with the omission of *αὐτῶν*. This means either that Acts scrupulously followed Matthew, or that an *αὐτῶν* has been added in every text of the original which we now possess. The abbreviated and adapted quotation in Mk. iv, 12 is followed in Lk. viii, 10, while finally the fourth Gospel has a strange version of its own (John xii, 40) which is not taken from the LXX. The double quotation of Is. xxviii, 16 is of peculiar interest.

The original LXX text runs: Ἴδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών λίθον πολυτελῆ, ἐκλεκτὸν, ἀκρογωνιαίον, ἔντιμον, εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ κατασχυνθῆ. This is quoted with omissions in I Pet. ii, 6, and with the alteration of ἐμβάλλω εἰς to τίθημι ἐν. The same passage is quoted in combination with Is. viii, 14 in Rom. ix, 33 with the identical alteration. This means that one passage is dependent upon the other, or that both are dependent upon a single source. Professor Hort in his commentary on I Pet. argued for the dependence of Peter upon Paul. There are several reasons for rejecting the dependence of Paul upon Peter. Professor Rendel Harris argued for the dependence of both upon a Testimony book. The best solution of the problem perhaps is that of the Dean of Winchester in his recent commentary on I Peter where he argues that both are dependent upon a rhythmical hymn. Is. xl, 3 Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, etc., is quoted identically by all three synoptists with the alteration of the words τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν to αὐτοῦ. Luke continues the quotation inaccurately. John i, 23, though quoting from the LXX, is inaccurate, altering ἐτοιμάσατε to εὐθύνετε. The fourth evangelist had a very inaccurate memory, but he never alters the substance or meaning of his quotations. Is. lxxv, 17 uses the words ὁ οὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινὴ This is changed to the plural when quoted in II Pet. iii, 13, while the Apocalypse (xxi, 1) keeps the singular but omits the article. A summary of the long passage in Zech. xii, 10, 13, 14 about the tribes mourning when they see the Lord appears twice in the New Testament. In the Matthaean version of the Little Apocalypse (Matt. xxiv, 30) we find κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς and again in Rev. i, 7 καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς. This is not direct quotation, and therefore one passage is likely to have been influenced by the other. This seems to indicate the dependence of the Book of Revelation upon the Little Apocalypse, or upon Matthew's Gospel.

Ps. xxii, 18 is quoted in all four Gospels in four different ways. The LXX has διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱμάτισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον. Matthew has διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ βαλλόντες κλῆρον. Mark has διαμερίζονται τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλῆρον ἐπ' αὐτά. Of the two Matthew is nearer to the original. Luke has διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλήρους. As usual he is farther from the LXX than Mark, as Mark is than Matthew. John, strange to

say, quotes the LXX word for word. Ps. lxii, 12 ἀποδώσεις ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ is quoted four times in the New Testament. Matthew leaves the LXX and alters ἔργα to πρᾶξι. There are two Pauline quotations, Rom. ii, 6 and II Tim. iv, 14 which, though not identical, are substantially the same and follow the LXX. Another version using δώσω for ἀποδώσω is found in Rev. ii, 23. None of these three seem to be influenced by any of the others. We have already mentioned the βίβλος ζώντων of Ps. lxix, 28. It is mentioned seven times in the New Testament. In Phil. iv, 3 it is βίβλος ζωῆς. In Rev. iii, 5 and xx, 15 it is ἡ βίβλος τῆς ζωῆς. In Rev. xvii, 8, xx, 12 and xxi, 27 it is τὸ βιβλίον τῆς ζωῆς. In Rev. xiii, 8 there are variants between the second and third of these forms. The substantial agreement of Paul with the Apocalypse in this rendering seems to indicate that the expression βίβλος ζωῆς had become a stock phrase in Christian preaching. Or did it, as Professor Rendel Harris would have advocated, come from a Testimony book? Ps. cx, 1 is the most frequently quoted Old Testament passage of all. It is cited altogether fifteen times, but it appears in at least three different forms. Here is the original: *Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.* This is quoted verbatim in Luke xx, 42, 43. It is alluded to in substantially the same form in Matt. xxvi, 64 and Luke xxii, 69, quoted again verbatim in Heb. i, 13 and mainly in the same form in Heb. x, 13. Variant readings in Matt. xxii, 44 and Mark xii, 36 give two further verbatim quotations, though the critical texts read here ὑποκάτω for ὑποπόδιον. A variant reading also brings Mark xiv, 62 into line with Matt. xxvi, 64 though in the critical texts the order is altered. A fourth form appears in I Cor. xv, 25, where ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν becomes ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας. This is a very natural version. A fifth form in which ἐν δεξιᾷ stands for ἐκ δεξιᾶς is found in I Pet. iii, 22, Col. iii, 1, Heb. i, 3, viii, 1, x, 13, and Eph. i, 20. Does this ἐν δεξιᾷ for ἐκ δεξιᾶς arise independently or does its source lie in a characteristic lapse of the Apostle Paul's memory in Col. iii, 1, followed by himself in Ephesians and by Peter and Hebrews? Again was there a current form in a Testimony book ἐν δεξιᾷ? The fact that the author of Hebrews uses this form alongside of an accurate quotation perhaps indicates that it rested on something more substantial than an inaccuracy of the Apostle Paul. Alternatively, did the change of preposition pass practically unnoticed? Ps. cxviii,

22, 23, is quoted word for word by Matthew (xxi, 42), Mark (xii, 10) and Luke (xx, 17), verbatim also except for the adaptation of λίθον to λίθος in I Pet. ii, 7. Acts iv, 11 has a different version, close enough to the LXX in the second clause, but substituting for ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες the words ὁ ἐξουθενηθεὶς ὑφ' ὑμῶν τῶν οἰκοδόμων. This demonstrates the dependence of Luke upon Mark when writing his Gospel and his independence when writing Acts. It is noteworthy that the quotation in Acts iv, 11 forms part of a speech of the Apostle Peter's before the Sanhedrin, the authority for which must have been either Peter himself, John, or the Apostle Paul present perhaps as a member of the Council before his conversion. The Apostle Paul is the most likely source, as Luke elsewhere describes a private deliberation of the Council at which no Christian was present. If this is so, we can understand this typically inaccurate Pauline type of quotation.

The quotation of Prov. x, 12 in Jas. v, 20 and I Pet. iv, 7 in a version independent of the LXX accurately representing the Hebrew shows the dependence of Peter upon James. It is noteworthy that the LXX φιλία is rendered by Peter ἀγάπη. The key words δεῖ γενέσθαι from Dan. ii, 28 are rendered verbatim in each synoptic version of the Little Apocalypse and twice in the Book of Revelation (i, 1, iv, 1). The accuracy, even in the case of two words, is so foreign to the Book of Revelation that dependence upon the Little Apocalypse is again indicated. The sevenfold quotation in the New Testament of Dan. vii, 13, 14 is again of interest. The original in the Alexandrine version as represented by the well-known MS from the Chigi Library runs καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο. This appears in four different forms in the New Testament. Matthew's version is peculiar to him. It occurs twice, in the Little Apocalypse (xxiv, 30) and later (xxvi, 64)—τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. As usual Matthew is closest of the synoptists to the LXX. No doubt the later quotation is Matthew's version and the passage in the Little Apocalypse is accommodated by him to it. The true Little Apocalypse version no doubt appears in Mark xiii, 26 and Luke xxi, 27 τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις or (Lucan) ἐν νεφέλῃ. The version in Mark xiv, 62 runs τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, and no doubt forms the basis for the version of Theodotion, which, as is well known, is the one which appears in the

usual copies and editions of Daniel in the LXX. With this agrees Rev. i, 7, apparently taken from Mark, Ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν. Lastly there is a rough allusion to the passage, in the true style of quotation in the Apocalypse in Rev. xiv, 14.

A very general summary of the results of comparing different versions of the same quotation gives the following results:—

Matthew is chiefly in agreement with Mark and chiefly differs from John.

Mark is chiefly in agreement with Luke and chiefly differs from Paul.

Luke is chiefly in agreement with Mark and chiefly differs from Acts. John is very independent. Acts is the same. James inclines to agree with Peter. Peter sometimes depends on Paul. Paul is very independent. Hebrews chiefly differs from Paul. Revelation is very independent but occasionally agrees with the Synoptists, that is to say, depends to some extent on the Little Apocalypse.

We now finally come to a short study of those quotations which are not taken from the LXX version. The greatest number comes in Matthew, but before we determine the significance of this, we may find it easier to turn further on and deal first with Luke. First of all we must remind ourselves of what we said at the beginning, that there is a certain number of short Old Testament allusions of which it is difficult to say definitely whether the writers took them from the Greek version or not. We had to leave these out of our reckoning when we were dealing with quotations from the LXX. Similarly now we must base our conclusions only upon such passages as can be said with reasonable certainty to be quoted from non-LXX sources. Fortunately the ignoring of the few doubtful cases will make little if any difference to our results. In Luke's Gospel then there are about twenty-three quotations that do not come from the LXX. Of these about sixteen occur in the first two chapters. Now quite apart from any question of quotations it is well known that on grounds of style alone the first two chapters of Luke show themselves to be a narrative based upon a Semitic source. This of course accounts for the difference in the quotations from the LXX version. They are independent translations made by the evangelist when translating his source as a whole out of Aramaic. But this being so, how are we to account for the thirteen or so quotations in the same chapters, three of them

verbatim, which undoubtedly draw upon the LXX? It seems to me that the answer to this question is simple. Imagine yourself translating out of Arabic into English a document which contained several quotations from the Bible without in any way indicating what words were quoted. Some of these quotations you would recognise as you translated them and you would clothe them in the language of the Authorised Version, with certain inaccuracies due to imperfect memory. Other quotations you would not recognise and would translate them into your own English in the course of your rendering of the document as a whole. This is exactly the case with the narrative of Luke i and ii, and it is an important criterion for our dealing with other sections of the New Testament where quotations are mixed. Apart from the sixteen in chapters i and ii there are in Luke at most seven further quotations from non-LXX sources. That in vii, 27 from Mal. iii, 1 he took verbatim from Matthew (unless both took it independently from a "Testimony book", which is unlikely as the whole context occurs in both). One is the quotation in x, 27 from Deut. vi, 5, which we have already dealt with and which perhaps should not come under this section at all. That in xiii, 19 from Ezekiel and Daniel he took with a grammatical adaptation from Matthew, not, by the way, from Mark, who has a different version. The remaining three (x, 19, xvii, 14, xvii, 29) are in a section peculiar to Luke, but they are mere allusions and scarcely constitute a basis for definite conclusions.

Now let us return to Matthew. The Little Apocalypse we must treat by itself. Apart from that section there are at most twenty-two quotations in Matthew which do not come from the LXX. Of these twenty-two six are in sections peculiar to Matthew (ii, 6, 15, 18, xiii, 41, 43, xxvii, 9); seven are quotations with or without a short surrounding context appended to passages which appear in Mark (iv, 15, 16, viii, 17, xii, 18-21, xiii, 35, xvi, 27, xxi, 5, xxvii, 43), Mark having no quotation; one is in a passage also occurring, but without the quotation, in Luke (xi, 29); five are in the Sermon on the Mount and thus peculiar to Matthew; one occurs also in Mark but in a different context (ix, 36); two have been carried over into Luke, one verbatim (xi, 10), and one in a different version (x, 35), neither being in a passage that occurs in Mark. This means that all quotations in sections common to Matthew and Mark derive from the LXX. This common material, then, came from a Greek source, written or oral, be the original Matthew, Mark, or something that preceded

both evangelists. With regard to the Matthaean sections in which we find all the non-LXX quotations mingled, of course, with others taken from the LXX, if we treat these sections separately from the rest of the Gospel, we may choose between two alternatives. The first is that in these sections Matthew took his quotations from a "Testimony book" and inserted them when necessary into his Greek text. The Testimony book was originally compiled in Aramaic. The quotations were either translated by Matthew as he selected them, or were already in a Greek version. The other alternative is that some at least of the special Matthaean sections were translated by the evangelist out of Aramaic or Hebrew. The unity of style throughout the Gospel fits the first alternative better, the occurrence of LXX quotations among the others in the Matthaean sections (notably the first of all, i, 23) fits better with the second. But I think one result emerges in either case. This is that some at least of the Matthaean sections are earlier, perhaps much earlier, than the common sections. To my mind, however, I am bound to confess that a simpler solution strongly suggests itself. The facts of the unity of style throughout the Gospel and the occurrence of LXX quotations among the others instead of militating against each other, as it seems they must do if we regard the Matthaean sections as originally separate from the common material and regard that material as derived by Matthew from Mark, appear to me to harmonise completely if we regard the whole Gospel as a unity, early, Palestinian and originally written in Aramaic and suppose instead that Mark (or Peter) took his material from Matthew. If Mark's Gospel were written in Rome and intended for Gentiles, this would account for his almost exclusive use of the LXX. In that case he took from Matthew only such quotations as he could reconcile with the LXX and omitted the rest. This seems to me to account far more reasonably for the non-appearance of so many non-LXX Matthaean quotations in Mark's edition of the common material than the view that Matthew added quotations to Mark and that all those added happened to be derived direct from the Hebrew or from some other non-LXX source. By the same criteria the Little Apocalypse emerges as an early document. In the Matthaean version of it there are about eleven quotations from the LXX as opposed to about seven from non-LXX sources. In the Marcan version there are about nine or ten from the LXX and three at most (all rather doubtful) from other sources. At least two

which are non-LXX in Matthew are taken from the LXX in Mark. Luke of course has Hellenised the whole section including all quotations that he uses. Now this seems to me to suggest that Matthew's version of the Little Apocalypse has the earliest features about it, which again seems to work out in favour of Chapman's view of the priority of Matthew.

But the interesting fact is that Mark can use "Testimony books" also. Among several doubtful possibilities there only seem to me to be two quotations in Mark certainly taken from non-LXX sources. These are Mal. iii, 1 in i, 2, peculiar in *this context* to Mark. Yet the quotation is word for word with Matthew's version. The second certainly non-LXX quotation in Mark is that from Joel iii, 13 in iv, 29, in the only short section in the Gospel which is peculiar to it. I do not profess to have an answer to the problem here raised. Can it be that the little section iv, 26-29 is part of a stratum earlier than the common portions which has somehow strayed into Mark? The context seems to make this unlikely. Is it due to the Apostle Peter's recollection? Is it a direct translation from Hebrew or Aramaic? How is it that these two non-LXX quotations in Mark are the quotations which are peculiar to the Gospel?

It will now be convenient to notice a certain phenomenon in the Epistle to the Romans. In spite of four or five instances of quotations in the first Epistle to the Corinthians which appear possibly to be influenced by sources extraneous to the LXX the only certain non-LXX quotations in the whole of the Pauline Epistles appear in that to the Romans. All of them with one exception (xii, 19) occur within the section, chapters ix-xi. There are thirty-six quotations in these chapters clearly taken from the LXX. There are six, which do not seem in most cases to represent clearly the Hebrew text but are very different from the LXX. Have we here a "Testimony book" again? Or have we rough translations out of Aramaic? At any rate, as in the case of the sections peculiar to Matthew's Gospel, I think we may see an indication that the section ix-xi is based in some way upon an early document, perhaps compiled by the Apostle soon after his conversion when he was demonstrating in the synagogues of Damascus that Jesus was Christ, and intended in the first instance for use among Jews.

The only quite certain non-LXX quotation in the Acts seems to appear, of all places, in the middle of Stephen's speech, where

in vii, 29 the word *πάρουκος* seems to reflect faithfully the Hebrew of Ex. ii, 15 as opposed to the LXX.

Out of a total number of eighteen quotations James has five at most which are influenced by sources other than the LXX. It seems natural that this should be so in the case of a Palestinian. One might have expected even more. The form of all his quotations may be accounted for by supposing that he cited from memory.

Peter's good LXX quotations in his first Epistle are no doubt due to Silvanus. In the three which show differences from the LXX he is influenced in two by Paul and in one by James.

There is one clear non-LXX quotation in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Even the presence of one is surprising. It is the quotation of Deut. xxxii, 35 *Ἔμοι ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω* in x. 30 in a version which renders the original Hebrew and neglects the LXX altogether. But this version is identical with that found in Rom. xii, 19, the only Pauline non-LXX quotation outside of Rom. ix-xi. Are both dependent on a Semitic source, or is one taken from the other? And if so, which one? I imagine Hebrews, whose author was such a complete Hellenist, is dependent upon Romans, but I cannot pretend to make any suggestion as to why the Apostle Paul should make use of this version of this passage.

It is in the fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse that we find, especially in the latter, a kind of rough-and-ready treatment of the Old Testament material which links these two works together hinting at unity of authorship and sets them in a class apart. In the matter of the frequency of their direct use of the Old Testament they differ so widely that each stands at one extreme in the list of New Testament books which contain quotations at all. One may read page after page of John's Gospel without meeting any direct allusion to the Old Testament (though the thought is full of them). Similarly the Johannine Epistles contain no quotations or verbal allusions at all. On the other hand there are few consecutive verses of the Apocalypse which do not contain one. Yet when the style and manner of quotation in the Gospel and the Revelation are compared, they appear to me to be much alike. Of about thirteen quotations in the Gospel drawn from the LXX three contain substantial changes. In the quotation in i, 23 of Is. xl, 3, LXX *ἐτοιμάσατε* becomes *εὐθύνατε*, in that of Ps. lxxviii, 24 in vi, 31 *οὐρανοῦ* becomes *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* and *φαιγεῖν* is added, and in that of Zech. ix, 9

in xii, 15 *χαῖρε σφόδρα* becomes *μὴ φοβοῦ*. Apart from these quotations from the LXX the evangelist gives us in xii, 40 an extraordinary version of Is. vi, 9, 10, which bears no affinity to the LXX and does not seem accurately to represent the Hebrew. In xiii, 18 he gives what appears to be an independent translation from the Hebrew of Ps. xli, 9, while in xix, 37 he again goes to the Hebrew of Zech. xii, 10 and writes *Ὁφονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν*, a rendering which significantly is reflected in Rev. i, 7 *ὄψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὄφθαλμος καὶ οἴτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν*. Now here is a writer who was accustomed to the use of the LXX, though he had an inaccurate, sometimes substantially inaccurate, memory for quotation from it, whose mind yet went back on occasion to the substance of Old Testament passages which he had learnt not from the LXX but in their original Semitic tongue. If there were no tradition of authorship or knowledge of the author's career, we should conclude, I think, in any case that here was a Palestinian Jew who for a long time had grown accustomed to using a Greek Bible.

The same is true to a greater extent of the author of the Apocalypse. Here also we have a man whose mind was soaked in the Old Testament Scriptures. He also is accustomed to the use of the LXX, but his allusions, nearly always short, are very rough, and it is sometimes difficult to tell whether he means to refer to the LXX or not. He makes substantial alterations in vocabulary. Such alterations occur sometimes in Luke, fairly often in Hebrews, occasionally in Paul, but more often than all in Revelation. Thus in ii, 23 *δοκιμάζων* becomes *ἐραυνῶν*, in iii, 19 *ἀγαπᾶ* becomes with necessary adaptation *φιλῶ*, in iv, 6 *πληρεῖς* becomes *γέμοντα*, in vi, 16 *βουνοῖς* becomes *πετραῖς* and *καλύψατε* becomes *κρύψατε*, in viii, 10 *Ἐώσφορος* becomes *ἀστήρ*, in ix, 9 *παρατασσόμενος* becomes *τρεχόντων*, in xiv, 5 *γλῶσσα δολία* becomes *ψεῦδος*, in xv, 8 *ἐπλήσθη* becomes *ἐνεμίσθη* in xvii, 3 *ἐτελεύτησαν* becomes *ἀπέθανεν* in xviii, 23 *ἄρχοντες* becomes *μεγιστᾶνες*, in xxi, 7 *διεμέτρησεν τὸ προτείχισμα* becomes *ἐμέτρησεν τὸ τεῖχος*. In about nineteen cases the author may be said with reasonable certainty to take his quotations from the Hebrew and he perhaps does so in about nineteen more. In four cases, three of them all together in chapter ix, he uses a strange version based neither on LXX nor Hebrew, just as was the case in John's Gospel with Is. vi, 9, 10. This occurs rarely elsewhere, notably in Matt. ii, 6, v, 48 and xxv, 31. In four cases he mixes Hebrew and LXX in a

single quotation, notably where he adds together as names of the serpent the Hebrew Satan and the Greek *διάβολος* which is the LXX version of Satan in Zech. iii, 1. These phenomena do not belong to certain strata, but are spread over the book. Now what does this mean? Does it not indicate a man of ripe experience, his heart and mind filled with the thought and images of Scripture, one again accustomed to using the LXX, who yet did not "think in words", but rather saw, felt and experienced the inner meaning conveyed by the words, one whose early underlying knowledge of the Scripture had been gained through its original language, who did not refer to his Bible to verify his quotations, less perhaps because he had no Bible with him, though on Patmos that might have been the case, than because, it may be, his eyes were dim with age and reading had long been difficult or impossible, one in fact whose life and mind and outlook and writing might be summed up in the Psalmist's words, "My *meditation* of Him shall be sweet?" Is not this unmistakably the Apostle John in his old age?

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. F. F. BRUCE wrote: Dr. Atkinson's paper is one of very great importance; it is one to which students will turn in years to come as a helpful summary of the evidence on this subject; and the VICTORIA INSTITUTE is to be congratulated on having secured it for its Transactions.

Out of the many aspects of the subject on which one is tempted to comment, I select one.

Dr. Atkinson mentions the noteworthy quotation of Ps. lxxviii, 18, in Eph. iv, 8, which reads, instead of the Massoretic and Septuagint text: "Thou hast received gifts among men," the opposite meaning "He gave gifts to men." The change from second to third person is insignificant in itself, because Paul is in any case referring to Christ in the third person; but why change "receive" to "give"? The change, as Dr. Atkinson remarks, is intentional; Paul adopts this reading because it alone fits his context; but where did he get it from? The answer is—from a Targum, or traditional paraphrase of the Hebrew Old Testament in the Aramaic vernacular. On the usual account, these Targums were not committed to writing until some centuries after New Testament times, but their written form preserves

a long-observed oral tradition. Now, the traditional Targum of the Psalms renders Ps. lxxviii, 18, thus : *selecta li-rqia* [*Mosheh nebhyya*], *shebhitha shibhyetha*, [*allephta pithgamé 'oraytha*,] *yehabhta lehôn mattenan li-bhné nasha* (" thou has ascended to the firmament, [Prophet Moses,] thou hast led captive captivity, [thou hast taught the words of the law ;] *thou hast given gifts to men* "). The Syriac (Peshitta) version of the Old Testament has practically the same reading, omitting the added phrases of the Targum, which we have put between square brackets.

Nor is this an isolated example of Targumic influence on the New Testament use of the Old Testament. A most important one is found in Mark iv, 12, in a quotation of Isaiah vi, 9f, in a form differing both from the Massoretic and LXX texts : " that they may behold indeed, but not see ; and hear indeed, but not understand ; lest they should turn and it should be forgiven them. " The closing words " and it should be forgiven them " (Gk. *kai aphethê autois*) are a straight quotation from the oral tradition underlying the " Targum of Jonathan " (Aram. *we-yishtebeq lehôn*). This fact may give us a clue to the real meaning of the conjunction *hina* (" that ") with which the verse in Mark begins. If we take the whole verse as a quotation from the Targum, then Gk. *hina* represents Aram. *di*, a conjunction or pronoun with a very wide range of meaning. (It should be noticed, too, that the parallel passage Matt. xiii, 13, has *hoti*, " because, " where Mark has *hina* .) In the present instance, *di* may be rendered by the relative pronoun " who, " and the two verses (Mark iv, 11f.) may mean : " It is granted to you to know the secret of the kingdom of God ; but all these things come as riddles to those who are outside, who behold indeed, but do not see ; and hear indeed, but do not understand, so that they do not return and receive forgiveness. "

G. H. Dalman, in *Jesus-Jeshua* (1929), p. 46, suggests that the quotation from Isa. lxi, 1f. in Luke iv, 18f., reflects the Targum on that passage. This would be natural enough, when we consider that after the Hebrew text was read from the roll of the prophet, the *methurgeman* would supply an oral paraphrase in Aramaic.

The wording of John xii, 41 (" These things said Isaiah, when he saw his glory ") reflects the text of the Targum of Isa. vi, 1, *chazethi yath-yeqara da-adonai* (" I saw the glory of the Lord "). And such

examples of Targumic influence on Old Testament quotations in the New Testament could no doubt be multiplied if an exhaustive comparative study were undertaken along these lines.

Air Commodore WISEMAN wrote : We are most sincerely grateful to Dr. Atkinson for his truly valuable summary and though we dissent from a very few of the opinions he expresses, we are aware that in this realm he is an authority. We cannot but acknowledge our debt to the careful and scholarly research which he has given to this subject ; the VICTORIA INSTITUTE is to be congratulated in having asked him to undertake it.

In referring to that part of the speech recorded in Acts vii, 7, Dr. Atkinson says Stephen " adds to the words of God to Abraham, etc." but is not part of this sentence in Genesis xv, 16, where $\omega\delta\epsilon$ is the equivalent to " in this place," as the Hebrew implies ?

Is it not hazardous to assume an " echo " in Acts vii, 15, even though it avoids part of a difficulty ? It is most unlikely that there was any confusion in the mind of Stephen or in the minds of members of the Council as to precisely where the various patriarchs had been buried ; their tombs were only about 30 miles away and were well known. In so condensed a report of Stephen's speech we cannot assume too much. We know that Abraham erected an altar in Shechem (Genesis xii, 6 and 7) ; was he allowed to do this without buying the ground ? It is our lack of detailed knowledge which should prevent us in assuming a blunder on the part of Stephen or that a blunder of this character would pass, unchallenged by any member of the Council.

Is Col. iii, 1, a " lapse of the Apostle Paul's memory ? " $\delta\epsilon\zeta\iota\alpha$ is used in the LXX version of Ps. xvi, 11.

Is Mark i, 2, intended to be a verbatim quotation from Mal. iii, 1 ? Or Mark iv, 29, one from Joel ii, 13 ? May not Isaiah xl, 3, also have been in mind when Mark i, 2, was being written ? The New Testament writers often condensed into a summarised statement their reading of a wide range of literature, just as careful writers of the present day do. In many instances it was never their intention to quote verbatim ; the general sense was of more importance than a verbal citation from one specific place. We have many instances

of exegetical paraphrase as may be seen in the changes in Mark i, 2 (one of the variations cited by Dr. Atkinson). These changes were, I submit, introduced in order to make clear that the passage relating to Jehovah in Mal. iii, 1, had been fulfilled in Christ, so instead of "My face" he writes "Thy face" and "My way before thee" "the Way before Me." The verbal changes are deliberately exegetical, and I think Dr. Atkinson would agree, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

A reading of the paper impresses one with the difference between the Rabbinic method of quotation from the Old Testament and that of our Lord and the New Testament writers. Some scholars such as Döpke and Kuenen, have, quite ineffectually, laboured to establish a theory that the rabbinic method has been followed. Although in his early years Paul was schooled in this method it is not followed. Surprisingly enough the rabbis did not hesitate to alter the text, sometimes in a most arbitrary fashion, in order to produce a novel meaning. Now it can be said—and this is important—that the New Testament writers have not altered the Hebrew or Greek text Old Testament in order to gain an advantage or produce a "proof" to which the Old Testament scriptures bears no testimony, and in no instance does a New Testament writer cast doubt upon what is written in the Old Testament.

Mr. E. H. BETTS wrote: Dr. Atkinson has placed us under a deep obligation by his collection and classification of so great a mass of data. This must have been laborious work. It is to be hoped that the material he has gathered may be made permanently available for closer scrutiny, in a more detailed form. We thank him for his labours and for many hours of pleasure and profit derived from the closer examination of the Scriptures to which his paper has led us.

With a few of his deductions and suggestions, however, we are not in agreement. Stephen, for instance, is the last person to whom we could attribute "slips." He was "full of the Holy Spirit." He was "full of faith and power." He worked miracles. Keen controversialists had not been "able to resist the wisdom and spirit by which he spake." His speech to the Council was a marvel of extempore oration and a model for all time of restraint coupled with purposeful selection. It was not errors in his address that aroused

the fury of his judges but the undeniability of its complete historical truth. Had there been blunders these acute and critical opponents could not have failed to detect and ridicule them. Whatever appears in our present text of Acts vii, 16, it is all but impossible for Stephen to have uttered it as it stands or the Council to have allowed it to pass unchallenged. That there is a discrepancy, and that a difficult one, is admitted. With our present knowledge it cannot be resolved. But there is nothing unresolvable given more information. Abraham quite probably bought land in Shechem, where he had interests. Jacob may have repurchased after a lengthy lapse. There *was* a burial place in Shechem, for Joseph's bones were laid there. This is not claimed as a solution, but it could be, if coupled with the possibility of a textual corruption in Acts vii, 16, arising late in the first or early in the second century A.D. Stephen may have referred to both the national burial places, and his double reference become fused into one muddle by the omissions of a tired copyist. His argument would have lost no force by such double reference since the point he was making here was the necessity of *purchase* in the land which was the promised inheritance.

For the rest, an "echo" is not a quotation. The former at its simplest is a purely verbal affair and may imply no allusion to the events of the original passage. Where Stephen undeniably quoted (in Acts vii, 6-7b), he marked the quotation most definitely by means of the introductory and closing formulae, viz., "God spake on this wise" and "Said God," respectively. There are all grades of transition between a quite unconsciously used "echo" and a quotation involving conscious allusion to a passage or an event. All writers and speakers utilise the verbal echoes which reverberate in their minds from past reading or other experience. But they cannot therefore be held to have made slips. Even where there is a measure of conscious quotation there may be a transference of reference without risk of imputation of blunder, as in the frequent quotations in different contexts of Mr. Churchill's famous words about the indebtedness of the "so many to so few."

Moreover, Stephen exhibited, throughout, the maximum of self-control and superiority to "strain." He was a specially selected messenger ("angel") for a critical occasion and was taken note of as such (vi, 15) by his enemies—to their greater guilt; and his whole

conduct was in beautiful keeping with such a role—in its calm, its respectfulness to others, his freedom from what was personal (even in his scathing denunciation) and finally in his prayer for his enemies at the moment of maximum physical strain. He displayed *ēgkrateia*, that noble fruit of the spirit (self-mastery), to the full. This, surely, would be incompatible with the failure implied in the commission of foolish blunders.

It is not good enough to say, merely, with Jerome that New Testament writers “had regard to the meaning and not to the words.” For, as inspired men, they had the words at their command—and selected and adapted and changed, to suit their divinely ordered purpose. Nor is there need to invoke inaccuracy of memory, which implies failure. The four instances given by Dr. Atkinson of inaccuracy can be otherwise accounted for. In Matt. vii, 23, *apochōreite* is a better because stronger word than *apostēte* since it expresses separation in both its elements, being literally equivalent to “separate away from.” In I Cor. i, 19, also, *athetēsō* connotes intended, purposed rejection and so is more apt than *krupsō* (hide). Similarly, in Heb. ii, 12, in the preference given to *apaγγelō* (bring tidings) over *diēgēsomai* (narrate) there is intended the hint of a new and fuller revelation. Eph. iv, 8, is fascinating, and (as Dr. Atkinson suggests) the alteration is quite doubtless deliberate and no failure of memory. The apostle seems to quote the Psalm (lxviii, 18) substantially unchanged up to a point, and then break off into an interpretation while, as to form, still quoting: “He led captivity captive and—as by revelation I may now put it—*gave* gifts unto men.” Likewise *pasa sarx* of Rom iii, 20, etc. is more exact because more particularized than *pas zōn* of Ps. cxliii, 2. It is the unregenerate man, and not all living, who needs justification.

What Dr. Atkinson, in his last paragraph, says beautifully of the aged apostle John is largely true of all the New Testament writers, especially the apostles. They *had* regard to the meaning and not to the words. But far from “slipping” in the use of the latter, as inspired men, they made them serve the divinely ordained end. And their minds, formed from scripture, were richly furnished with echoes and quotations—both.

Brig.-General H. BIDDULPH wrote: In Stephen’s speech in Acts vii., I do not think that the variations in some of his historical

statements from the fuller accounts in the Old Testament are due to his "making an extempore speech under conditions of stress and excitement." He was addressing the Council of the Jews, and was not instructing Gentiles in the details of Old Testament history. His theme was the perpetual unbelief and hard-heartedness of the Jews throughout their history. To avoid breaking the thread of his argument, the historical details had to be reduced to the lightest connecting links. For instance, take verses 15-16. Suppose he had said "So Jacob went down into Egypt, with our fathers, and died there and was carried over to the cave of Machpelah, which Abraham bought from Ephron the Hittite for a sum of money. His sons also died in Egypt and were carried to Shechem and buried in the plot of ground which he bought of Hamor, the father of Shechem" (Jerome states that the patriarchs as well as Joseph were buried in Shechem). It will be seen at once how this accurate historical statement breaks the thread of and detracts from the force of Stephen's address, without adding anything of value, or which his audience did not know thoroughly. Moreover, Stephen's actual statement is merely an example of that peculiar Hebrew grammatical idiom, called *constructio praeagnans*, by which two different ideas were coalesced into a single sentence. The same reasoning applies to verse 7.

Mr. W. F. SPANNER wrote: The learned author has given us a valuable paper which gives evidence of painstaking research. We owe him a debt of gratitude, and I should like to thank him for what he has given to us.

I have a few observations to make. The author states that what mattered to the apostles was not so much the exact words of scripture as the meaning which lay behind the words. This is, I agree, true, but inasmuch as words form the vehicle by which meaning is conveyed the words themselves are important. The greater the importance which attaches to an idea the greater becomes the necessity for choosing with exactness the form of words to convey this idea. I think it is perfectly reasonable to believe that the writers of Holy Scripture chose their words with scrupulous exactness in view of the vital importance of the message which they were chosen to convey.

The author has suggested that the writers of the New Testament were guilty of inaccuracy of memory in their use of the Old Testament. Surely it is nearer the truth to say that the New Testament writers wrote freely under the supernatural impulse of the Holy Spirit (who is the true author of original Holy Scripture), and did not consider themselves bound to follow the exact wording of the Old Testament. The promise that the memories of the apostles should be supernaturally aided by the Holy Spirit is given in John xiv, 26.

Again to suggest, as the author does, that Stephen was guilty of a slip seems to me to be choosing an easy way out of a difficulty. Stephen is said to have been "full of the Holy Ghost" (Acts vii, 55). Would it not be better to admit that the solution of the difficulty mentioned by the author cannot be resolved in our present state of knowledge, rather than attribute a "slip" to Stephen?

Mr. B. B. KNOPP wrote: The VICTORIA INSTITUTE is indebted to Dr. Atkinson for his valuable Paper, which is obviously the product of much labour and study. If I venture to make a few remarks thereon, it is not as a mere captious critic, but because it appears to me that if we *confine* ourselves to a close scrutiny of the actual text, we may miss something of the grand majesty of the Word of God. We may fall into the error of inventing a human explanation for something which can be revealed only by the light of the Spirit of God.

Among the reasons given by the author for modifications by the New Testament of Old Testament passages is inaccuracy of memory. I think a true believer in verbal inspiration would be very reluctant to accept such a view. Is it necessary, for instance, to assume that such a passage as Matt. vii, 23, is intended to be a verbatim quotation? Would not the similarity of language be accounted for by the Evangelist's being steeped in the Old Testament, just as Englishmen of say Bunyan's time were steeped in our Authorised Version, with the effects on their language which are so well known?

If the Holy Spirit by Stephen (for he was filled with the Holy Ghost) says that God spoke certain words to Abraham, who are we to say that He didn't, even though they are not recorded in Genesis,

and similar words were spoken to Moses? The substance was certainly conveyed to Abraham on more than one occasion. See especially, Gen. xv, 18. Again, Acts vii, 15, may be an echo of the language of Ex. i, 6, but it is an echo of the fact of Gen. xlix, 33. As regards verse 16 of this chapter, there are a variety of ways in which the seeming contradiction may be reconciled. It may be that Jacob extended the original purchase of Abraham. That the two transactions were not wholly unconnected seems probable from the fact that both pieces of land were used as burial places.

It is interesting to recall the work of a scholar of a past generation, in this connection: Like Dr. Atkinson, Bishop Horne lists a certain number of quotations from the LXX, and a certain number which appear to be borrowed but not verbatim. He lists others which have the same meaning but are differently phrased, others that more accurately represent the original Hebrew, and still others that differ from both original Hebrew and LXX. The numbers in each category must always be matters of opinion, and subject to modification as research goes on, but if anything is proved thereby, it is that when the Holy Ghost in the New Testament quotes something He said in the Old, He is completely independent of all human versions. He is His own infallible Interpreter.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am very grateful to all those who commented on my paper for their kind remarks, and especially to Mr. Bruce for observations which greatly add to whatever value my paper may originally have had. Most others who have kindly commented seem to have concentrated on Stephen's speech. Obviously, I cannot here reply in great detail, but may I summarise as follows? (1) My remarks primarily concerned the text of the quotations, not the matter of them. (2) Assuming that the speech contains inaccuracies, this does not affect the record of the speech except, as I have tried to show, to enhance the impression of its accuracy and inspiration. (3) Assuming that the textual form of some of the Old Testament quotations which appear in the New Testament is due to inaccuracy of memory on the part of New Testament writers, it is my belief that this and all other circumstances were overruled and used by the inspiring

Spirit. (4) I believe with all my heart in the plenary inspiration, complete authority and perfect infallibility of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

May I again thank all those who by taking the trouble to comment have emphasised my points or indicated weaknesses of matter or argument ?