

THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT
IN
THE PAULINE EPISTLES

by

Edward Earle Ellis, B. Sc., M. A., B. D.

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of Divinity
in partial fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THEOLOGY
at New College
University of Edinburgh

Edinburgh, Scotland
May, 1955



To the Memory of
My Father
who taught me from a child
to know and love
the Holy Scriptures

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Of the many to whom the writer owes a debt of appreciation, he desires to mention especially the helpfulness and advice of the following persons:

Professors Matthew Black and James S. Stewart, the candidate's advisors, whose encouragement, insights, and corrections were so instrumental in the completion of the dissertation. For Professor Black's continued interest and assistance after assuming his duties as principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, the writer is particularly grateful.

Professor Otto Michel of Tübingen, who gave the writer helpful suggestions regarding German works in the field, and whose own book, Paulus und seine Bibel, was grundlegend for the present study.

Professor Krister Stendahl of Harvard, who so graciously made available to the writer at the earliest possible moment a copy of his important dissertation, The School of St. Matthew.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABBREVIATIONS	vi
INTRODUCTION	vii
Historical Survey	
The Pastoral Problem	
Chapter	
I. PAUL AND HIS BIBLE	1
Introduction	1
The Nature of the Quotations	3
General Analysis	
The Problem of the Septuagint	
Paul's Attitude to Scripture	17
General Considerations	
The Introductory Formulas	
<i>Γραφή</i> and <i>Τόξμα</i> in Pauline Usage	
The Relation of <i>Γραφή</i> to Other Authorities	
The Extent of <i>Γραφή</i> : Paul's Canon	
II. PAUL AND JUDAISM	44
Introduction	44
Contemporary Jewish Exegesis	46
Pauline and Jewish Literary Methods	55
General	
Introductory Formulas	
Combined Quotations	
Allegory	
Pauline and Jewish Exegesis	67
General	
Messianic Consciousness	
The Doctrine of the Fall	
The Nature of Eve's Sin	
The Priority of the Male in Creation	
The Doctrine of the Second Adam	
The Angels at Sinai	
The Following Rock	
The Seed of Abraham	
The Beggarly Elements	
Paul's Use of Non-Canonical Literature	98
General	
The Wisdom of Solomon	
Philo	
Common Tradition	
Conclusion	108

Chapter	Page
III. PAUL AND THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH	110
Introduction	110
Pauline and New Testament Parallels	112
The 'Testimony Book' Hypothesis	128
<i>Ἄγειν Κύριος</i> Quotations	140
Summary and Conclusion	147
IV. PAULINE EXEGESIS	150
Introduction	150
Topical Emphases	152
Faith and Works	
Jew and Gentile	
Miscellaneous	
Typology	167
New Covenant Exegesis	180
The True Israel	
<u>Midrash Peshar</u>	187
Pauline Exegesis: An Added Factor	197
Conclusion	198
APPENDIX I	201
APPENDIX II	209
APPENDIX III	241
APPENDIX IV	243
BIBLIOGRAPHY	244

ABBREVIATIONS

- BA - Biblical Archeologist.
 BJRL - Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.
 CAP - Charles' Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.
 DSH - Habakkuk Commentary, Dead Sea Scrolls.
 DSS - Dead Sea Scrolls.
 ET - Expository Times.
 HDAC - Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.
 HDB - Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible.
 HDCG - Hasting's Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.
 HTR - Harvard Theological Review.
 IF - Introductory Formula (s)
 JBL - Journal of Biblical Literature.
 JQR - Jewish Quarterly Review.
 JTS - Journal of Theological Studies.
 KTW - Kittel's Theologische Wörterbuch.
 LXX - Septuagint.
 MT - Masoretic Text.
 NT - New Testament.
 OT - Old Testament.
 SBK - Strack-Billerbeck Kommentar.
 SBT - Babylonian Talmud, Socino Edition.
 SJE - Singer's Jewish Encyclopedia.
 SJT - Scottish Journal of Theology.
 SMR - Midrash Rabba, Socino Edition.
 VT - Vetus Testamentum.
 ZATW - Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
 ZFK - Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.
 ZNTW - Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.

Talmud Tractates

- | | | |
|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Ab. - Aboth | Hul. - Hullin | Pes. - Pesahim |
| 'Ar. - 'Arakin | Ket. - Kethuboth | RH - Rosh Hashanah |
| 'AZ - 'Abodah Zarah | Kid. - Kiddushin | Sanh. - Sanhedrin |
| BB - Baba Bathra | Mak. - Makkoth | Shab. - Shabbath |
| Bek. - Bekoroth | Meg. - Megillah | Sheb. - Shebi'ith |
| Ber. - Berakoth | Men. - Menahoth | Shebu. - Shebu'oth |
| BK - Baba Kamma | Mid. - Middoth | Sot. - Sotah |
| BM - Baba Mezia | MK - Moed Katan | Suk. - Sukkah |
| Ed. - Eddreyyoth | Naz. - Nazir | Ta. - Ta'anith |
| 'Er. - 'Erubin | Ned. - Nedarim | Yeb. - Yebamoth |
| Git. - Gittin | Neg. - Negaim | Yom. - Yoma |
| Hag. - Hagigah | Nid. - Niddah | Zeb. - Zebahim |
| Hal. - Hallah | Or. - Orlah | |

INTRODUCTION

The use of the OT in the New has long been recognized as an important field of research. Too often, however, the emphasis placed upon rabbinic and hellenistic influences has tended to subordinate and obscure the unique place of the OT in minds and theology of the early Christian writers. The trend of recent years to seek from the OT itself the source and meaning of NT thought has been an entirely proper one, as Hoskyns' words so well express: "[There are] grounds for supposing no further progress in the understanding of primitive Christianity to be possible unless the ark of NT exegesis be recovered from its wanderings in the land of the Philistines and be led back not merely to Jerusalem, for that might mean to contemporary Judaism, but to its home in the midst of the classical OT Scriptures--to the Law and to the Prophets."¹

The present study is not primarily textual, an area already well covered, but rather seeks the rationale underlying the Pauline usage both in its textual manifestation and in its theological application. Even where a variant text is apparently in view, Paul's textual aberrations in many cases have a hermeneutical purpose and often are closely tied to the immediate

¹E. C. Hoskyns, "Jesus the Messiah," *Mysterium Christi*, ed. G. K. A. Bell and D. A. Deissmann (London: Longman, Green, 1930), p. 70. Cf. A. M. Hunter, *The Work and Words of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1950), p. 71: "After ransacking all sorts of sources, Jewish and Greek (and, we may add, starting all sorts of 'hares,' some of which have not run very well) [scholars] are re-discovering the truth of Augustine's dictum, 'The NT lies hidden in the Old, and the Old is made plain in the New.'"

application of the citation. While rabbinic Judaism has influenced the mechanics of Pauline citation, one must look to the apostolic Church and to Christ Himself to find the primary source of the apostle's understanding and use of the OT. The emphases, applications, and hermeneutics of Paul's quotations mark him as one with the apostolic Church in contrast to his rabbinic background.

Historical Survey

The Reformation spurred a revival of interest in NT quotations and gave rise to the first systematic treatment of the subject.¹ In the Reformation, as in the early centuries, the prophetic element in quotation produced two schools of thought.² Reflecting the Alexandrian school were those favoring a double reference or allegorical view of prophecy; the reformers tended toward the historical emphasis of the Antiochian exegetes.³ As for the more direct study of NT quotations, DRUSIUS wrote (ca. 1594) a series of critical notes which were published in London in 1660.⁴ At about the same time CAPPELLUS completed ^{his} Critica

¹The first listing of NT quotations appears to have been in Robert Stephens' Greek Testament, published in Paris, 1550. Cf. H. Gough, The New Testament Quotations (London: Walton and Moberly, 1855), p. iii.

²Cf. F. A. G. Tholuck, The Old Testament in the New, trans. C. A. Aiken in Bibliotheca Sacra XI (July 1854), 563-616.

³E.g., Theodore Mopsuestia. Cf. Calvin on Mt. 2:18; Rom. 10:6ff; Eph. 4:8f; Heb. 2:6ff; 4:4. Many such passages were viewed as the adaptation of OT language and not as prophecies. So also Hengstenburg, Psalms (Edinburgh: Clark, 1846), I, 264ff: "Many Psalms are fulfilled in the Messiah inasmuch as they describe the righteous man according to his idea."

⁴J. Drusii, "Notae in Parallela Sacra," Tractatum Bibliorum, Volumen Prius, sive Criticorum Sacrorum, Tomus VIII (Londini: Flesher, 1660), pp. 1262-1326.

Sacra. Thirty-six years in the making, it contained variant NT textual readings and an appendix on NT quotations.¹ ALTING, also in an appendix, compared OT citations in Mt. 1-12 with the Hebrew and LXX, with annotations.²

The following century saw the ground-work firmly laid for almost all of the important issues in this field of research, issues which have remained prominent even until the present, e.g., textual variations, affinities with rabbinic practices and the propriety of NT exegesis. The Dean of Chichester concluded a course of lectures with the words, "I conceived it seasonable, at a Time when the Argument from Prophecy was exposed to open ridicule, to suggest some proper Observations on the Subject, for the assistance of serious Minds disposed to consider;. . ."³ But prophecy was not the only issue stirring the minds of scholars. In an argument strangely resembling some twentieth century discussions WHISTON and CARPZOV sought to resolve some of the textual problems of NT citation. Whiston argued that the NT was exact with first century Greek and Hebrew texts but that the latter were corrupted. Having "shrewdly suspected some pernicious practices of the Jews in this case," especially with regard to the Hebrew Bible, Whiston sought to correct the present OT text with the Samaritan Pentateuch, the NT, Philo, Josephus, and

¹L. Cappelli, "Quaestio de Locis Parallelis Veteris et Novi Testamenti," Critica Sacra (Paris: Cramoisy, 1650), pp. 443-557. He concluded that the apostles cited from the Greek and not the Hebrew, as commonly supposed.

²J. Alting, Operum, Tome II (Amstelaedami: Borstius, (1685).

³T. Sherlock, The Use and Intent of Prophecy (London: Pemberton, 1726), p. 195.

other sources.¹ Carpzov, in reply, defended the accuracy of the Hebrew text and attributed NT variations to hermeneutical purposes and literary convenience.² Later in the century RANDOLPH tabulated, in columnar fashion, NT citations and their LXX and Hebrew parallels, giving notes of explanation; he judged that while NT writers were largely in agreement with the Hebrew, "they sometimes quote the LXX, and perhaps other translations or paraphrases."³ Randolph's contemporary, Henry OWEN, who contended NT writers usually used the LXX, voices the sentiment which generally pervaded the study of the subject in his day:

Objections of various kinds have been made to the truth of the Christian religion: but no objections of any kind seem to bear so hard upon it as those which are drawn from the differences that occur between the quotations in the NT and the passages to which they refer in the Old. On these differences therefore, Jews and Infidels particularly insist and largely expatiate.⁴

Perhaps the most significant contribution of the period was that of SURENHUSIUS who demonstrated the extensive agreements in methodology between NT and rabbinic writers.⁵ His epoch-making

¹W. Whiston, An Essay towards Restoring the True Text of the Old Testament (London: Senex, 1722), p. 283.

²J. G. Carpzov, A Defense of the Hebrew Bible, trans. M. Marcus (London: Lintot, 1729), pp. 104-183. The LXX was quoted when the sense corresponded to the Hebrew or "well explained the Hebrew text" (p. 112).

³T. Randolph, The Prophecies and other Texts Cited in the New Testament (Oxford: Fletcher, 1782), p. 27. He found 120 quotations followed the Hebrew, 119 the LXX. Randolph's paraphrases are suggestive for later research.

⁴H. Owen, The Modes of Quotation used by the Evangelical Writers (London: Nichols, 1789), p. 1.

⁵G. Surenhusio, 711477 7112 sive Βιβλος καταλλαγης in quo secundum veterum Theologorum Hebraeorum (Amstel-aedami: Boom, 1713). He especially deals with IF, merged quotations, and the practice of citing from the Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa in succession.

study supplied the foundation for the investigations of DÖPKE and all subsequent work in the field.¹

Writers of the nineteenth century gave further attention to the critical problems of NT exegesis² and particularly intensified the study and comparison of textual data. Some writers such as GOUGH, TURPIE, TOY, AND DITTMAR were concerned chiefly with classification and comparison of NT citations with the LXX and MT.³ The first and last are almost purely technical studies and compare apocryphal, rabbinic, as well as OT parallels. Turpie and Toy give a commentary on each of the passages. The former seeks throughout to defend the propriety of NT texts and applications; (in a second volume he classified in similar fashion all of the IF in the NT).⁴ Toy's comments are of a more critical nature.

¹J. C. C. Döpke, Hermeneutik der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller (Leipzig: Vogel, 1829).

²Cf. L. Woods, The Objection to the Inspiration of the Evangelists and Apostles from their manner of Quoting Texts from the Old Testament (Andover: Flagg and Gould, 1824); A. T. Hartmann, Die Enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen (Hamburg: Perthes, 1831); Tholuck, op. cit.; C. Taylor, The Gospel in the Law (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, 1869); A. Clemen, Der Gebrauch des Alten Testaments in den neutestamentlichen Schriften (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1895). F. Johnson, The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old (London: Baptist Tract Society, 1896). J. Scott, Principles of New Testament Quotation (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1877).

³H. Gough, The New Testament Quotations (London: Walton and Moberly, 1855); D. M. Turpie, The Old Testament in the New (London: Williams and Norgate, 1868); C. H. Toy, Quotations in the New Testament (New York: Scribners, 1884); W. Dittmar, Vetus Testamentum in Novo (Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1903). Cf. also E. Böhl, Die Alttestamentlichen Citate im Neuen Testament (Wien: Braumüller, 1878).

⁴D. M. Turpie, The New Testament View of the Old (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1872).

With particular reference to Pauline citations, ROEPE concludes that the apostle quotes almost without exception from the LXX, and this is often from memory.¹ The valuable Leipzig dissertation of KAUTZSCH arrived at similar results: Paul always uses the Alexandrian version with the exception of the two Job citations (Rom. 11:35; 1 Cor. 3:19); in these, and perhaps a few others, Paul's text reflects the Hebrew because no LXX translation was available to him. MONNET and VOLLMER generally follow Kautzsch in this regard.² In opposition to this trend, the ingenious theory of Edward BÖHL sought to prove that the peculiarities of NT quotations should be attributed to an Aramaic Volksbibel current in the time of Christ, which in translation was almost identical with the LXX.³ Although the idea never commanded a wide following and was often dismissed as quickly as it was heard,⁴ the dominant views of the LXX protagonists were also to

¹G. Roepe, De Veteris Testamenti locorum in apostolorum libris allegatione, 1827. LXX variations are attributed to other Greek versions; combined quotations are the result of memory citation.

²A. F. Kautzsch, De Veteris Testamenti Locis A Paulo Apostolo Allegatis (Lipsiae: Metzger und Wittig, 1869). H. Monnet, Les Citations de l'ancien testament dans les epitres de St. Paul, Lausanne, 1874; H. Vollmer, Die Alttestamentlichen Citate bei Paulus (Freiburg: Mohr, 1896). Monnet considers further Paul's hermeneutical method and his attitude toward the OT. Vollmer confines himself to the four Hauptbriefe; an appendix examines the literary relation between Paul and Philo.

³E. Böhl, Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel (Wein: Braumüller, 1873).

⁴Vollmer (op. cit., p. 8) regarded it as wishful thinking. However, Zunz (Vorträge, pp. 5ff, 330ff) argued that Palestinian Jews required an Aramaic translation; and Toy, though rejecting Böhl's theory, admits the extensive use of oral targums. Cf. Toy, op. cit., p. xvi.

suffer considerable modification in subsequent investigations.

The problem of the LXX in contemporary study and other questions pertinent to Pauline quotations are examined in the following chapters.¹ Of the more important works on the subject are those of THACKERAY, HARNACK, MICHEL and BONSIKVEN.² Thackeray evaluates the influence of rabbinic ideas on Pauline theology and exegesis; Bonsirven compares and contrasts types of exegesis in rabbinic and Pauline literature. From the infrequent use of the OT in the smaller letters, Harnack gathers that Paul never intended that Gentile Christianity should become a 'book religion' based on the OT. Written almost thirty years ago, Michel's Halle dissertation is, in succession to Kautzsch and Vollmer, the most recent book on Paul's use of the OT.

¹In the field of NT quotation cf. also A. Schlatter, Das Alte Testament in der johanneischen Apokalypse (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1912); T. Haering, "Das Alte Testament im Neuen," ZNTW, XVII (1916), 213-227; L. Venard, "Citations de l'ancien Testament dans le Nouveau Testament," Dictionnaire de la Bible, ed. L. Pirot, Supp. II (1934); R. Charles, L'ancien Testament dans le Nouveau, 1937; M. Kähler, Jesus und das Alte Testament (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1938); A. Oepke, Jesus und das Alte Testament (Leipzig: Deichert, 1938); T. W. Manson, "The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus," BJRL, 34 (1952), 312-332; C. Smits, "Oud-Testamentische Citaten in het Nieuwe Testament I, Synoptische Evangelien," Collect. Francisc. Neerlandica 8:1 (1952); J. W. Wenham, Our Lord's View of the Old Testament (London: Tyndale, 1953); J. Dupont, "L'utilisation apologetique de l'ancien Testament dans les discours les Actes," Ephemer Theol. Lovan., 29 (1953).

²H. St. J. Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought (London: MacMillan, 1900); A. von Harnack, "Das Alte Testament in den Paulinischen Briefen und in den Paulinischen Gemeinden," Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: A. d. W., 1928), pp. 124-141; O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929); J. Bonsirven, Exegese Rabbinique et Exegese Paulinienne (Paris: Beauchesne, 1939).

The Pastoral Problem

The present study includes the traditional Pauline corpus with the exception of Hebrews.¹ All of these epistles are admittedly 'Pauline,' whether they are written by the apostle himself or not; and one might, as Dodd, leave the question at that.² However, it may be in order to give some attention to the most pressing critical problem--the authenticity of the Pastoral epistles. Their genuineness was first questioned by Schleiermacher (1807) and Eichhorn (1812). A rapid development of this type of criticism led to the rejection by the 'Tübingen School' of all the Pauline epistles except the Hauptbriefe; some scholars rejecting them all, concluded that 'Paul the apostle' was a figment of second century imagination.³ In the receding tide of radical criticism over the past fifty years the Pastorals, the first to be questioned, remain the only epistles still regarded as spurious by most scholars; and even here the presence of Pauline 'fragments' is generally recognized.⁴

¹On this cf. B. F. Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews (3rd. ed.; London: MacMillan, 1920), pp. lxxii-lxxix.

²C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet, 1952), p. 30: "For our present purpose I shall treat the Pauline corpus (excluding Hebrews) as representing the work of one author. Even if certain of the writings contained in it may not be from the hand of the apostle, they all depend largely upon him."

³Cf. A. Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters (London: A. and C. Black, 1948), pp. 7ff, 123ff.

⁴Cf. P. N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastorals (Oxford: University Press, 1922), pp. 87-135; R. Falconer, The Pastoral Epistles (Oxford, Clarendon, 1937), pp. 13-17. However, B. S. Easton (The Pastoral Epistles, London: SCM, 1948, pp. 16f) finds no real evidence for the use of sources, allowing for the influence of Pauline teaching, the letters are from a single hand.

The patristic testimony is about as good as for the other epistles.¹ Isolated objections and their apparent absence from ~~Paul~~^P 46 and from Marcion's Canon (because they were private letters ?) does not detract from the total picture. Modern objections rest on other grounds: (1) the historical situation, (2) the type of heresies present, (3) the stage of Church organization, (4) theological concepts, (5) vocabulary and style.² Lock, who is undecided about the authorship of the Pastorals, considers only the last point to pose a difficult problem.³ As to the other points, Zahn contends that the false teaching attacked in the Pastorals resembles nothing known in post-apostolic times; it is definitely Jewish and appears to be related to the Colossian heresy.⁴ Jeremias, who gives a good summary of the whole problem, regards the theological peculiarities to stem from the unique purpose and character of the letters; and they are not without parallels elsewhere in Paul.⁵

¹Cf. J. D. James, The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles (London: Longmans, Green, 1906), pp. 5-24.

²P. Feine and J. Behm, Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1950), pp. 206-218.

³W. Lock, The Pastoral Epistles (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1924), pp. xxviii.

⁴Cf. 2 Tim. 3:6-9; Tit. 1:10, 14. T. Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, trans. M. W. Jacobus (Grand Rapids, Kregal, 1953), II, 115; Feine-Behm, op. cit., p. 212.

⁵J. Jeremias, Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus (6th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1953), p. 4. 1 Tim. 4:1, 6; Tit. 1:13 equate faith with right doctrine; but cf. Rom. 6:17; 16:17; Gal. 1:23. Good works are stressed in 1 Tim. 2:10; 2 Tim. 2:21; Tit. 2:14, but cf. 2 Thess. 2:17; 2 Cor. 9:8; Rom. 2:7; 13:3; Eph. 2:10. Most theological themes and some incidental allusions (e.g., to the Holy Spirit) are characteristically Pauline. Cf. Lock, op. cit., pp. xxviii; H. B. Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament (London: MacMillan, 1909), p. 243.

N. P. Harrison, in a most thorough and minute statistical analysis, argues that the type and frequency of vocabulary precludes Pauline authorship.¹ He found an extremely high proportion of hapax legomena and words used only infrequently elsewhere; and if his method is valid, his conclusions are well nigh incontrovertible. However, Michaelis has shown that "die statistische Method Harrisons ent hält im Ansatz einen Fehler der ihre Ergebnisse in Frage stellt."² Two potent objections undermine the whole of Harrison's argument: First, any effective statistical argument must take into account both the subject matter and literary character (e.g., doctrinal or paraenetic) of the text; the vocabulary is never independent of its situation and purpose. Words must be weighed as well as counted. By placing all words into one statistical tabulator Harrison omitted factors essential to a correct evaluation. Second, it is basic to all graph analysis that proper quantities of material are set in relation to each other. In general, the shorter a text the greater is the proportional weight of elementary, indispensable vocabulary; as the text lengthens this vocabulary is repeated and its relation to the total drops. For example, Romans with 26 pages has a vocabulary of 993 words, or 38.2 words per page. However, 1 Tim. has $529:6 \frac{1}{3} = 83.5$; 2 Tim., $413:4 \frac{2}{3} = 88.5$; Tit. $293:2 \frac{2}{3} = 109.9$ words per page. Since the Pastorals have an abundant vocabulary anyway, any comparison with longer and less wortreich

¹Harrison, op. cit.

²W. Michaelis, "Pastoralbriefe und Wortstatistik," ZNTW, XXVIII (1929), 74: ". . . Harrison's statistical method contains an error at the outset which places its results in question."

texts is always heavily weighted toward the Pastorals. All of Harrison's tests produced the same results because, under the method, they had to produce the same results. The method, as Michaelis concludes, is incapable of showing either the genuineness or spuriousness of the Pastorals.¹

Stylistic differences, hapax legomena, and the use of known words in a different significance, structure, and frequency remain a problem for the Pauline authorship. Roller's valuable investigation into the nature and practice of ancient letter-writing probably offers the best solution to it:² The writer often employed an amanuensis who copied first on a wax tablet and then transcribed the contents onto papyrus; a variable degree of freedom was involved in the process. The author then read, corrected and added a closing greeting (cf. Gal. 6:16). If Paul, because of age or infirmity (cf. 2 Tim. 2:9), gave his amanuensis a greater degree of freedom than usual, the stylistic peculiarities are suitably accounted for; and a conclusion to the problem of the Pastorals may be reached: "auch hinter diesen Briefen steht als ihr Schöpfer die Gestalt des grossen Heidenapostels."³

¹Michaelis, op. cit., p. 76. Cf. M. Dibelius, Die Pastoralbriefe (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1931). For parallels to the Pastorals' hapax legomena in classical literature cf. E. K. Simpson, The Pastoral Epistles (London: Tyndale, 1954), pp. 16ff. The small scope of extant Pauline material (ca. 120 pages, 3000 main vocables) is itself a hinderance to this type of argument.

²O. Roller, Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933), pp. 4ff; cf. Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 6f.

³Jeremias, op. cit., p. 7. "Also behind these letters stands, as their creator, the form of the great apostle to the Gentiles." So also Feine-Behm (op. cit., p. 217) who give further bibliography.

References to the OT in the Pastorals are, for the most part, characteristic of the apostle Paul. The divine character and contemporary application of the OT (2 Tim. 3:15; cf. Rom. 15:3; 1 Cor. 10:11), the ethical motivation in adducing Scripture (1 Tim. 5:18f; cf. 1 Cor. 6:16; 9:9; 2 Cor. 6:16ff), and the coupled or merged citation (1 Tim. 5:18; 2 Tim. 2:19 cf. Rom. 9:33; 11:34f; 1 Cor. 3:19f; 15:45)¹ are all found elsewhere in the Pauline letters. The καὶ connective is unusual but not unknown (cf. Rom. 9:33). Also, no explicit quotation of a verbum Christi as Scripture (1 Tim. 5:18b; cf. 1 Cor. 9:9, 14) occurs elsewhere, but it is in keeping with his attitude toward Christ's sayings.² The infrequent citation of Scripture (there is only one formula quotation) follows the pattern of Paul's other small epistles;³ and the tendency to cite pagan writers is reminiscent of earlier Pauline practice (Tit. 1:14; cf. Acts 17:28; 1 Cor. 15:33).

All in all, the weight of evidence favors the genuineness of the Pastorals. For Jeremias, the unique situation and the intimate relation between writer and recipient stand as chief considerations. Certainly the difficulties surrounding a pseudepigraphal or fragment-redaction theory are considerable even for the historical situation: If attempted soon after Paul's death, his friends and Churches would have raised questions; if later,

¹On 2 Tim. 2:19 cf. also Phil. 2:12b-13.

²Cf. infra, pp. 29ff.

³Cf. infra, pp. 32ff. For a statistical analysis cf. H. K. Moulton, "Scripture Quotations in the Pastoral Epistles," ET, 49 (1937-38), 94.

the Church at large would have subjected them to careful scrutiny. Early Christendom was not nearly so susceptible to 'pious fraud' in this regard as some modern writers would like to suppose; and the history of the Canon and 'Apocryphal NT' bear witness to this fact.

The textual sources for the dissertation include Kittel, Swete, and Nestle.¹ In quoting from the English Bible, the King James version has usually been followed; other versions are used as indicated, and a few times the writer has given his own rendering. Abbreviations used in the text and footnotes are catalogued on p. vi.

¹R. Kittel, Biblia Hebraica (Stuttgart: Bibelanstalt, 1937); H. B. Swete, The Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: University Press, 1895); E. Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece (Stuttgart: Bibelanstalt, 1949).

CHAPTER I

PAUL AND HIS BIBLE

Introduction

The writings of the apostle Paul reveal a person immersed in the content and teachings of the OT. H. A. A. Kennedy, after a study of Paul's religious terminology, found that practically every leading conception in this field of Paul's thought had its roots definitely laid in OT soil.¹ Whether it is giving a dogmatic proof,² an analogy,³ an illustration,⁴ or merely ^{supplying} using language with which to ^{the Apostle may clothe his} clothe his own thoughts,⁵ the OT appears frequently throughout the Pauline epistles.⁶ The style and vocabulary of the apostle is such that it is often difficult to distinguish between quotation,

¹H. A. A. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913), pp. 154-160.

²E.g., Rom. 3:10-18. ³E.g., Rom. 2:24. ⁴E.g., Rom. 10:6-8.

⁵E.g., Rom. 12:20; 1 Cor. 15:32; 2 Cor. 10:17; 13:1.

⁶With these distinctions in mind writers have sought to measure Paul's fidelity to and departures from the sense of the OT passage; cf. B. Jowett, The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans; Commentary (London: Murray, 1894), pp. 191ff; F. Johnson, op. cit. It is doubtful, however, whether the categories--proof, analogy, illustration--actually denote the rationale underlying the Pauline use of the OT, although they were appropriate in answering some critics who imagined the apostle finding 'proofs' at any cost; cf. Toy, op. cit., pp. xxi, xxxvi. However, quotations which seemingly are just analogy or rhetorical accommodations often prove to have a more profound significance in Paul's hermeneutic. See infra, pp. 150, 187ff.

allusion, and language coloring from the OT.¹ This is not only the Word of God but also his mode of thought and speech; thus it is not unnatural that he should find in it vivid phraseology to apply to a parallel situation in his own day.²

The Pauline use of the OT appears in three distinct forms: quotations proper, intentional and casual allusion,³ and dialectic and theological themes.³ The task of defining 'quotation' in the Pauline literature is rather difficult, and the decision in the end is somewhat arbitrary. The apostle probably did not have our concept of quotation-marks; he certainly did not give to it the sanctity which characterizes our literary usage. Some references which are introduced with an explicit citation formula echo only the tenor of the passage;⁴ others, not given even the dignity of an introductory conjunction, follow the OT text verbatim ac litteratim.⁵

¹The non-formal character of the Pauline letters accords with this; cf. O. Roller, Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe (Stuttgart: Kohnhammer, 1933). Cf. A. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1927), p. 232; F. Prat, The Theology of St. Paul, trans. J. L. Stoddard (London: Burns, Oates and Washburne, 1945), I, 18.

²The use today of such words as "Munich," "Dunkirk," "blood, sweat and tears," follows in the same pattern. With this in mind Jowett framed his definition: "Quotation, with ourselves, is an ingenious device for expressing our meaning in a pointed or forcible manner; it implies also an appeal to an authority. And its point frequently consists in a slight, or even great, deviation from the sense in which the words quoted were uttered by their author" (B. Jowett, op. cit., p. 190).

³See Appendix I.

⁴E.g., 1 Cor. 14:31.

⁵E.g., 1 Cor. 15:32. Neither the Westcott-Hort nor the Nestle text distinguishes between quotation and allusion. S. Johnson ("Biblical Quotations in Matthew," HTR, XXXVI, April 1943, 135-153) divides between the 'formula' quotations and the others. But this is not very effective; two texts in Paul are cited with and without a formula; cf. Jer. 9:24 (1 Cor. 1:31; 2 Cor. 10:17) and Hab. 2:4 (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11).

The gradation from quotation to allusion is so imperceptible that it is almost impossible to draw any certain line. The selection in Appendix I has taken into account three factors: the presence of an introductory formula or conjunction, the degree of verbal affinity with the OT text, and the intention of the apostle as judged from the context.

The Nature of the Quotations

General Analysis

Paul quotes the OT 93 times.¹ Reminiscences are found throughout the epistles (except Philemon); but ^{direct} quotations occur, aside from four in Ephesians and one each in First and Second Timothy, only four in the Hauptbriefe. Although the quotations are drawn from sixteen OT books, three-fourths of them are from the Pentateuch (33), Isaiah (25), and the Psalms (19). The citations appear both singly and in combination.²

The texts appear in several forms. Most often they reproduce the OT passage with occasional variations in conformity with the new context.³ A few times they are merely quotations of substance whose source is conjectural.⁴ The terse manner in which

¹ About one-third of all New Testament quotations are cited by Paul.

² See Appendix III. Paul combines texts in three ways: merged quotation (e.g., Rom. 3:10-18), chain quotation or haraz (e.g., Rom. 9:25-29), and looser midrashic commentary (cf. Rom. 9-11; Gal. 3). Cf. infra, pp. 60-4.

³ E.g., Rom. 3:18 (ἀυτοῦ to ἀυτῶν); 10:5 (ἀυτοῖς to ἀυτῆ); 10:19 (ἀυτοῖς to υαῖς); 2 Cor. 6:18 (ἀυτῶ.. ἀυτοῖς to υμεῖν.. υαεῖς); Gal. 4:30 (υῖου Ἰσαακ to υῖου τῆς ἐλευθερίας).

⁴ E.g., 1 Cor. 2:9; Eph. 5:14; cf. Rom. 3:10.

some texts are cited suggests that they may have been used as a teaching or catechetical device.¹

Fifty-one of Paul's citations are in absolute or virtual agreement with the LXX, 22 of these at variance with the Hebrew.² In four passages Paul follows the Hebrew against the LXX; 38 times he diverges from both.³ Combined quotations show a much greater variation than the others;⁴ there also seems to be a relation between the variations and the particular book cited.⁵

The priority of the LXX in Pauline quotations has long been recognized. As early a writer as Henry Owen noted the fact and ascribed it to the desire of early Christian missionaries to use a translation acceptable to Hellenistic Jews.⁶ Kautzsch, in an oft-quoted dissertation,⁷ concluded that the LXX had virtually

¹ A familiar verse, quoted or summarized, could be utilized to bring the whole context before the reader's mind. Similarly, a 'pointer' or lemma text might recall a topical series previously taught them. Cf. Scott, op. cit., pp. 25-27; C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet, 1952), p. 126.

² These are chiefly from Genesis and Isaiah. See Appendix I. But in passages from Isaiah Paul also shows knowledge of the Hebrew. Cf. Rom. 10:15 (*ὑπακοή*) 1 Cor. 14:21; 15:54.

³ See Appendix I and II.

⁴ Almost all of them diverge. Of the merged quotations only two texts in Rom. 3:10ff. follow the LXX. Among the chain quotations or haraz Rom. 12:12-13; 25:29, each have one text in agreement with the Alexandrian text. Rom. 13:9, if included, should also be added.

⁵ See Appendix I. All quotations from Kings, Job, Jeremiah and Hosea differ from the LXX, as do about half of those from Isaiah and Deuteronomy. Citations from Genesis and Psalms generally agree or vary only slightly.

⁶ Owen, op. cit., p. 6.

⁷ Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 5; cf. E. Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (2nd ed. Revised; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901), II, 285; Wm. Sanday and A. C.

an exclusive place in Paul's Scriptural usage. Swete affirms that more than half of the Pauline quotations were taken from the LXX without material change and that, by any test, the LXX "is the principal source from which the writers of the New Testament derived their Old Testament quotations."¹ Even where the quotations vary from the LXX, parallel phraseology is often apparent.²

Affinities with the LXX are not only evident in Paul's quotations but ~~also~~ extend to his general style and vocabulary as well.³ It was inevitable that, after the translation of the Hebrew Bible, words in the Greek version would acquire "something of the value of the Hebrew words they represent."⁴ It was only natural that Paul, retaining in his mind Hebrew concepts

Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895), p. 302. H. Lietzmann, An die Galater (Tübingen: Mohr, 1923), pp. 32-34; H. Monnet (Les Citations de l'Ancien Testament dans les Epîtres de St. Paul, 1874) follows and develops Kautzsch's theory.

¹H. B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: University Press, 1900), pp. 392, 400ff.

²Cf. Rom. 2:27; 9:26; 1 Cor. 2:16; 6:16. See Appendix II.

³E.g., 2 Cor. 3:4-18 (Exod. 34:29-35); Rom. 1:23 (Ps. 105(106):20; cf. Jowett, op. cit., p. 201. Vollmer, op. cit., p. 10ff; Michel, op. cit., pp. 58-60. For terminology of LXX coinage see T. Nägeli, Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905), p. 60-65. A. Deissmann perhaps overstates it: "To understand the whole Paul from the point of view of the history of religion, we must know the spirit of the LXX." (St. Paul, trans. W. E. Wilson (2nd ed., Revised; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926, p. 99).

⁴Reciprocally, Hebrew words acquired some new connotations, at least in the diaspora. C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), p. xi; cf. N. H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament (London: Epworth, 1944), p. 159.

and thought-forms, should frame his Greek on the analogy of the existing theological vocabulary of the LXX.¹ Even where the apostle quite evidently sees in a citation the underlying connotations of the Hebrew, the Alexandrian version remains his mode of expression.² "The careful student of the Gospels and St. Paul," concludes Swete, "is met at every turn by words and phrases which cannot be fully understood without reference to their earlier use in the Greek Old Testament."³

The quotations show considerable distribution among the LXX text forms, none of them being followed consistently. Sometimes they agree with LXX-B, more often with LXX-A and LXX-F.⁴ There seems to be some relation between the text followed and the OT book quoted.⁵ For example,ⁱⁿ 23 quotations from Isaiah Vollmer found seven in agreement with LXX-A against LXX-B. Leviticus, on the other hand, shows affinities with LXX-F. There is no

¹Cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, Sources of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895), pp. 94f.

²A. D. Nock, "The Style and Thought of Paul," Contemporary Thinking about Paul: An Anthology, ed. T. S. Kepler (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1950), pp. 182-186.

³H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 404; cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, The Jew and Judaism during the Greek Period (London: SPCK, 1941), p. 54. The influence of the King James Version in the English-speaking world is a partial parallel. Cf. C. S. Lewis, The Literary Impact of the Authorized Version (London: Athlone, 1950), pp. 15ff; W. M. Smith, This Atomic Age and the Word of God (Boston: Wilde, 1948), pp. 44-57.

⁴E.g., Rom. 10:5; 2 Cor. 6:16; Gal. 3:10-12.

⁵This might be expected if different books were not allowed on the same roll. Cf., F. Buhl, Canon and Text of the Old Testament, trans. J. MacPherson (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1892), pp. 37f.

⁶Vollmer, op. cit., pp. 13-20, 48; Michel, op. cit., p. 3.

discernible connection, however, between the OT text and the provenance of the Pauline letter. In general, LXX-A appears to be more in accord with Paul's quotations than the other manuscripts.¹ It has been influenced in places by the NT,² but on the whole it proves "unusually trustworthy" in portions important for NT usage.³

As noted above, there are a considerable number of variations from the LXX in Paul's quotations.⁴ To account for them several hypotheses lie at hand: a direct use of the Hebrew⁵ or its employment to correct the LXX,⁶ citation from an Aramaic

¹Cf. Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 403; "In the Epistles, as in the Gospels, the text of the LXX which is employed inclines to cod. A rather than to cod. B." K. Stendahl (*The School of St. Matthew*, Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1954) affirms that this relationship "has more solid foundations than Swete himself could have known . . . (p. 176)." Cf. also W. Staerk, "Die alttestamentlichen Citate bei den Schriftstellern des Neuen Testament," *ZNTW*, 35 (1892), 464-485; 36 (1893), 70-98.

²E.g., in adding Rom. 11:35 (Job 41:3) to Is. 40:14 (Rom. 11:34) and probably taking Ps. 13:1ff from Rom. 3:10ff. Cf. Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 252; Stendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 172ff.

³E.g., Isaiah and the Minor Prophets. *Ibid.*, p. 172.

⁴Paul's vocabulary also, at times, reflects a usage distinct from the LXX. Cf. Nägeli, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-68. For a recent investigation of the Pauline text with special reference to the Chester Beatty papyri cf. G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles* (Oxford: University Press, 1953).

⁵E.g., Rom. 9:17; 10:15 (*ὡπαῖος*); 1 Cor. 3:19; 14:21; 15:54; cf. E. Huhn, *Die Messianischen Weissagungen* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1900), II, 279.

⁶E.g., Rom. 9:17, *ἡ τῆς ἰσραὴλ* = *ἐξ ἰσραὴλ*; Rom. 12:19, *ἡ πρὸς ἐμοὶ ἐπίκλησις*.

targum or translation,¹ the use of other Greek translations,² or free quotation from memory.³ Paul often gives the impression of quoting from memory, "yet a memory which was the storehouse of more than one language, and one trained in Jewish methods of bringing together passages from different books of the Old Testament."⁴ From a psychological viewpoint it might be expected that one who knew the Scripture in several languages and had a thorough knowledge of the sense of Scripture would be less tied to any text-form. "Memory quotation" should be understood, however, as a free rendering in accordance with literary custom⁵ or for an exegetical purpose,⁶ rather than as a result of "memory-lapse." The importance of scriptural memorization for the Jew,

¹Toy, *op. cit.*, p. xxxvi; Böhl, *op. cit.* Both, from partisan considerations, argue against the idea of a reference to the Hebrew. F. H. Wood ("Quotation," *HDB*, Vol. IV (1901) takes the variants ἐς νίκης (1 Cor. 15:54) and ἀγαπήσει (1 Cor. 2:9) to be from Aramaic interpretations of the Hebrew.

²Cf. Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-34; Thackeray, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

³Perhaps the reason most often given, e.g., Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 401; Sanday and Headlam, *op. cit.*, p. 302.

⁴Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

⁵For free quotation in the OT cf. the ten "words" in Exod. 20 and Dt. 5; 2 Sam. 23:17 (1 Chron. 11:19); 2 Sam. 5:19-20 (1 Chron. 14:9-11); 1 Kg. 9:3-9 (2 Chron. 7:12-22). In the Apocrypha note the allusions in Bar. 1:15-2:29 (Dan. 9:7-8; Dt. 9:7-19). For Philo's usage see H. E. Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture* (London: MacMillan, 1895), pp. xxxv-xxxvi. Examples from Greek and Latin writers and in the early fathers are cited by F. Johnson (*op. cit.*, p. 29-61) and Scott (*op. cit.*, pp. 63-83, 87-91).

⁶E.g., σοφῶν for ἀνθρώπων (1 Cor. 3:20); ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπος for ὁ ἀνθρώπος (1 Cor. 15:45); probably ἔδωκεν for ἔλαβες (Eph. 4:8); the addition of πᾶς (Rom. 10:11); cf. Prat, *op. cit.*, I, 414-417.

Paul's Rabbinic training, and the verbal exactness of many of his quotations militate against the latter explanation.¹ Moreover, the large measure of agreement with the LXX seems to reflect a conscious desire to reproduce a given text; it cautions against resorting to "free quoting from memory" as soon as differences arise.²

One of Paul's quotations shows remarkable resemblance to Greek texts other than the LXX:³

Is. 25:8	1 Cor. 15:54	Is. 25:8 (LXX)	Theodotion	Aquila	Symmachus
εϋλι	κατεπόθη	κατέπιεν	καταπόθη	καταπόντισει	καταπόθησει
μηβπ	ὁ θάνατος	ὁ θάνατος	ὁ θάνατος	τόν θάνατον	τόν θάνατον
πυιζ	εἰς νίκος	ἰσχύρας	εἰς νίκος	εἰς νίκος	εἰς τέλος

Such noteworthy parallels are few, however,⁴ and it is not certain that they reflect a common Greek version.⁵ F. H. Woods points to

¹J. Bonsirven (*op. cit.*, p. 337) rejects the idea of memory failure: "Infirmité humaine fort possible. Cependant cette explication insuffisante à convaincre ceux qui ont vu des rabbins à l'ancienne récitant des livres entiers de la Bible et devenus de vivantes concordances de l'Ancien Testament." ("Human weakness is quite possible. However, this explanation is insufficient to convince those who have seen some rabbis of the 'Old School' who recited entire books of the Bible and became living concordances of the Old Testament.")

²Cf. Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 158. ³Vollmer, *op. cit.*, p. 21-35.

⁴Paul's use of *παρουσία* (π7γ) in 1 Cor. 3:19 as contrasted with the LXX's *φρονήσις* also agrees with Theodotion's translation of π7γ in other places. Vollmer (p. 35) concludes that other versions of single OT books stand behind Paul, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. Cf. Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-34. A. Rahlfs' "Ueber Theodotion - Lesarten im Neuen Testament und Aquila-Lesarten bei Justin," *ZNTW*, XX (1921), p. 182ff.

⁵The connection may lie in a Targum. Note Aquila and Onkelos on Dt. 32:35; cf. Rom. 12:19; cf. Lietzmann, *op. cit.* For the possible use of an Aramaic targum by NT writers cf. the conclusions of M. Black, "The Problem of the Old Testament Quotations in the Gospels," *Journal of the Manchester University Egyptian and Oriental Society*, 23 (1942), p. 4.

εἰς ἄνδρας (ΠΥΓΞ) as a translation in accordance with the Aramaic meaning of the root. In some passages (e.g., Rom. 12:19) the same result is obtained if one posits an independent use of the Hebrew. It is probable that Paul was acquainted with other Greek texts;¹ however, the evidence is not sufficient to draw any certain conclusions.

The theory of an Aramaic Volksbibel finds little, if any, support in Paul's variants; the apostle's fluency in both languages would make any accurate labeling in this regard difficult.² Nevertheless, Aramaic texts of some type probably lie behind some of the citations. Besides the instances above, the variant in Eph. 4:8 also may reflect a targum,³ but its immediate source is more likely an interpretive rendering known to Paul and perhaps used in the early Church.⁴

The number and character of Pauline variations from the LXX text give rise to questions which cannot be divorced from the

¹So Lietzmann, op. cit. Vollmer, op. cit., p. 35; Michel, op. cit., pp. 63ff.

²On Paul's bilingual ability see J. H. Moulton, A Grammar Of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1919), II, 1, 21-23; cf. Acts 21:40. Note such Semitic constructions as "the light^{of the gospel} of the glory of Christ" (2 Cor. 4:4).

³So, Thackeray, op. cit., p. 182.

⁴On Eph. 4:8 see infra pp. 157ff. The Hebrew יָטַח may be rendered "for men." Meyer and Alford also note that the Hebrew verb (ΠΥΞ) may have a proleptic significance, "to fetch," i.e., to take in order to give. The fact that Paul's interpretation is found in the Syriac and the Targum shows that it is not merely arbitrary; it may point rather to his close acquaintance with the Aramaic and/or Hebrew. Cf. Rom. 9:7; 10:15; 1 Cor. 2:9. See T. K. Abbott, The Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897), pp. 111ff. Thackeray (op. cit., p. 182) notes a possible textual basis for the variant, i.e., a transposition of the letters in "take" (ΠΥΞ) and "give" (ΠΥΞ).

wider context of the problem. Some appraisal of this wider context may be of assistance in drawing conclusions regarding the OT text in the epistles.

The Problem of the Septuagint

A generation ago the "Letter of Aristeas,"¹ for all of its legendary accretions, was generally considered to be reliable in its most essential aspects, i.e., a third century B. C. Greek translation of the Pentateuch originating in the Jewish community in Alexandria. In addition, the Egyptian city was regarded as the probable later provenance of the rest of the Greek Bible, which became the regula fidei of most of the diaspora and later of the Christian church. With this view of the LXX one naturally would treat it^t as any classical text. Seek the archetype behind the three major revisions (Hesychius, Lucian, Origen) and other witnesses with the ordinary tools of textual criticism. Lagarde is a typical representative of this older school; Rahlfs, following in his train, bases the whole critical apparatus of his LXX on this view of LXX origins.²

The theory of a third century B. C. proto-LXX, passing through various revisions and culminating in the Christians' Greek Bible, faced a problem in the textual variations of OT citations in Jewish writings (e.g. Philo), the NT, and the early Fathers. These quotations often appeared to reflect, not ad hoc renderings of

¹ See Swete (op. cit., p. 1-27, 499ff) for a historical introduction and Greek text of the "Letter." An English translation is found in R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), II, 83-122.

² A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta (Stuttgart: Bibelanstalt, 1935).

the LXX or even variant LXX rescensions, but a different textual source. For a long time attempts to solve the problem were made within the framework of the traditional view of LXX origins, i.e., that it stems from one archetypal text. Aramaic targums or versions, divergent LXX rescensions, and ad hoc translations were adduced to solve the problem of the variations. The "testimony-book" hypothesis represents a special aspect of the same question.¹

In a more recent attempt to solve the problem, advanced by Paul Kahle, the whole theory of LXX origins undergoes radical alteration.² In Kahle's eyes, the "Letter of Aristeas" is a late second century B. C. propaganda piece designed to promote and standardize a recent Alexandrian revision of a Greek Torah. The legend was later attached to the Christian Greek Bible even though the Alexandrian Pentateuch was only one of the many roots of the resultant text. In short, "the Letter of Aristeas has put us on a wrong track,"³ the Greek Bible cannot be explained on the basis of an archetype at all. Its inception should be viewed rather as a development similar to the Aramaic targums and Latin Vulgate. The targums were at first oral renderings with a diversity of readings from synagogue to synagogue; later these were

¹Infra, pp. 128ff

²P. E. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza (London: The British Academy, 1947), pp. 132-179. The theory of Sperber is similar: Transcriptions and, later, translations, of which at least two Greek texts arising from two types of Hebrew texts are still identifiable. (A. Sperber, "NT and Septuagint" JBL, LIX (June 1940), 193-289; "The NT and the Septuagint" Tarbiz, VI (1934), 1-29. On the whole problem see K. Stendahl, op. cit., p. 174-182; B. J. Roberts, The Old Testament Texts and Versions (Cardiff: University Press, 1951), pp. 101-119.

³Kahle, op. cit., p. 175.

reduced to writing, and finally an official Targum evolved. In like manner the Vulgate arose out of many independent Latin texts. The Greek-speaking diaspora were no less in need of targumic paraphrases than their Aramaic-speaking brethren in Palestine. From these Greek targums the first Greek texts were derived; and out of that diversity came the later uniformity of the Christian LXX.

In the NT, behind Origen's Hexapla, in the old Latin versions, and to a lesser extent in Philo¹ and Josephus² one sees variant forms of the Greek texts in use at the time of Christ. Manson, in essential agreement with Kahle, views these texts as conforming to a regional pattern;³ the large agreement of the NT with the LXX, reflects the important place that one text form enjoyed in the early church. Much of what has come down to us,

¹In a critique of Kahle's view of Philo's aberrant quotations P. Katz (Philo's Bible, Cambridge: University Press, 1950, p. 95) argues the MSS-UF upon which Kahle relies, actually reflects a lost recension of the Pentateuch which was interpolated into Philo's lemma text. Kahle, following A. Schroeder, accepted the variant MSS-UF as an accurate text and considered Philo's LXX uniformities to have been harmonized by Christian copyists. Cf. P. Katz, "Das Problem des Urtextes der Septuaginta," Theologische Zeitschrift, 5 (1949), pp. 15-24; Stendahl, op. cit., p. 180.

²Against H. St. J. Thackeray (Josephus, the Man and the Historian, New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1929, pp. 81ff) who divides Josephus' usage between Hebrew or Aramaic targums (Pentateuch and probably Joshua, Judges, Ruth) and an ur-Lucianic recension of the LXX (rest of historical Books). Kahle assigns the variant texts to Greek targums and the Lucianic affinities to Christian copyists. T. W. Manson ("The Cairo Geniza: A Review," Dominican Studies, II (April 1949), 183-192) suggests that a Greek targum may lie behind the Lucianic text itself.

³Manson, op. cit. For example, Theodotian (an Ephesian according to Irenaeus) finds parallels in 1 Cor. 15:54 and John 19:37, both of Ephesian origin. If behind Theodotian lies a Greek targum of Asia, likewise there may lie targums of Syria and Egypt. Stendahl, (op. cit., p. 160), however, finds Theodotian in Matthew and surmises that Paul's acquaintance stems from Greek studies under Gamaliel. Cf. Sotah 49 (SBT, pp. 265ff).

states Manson, "is the debris of a primitive diversity only very imperfectly overcome rather than the record of sporadic lapses from a primitive uniformity."¹ And so Kahle concludes: "The task which the LXX presents to scholars is not the 'reconstruction' of an imaginative Ur-text, nor the discovery of it, but a careful collection and investigation of all the remains and traces of earlier versions of the Greek Bible which differ from the Christian standard text."^{1a}

Kahle presents his case in thorough fashion, but his handling of the Aristeas tradition² and the quotations of Philo³ is open to question; the lack of an extant Greek targumic tradition also militates against such a process on the scale which Kahle envisions.⁴ "This [theory] is a most radical attitude to the relation of NT quotations to the Greek OT," objects Stendahl, "and Kahle has hardly faced its implications from the NT point of view. . ."⁵ Such a cleavage of opinion is not likely to be

¹Manson, op. cit., p. 191.

^{1a}Kahle, op. cit., p. 179.

²See Swete's treatment (op. cit., p. 1-27). Kahle does not mention the testimony of Aristobulus (2nd century B.C.) which Swete inclines to regard as genuine (op. cit., pp. 12f, 18f). Assuming the "Letter" to be a 100 B.C. propaganda piece, it does not follow that it was entirely baseless. Evidences of antiquity of the tradition in the "Letter" and in Philo (de vita Mosis, II, 25-44 trans. F. H. Colson (London: Heineman, 1935), VI, 461-470) are not easily dismissed.

³Supra, p. 137

⁴Kahle admits the use of a revised Greek text in the diaspora c. 100 B.C. (cf. Schurer, op. cit., ii, II, 285). Yet Aramaic targums do not appear until ca. 1st century A.D., and the evolution of the text-form is much later. Assuming a parallel developmental process (oral to written targum to text) it is hard to imagine the Greek having gone to completion so much earlier, even granting the retarding effect of Rabbinic proscriptions in Palestine.

⁵Stendahl, op. cit., p. 176. cf. B.J. Roberts, op. cit., pp. 101-119.

reconciled until many theoretical elements in the whole problem can be replaced by additional historical data; some recent evidence of this sort appears to favor an archetypal view of LXX origins.¹

As the above observations indicate, the text behind Paul's quotations is a most difficult problem. While the Alexandrian version probably had the character of an official translation for the diaspora in certain areas² and plays an important role in Paul's usage,³ it cannot be regarded as the apostle's sole textual source.⁴ His fluency in Aramaic and Greek might, at first blush, favor an ad hoc rendering. However, affinities with other Greek texts and the familiar manner in which the quotations are often introduced suggest that Paul made use of variant translations or renderings known to his readers.⁵ Whether these were independent

¹Viz, Greek texts among the Qumran MSS. F. M. Cross ("The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls," BA, XVII, February 1954, 2-21) regards them as "decisive evidence" (p. 12) for the older view. D. Barthelemy ("Redecouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante," Revue Biblique, 60, January 1953, 18-29) thinks they represent an old LXX revision which is a common denominator behind Aquila, Theodotian, and Symmachus. They appear to be in close relation to some patristic quotations and to Origen's text (cf. Cross, op. cit., pp. 12ff).

²Philo's veneration for the LXX doubtless reflects the attitude of a great many Hellenistic Jews (Philo, de vita Mosis, II, 25-44; Colson, VI, 461-470).

³He probably possessed some rolls of Scripture (2 Tim. 4:13) and had access to texts in the synagogues.

⁴Paul's variant citations from Job are not, as Kautzsch thought, because of the lack of a LXX translation of that book; Philo (de mut. nom., Colson, V, 167) quotes Job 14:4 from the LXX. Neither do Kautzsch nor Vollmer settle the question of Paul's knowledge of Hebrew (cf. Zahn, op. cit., I, 70).

⁵As only one book was permitted on a roll, it was quite possible to have various text forms in one collection. cf. Buhl, op. cit., p. 38.

texts or merely revisions within the LXX family cannot be determined with certainty, but the evidence does not point to any great number of independent textual traditions or to a great abundance of Greek targums.¹ Some of Paul's variants show the influence of the Hebrew;² others can be traced to no text at all-- they are Paul's own rendering in which he interprets and applies as he quotes.³ The nature of the problem and the incomplete state of textual evidence preclude any final adjudication of the matter; the words of Sanday still remain relevant for several Pauline passages: "[There is] not sufficient evidence to say whether this [variation] arises from a reminiscence of the Hebrew text . . . , or from an Aramaic targum, or from the use of an earlier form of LXX text."⁴

The inconclusive character of results obtainable from textual criteria leads one to consider a solution, or at least a partial solution, on other grounds. There is always a temptation to relieve oneself of textual difficulties by taking recourse in 'free paraphrase' or 'interpretive rendering.' Nevertheless, several factors, both in the textual analysis⁵ and in the overall

¹A. Deissmann, Paul, op. cit., p. 100. "It is not improbable that Paul made use of a text in the LXX which had already undergone a Jewish revision." Cf. Barthelemy, op. cit., supra, p. 15n.

²See Appendix I.

³Cf. Bonsirven, op. cit., p. 377. See infra, pp. 187ff.

⁴Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 302.

⁵Especially pertinent are variations in the citations of one epistle taken from one OT book. Although, as Vollmer pointed out (supra p. 6), there is some relation between the text-form and the book quoted, this is not uniformly true; in quotations from

Pauline hermeneutic,¹ indicate that the answer to many of these problems may lie in this direction.

Paul's Attitude to Scripture

General Considerations

Paul's use of the OT cannot be understood apart from his attitude toward it.² To him the Scriptures are holy and prophetic;³ they constitute the very oracles of God (τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ),⁴ and they "were written . . . for our learning."⁵ All his important doctrines are buttressed by an appeal to his Bible;⁶

Isaiah Rom. 1:27-28 varies from the LXX but vs. 29 agrees; Rom. 10:15 varies, vs. 16 agrees; Rom. 3:15-17 varies, Rom. 15:21 agrees; 1 Cor. 2:16 varies, 1 Cor. 15:32 agrees; 2 Cor. 6:17 varies, 2 Cor. 6:2 agrees. It is impossible to reduce the problem to the simplicity, "What text of a given OT book was available to Paul in a given city from which he wrote?"

¹See infra, pp. 187ff.

²For a very good essay on the attitude of NT writers to Scripture see B. B. Warfield, Revelation and Inspiration (New York: Oxford University Press, 1927), and the article "Scripture" in HDCC. A review of a recent re-issue of Warfield's book (The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible, London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1951), appears in SJT, 7 (March 1954), 104-108.

³Rom. 1:2; 4:3.

⁴Rom. 3:1-2. That the phrase does not refer to Holy Scripture against G. Kittel's (KTW, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933- , IV, 144ff) contention that the reference is to Heilsgeschichte in the OT and NT, see J. W. Doere, "Some Notes with reference to τὰ ΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ in Rom. III 2," Studia Paulina, J. de Zwaan Festschrift (Haarlem: Bohn, 1953), pp. ; Warfield, op. cit., pp. 351-407. T. W. Manson examines the word λόγια in the LXX, NT, and patristic writings and concludes that it refers to divine utterances in Scripture, not Scripture itself ("The Life of Jesus," BJRL 29: 1945-1946, 392-428).

⁵Rom. 15:4.

⁶Cf. A. R. Gordon, "Quotations," HDAC, ed. J. Hastings, Vol. II (1918).

to place the origin of Scripture in God Paul's phrase "God-breathed" (θεόπνευτος)¹ could hardly be improved upon. In his view of the OT the apostle is not only in agreement with Christ² and the other NT writers³ but with the whole of Judaism⁴ and the early Church.⁵

Although the OT is sometimes referred to by Paul as "the law,"⁶ "the writings,"⁷ or "the law and the prophets;"⁸ "the scripture" (ἡ γραφή) is the prevailing usage.⁹ These

¹2 Tim. 3:16. There is no basis in Pauline thought for constructing this passage to divide between γραφή which is God-breathed and other γραφή which is not.

²In Mt. 19:7 ("he who made them . . . said . . .") Christ attributes the text of the OT to the mouth of God. Cf. J. Hänel, Der Schriftbegriff Jesu (Gutersloh: Bertelsmann, 1919).

³Cf. 2 Pet. 1:21. The γραφή is not of its own "breaking forth" (ἐπιλύσους) but, carried along by the Holy Spirit, the prophets spoke ἀπὸ Θεοῦ.

⁴H. Holtzmann, (Die Pastoralbriefe, p. 163, quoted in Warfield, op. cit., p. 272) writes: "[The writer] shares the Jewish conception of the purely supernatural origin of the Scriptures in its strictest form, according to which 'theopneustic' is ascribed immediately to the Scriptures. . ." Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley, An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha (London: SPCK, 1935), p. 83.

⁵Cf. E. Reuss, Canon of the Holy Scriptures trans. D. Hunter (Edinburgh: J. Gemmell, 1884), p. 210; E. Grafe, Das Urchristentum und das Alte Testament (Tübingen: Mohr, 1907), p. 18; A. Harnack, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, trans. J. Moffatt (2nd ed. Revised: London: Williams & Norgate, 1908), I, 279-289. The last, though colored by the author's presuppositions, is an informative treatment.

⁶E.g., 1 Cor. 14:21 (Is. 28:11-12).

⁷Col. 2:14 cf. 2 Tim. 3:15 (ἐνὰ γραμμάτα).

⁸E.g., Rom. 3:21.

⁹As in the Fourth Gospel; αἱ γραφαί is more usual in Mark and Luke.

designations probably stemmed from the three divisions of the Jewish canon;¹ sometimes they were still applied in this distinctive sense.²

Lightfoot regards the singular *γραφή* in the NT as always indicating a particular passage of Scripture;³ although this is generally true, Warfield's observation is more accurate; "(Often the) reference is to the Scripture as a whole, to that unitary written authority to which final appeal was made. In some of these passages it is no less than impossible to take it otherwise."⁴ In Warfield's opinion the anarthrous use of *γραφή* (1 Pet. 2:6; 2 Pet. 1:20; cf. 1 Tim. 3:16) is explicable only on this basis.

The Introductory Formulas (IF)

One of the earliest examinations of IF was made in the 17th century by Surenhusius,⁵ who sought to show that the IF supplied a clue to the purpose of the quotation and the reason for its textual variations. In 1789 Henry Owen, pointing to the fact that the same quotations, in the same words, to prove the same point, had different IF, discarded the theory as baseless.⁶ Owen lays down

¹Cf. Luke 24:44.

²E.g., Rom. 7:7; 16:26; 1 Cor. 9:9. See E. Huhn, op. cit.

³J. B. Lightfoot, The Epistle to the Galatians (London: MacMillan, 1884), p. 147.

⁴Warfield, op. cit., p. 140; cf. Rom. 4:3; 9:17; 10:11; 11:2; Gal. 3:8, 22; 4:30; 1 Tim. 5:18. On the IF *καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή* (Jn. 7:38) R. V. G. Tasker (The Old Testament in the New Testament, 2nd ed. Revised; London: SCM Press, 1954, p. 58) concurs: "The reference would seem to be to many Old Testament passages rather than to a single prophecy." Cf. 1 Cor. 14:21; Jas. 4:5. See KTW, I, 753-754.

⁵Surenhusius, op. cit.

⁶Owen, op. cit., pp. 12f.

the rule that the chief, if not sole, purpose of the IF was to show that the words "are either taken from, or have some reference to, books of the Old Testament."¹ This precept still serves as a good foundation from which an investigation can proceed. In Rom. 4:17 *καθὼς γέγραπται* introduces a proof-text for an argument, but that is hardly its import in Rom. 8:36; in Rom. 4:17 the formula introduces a verbatim quotation, in 1 Cor. 1:31 the text is very free.² In Rom. 7:7 *ὁ νόμος ἔλεγε* is used with a verbatim citation; but the virtually identical *ὁ νόμος λέγει* in 1 Cor. 14:34 concludes a very general reference to the teaching of various OT passages.³ There is a tendency at times to use certain formulas for a specific purpose, but for the most part the wide variety of IF only illustrates the apostle's stylistic freedom.⁴

In the Pauline epistles an IF using "it is written" (*γέγραπται*) is most common (29 times),⁵ "the scripture says"

¹Ibid. Variations in IF were taken to reflect only the nature of the subject, cast of the discourse, the current idiom, and imitation of former writers. With the exception of *ἐνὰ πληρωθῆ* which does not occur in the Pauline writings, and possibly *δοὶ λέγει* this classification is quite satisfactory. Cf. Toy, op. cit., p. xxx; Rom. 1:17 (Gal. 3:11); 9:33 (Rom. 10:11); 10:5 (Gal. 3:12); 10:16 (Jn. 12:38); 1 Cor. 1:31 (2 Cor. 10:17); 9:9 (1 Tim. 5:18); Gal. 3:6 (Jas. 2:23).

²Cf. also Gal. 4:22.

³Cf. Mt. 2:23; Jn. 7:38; 8:17; Jas. 4:5. J.B. Lightfoot (Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul, London: MacMillan, 1895, p. 263) and Thackeray (Paul and Jewish Thought, p. 188) take the postscript position of the IF in Rom. 2:24 to indicate that the quotation is deliberately disengaged from its OT context. But this occurs where the IF precedes the quotation also, e.g., Rom. 9:25. See infra, pp.

⁴Cf. especially Rom. 4:18; 7:7; 9:9; 11:4; 1 Cor. 15:54; 2 Cor. 4:13.

⁵Not including Gal. 4:22 where the general teaching of the

(ἡ γραφή λέγει) is second in frequency (six times). Other IF with λέγω are recurrent, e.g., "David says,"¹ "the law says,"² "God said;"³ sometimes λέγει is used without a subject expressed but with God or Scripture probably to be understood.⁴

The IF are particularly important in showing Paul's attitude to the OT. Even in the Greek world the formula καθὼς γέγραπται was used with reference to the terms of an unalterable agreement;⁵ for the Jew it signified much more--the unalterable Word of God.⁶ "The Scripture says," "God says," and "Isaiah says" are for Paul only different ways of expressing the same thing.⁷ In two passages the Scripture is personified and viewed as speaking to someone or foreseeing certain events.⁸ Weizsäcker has not put it too strongly: "In short the written word is equivalent to Providence, so certainly is it the declaration of the Divine will."⁹ Often where the Scripture writer is named as speaker it

OT is in view. See Appendix I. Cf. D. M. Turpie, The New Testament View of the Old, for a comprehensive tabulation of IF in the NT.

¹Rom. 4:7, 8; 11:9, 10. Cf. "Isaiah says" (Rom. 10:16, 20; 15:12); "Moses says" (Rom. 10:19).

²Rom. 7:7 (1 Cor. 14:34).

³2 Cor. 6:16; cf. Rom. 9:15; 2 Cor. 6:2; Rom. 11:4.

⁴Cf. Rom. 15:10; Gal. 3:16; Eph. 4:8; 5:14; See infra, pp.

⁵A. Deissmann, Paul, p. 101.

⁶For the use of IF in Jewish literature see infra, pp. 58ff.

⁷Cf. Warfield, op. cit., p. 283-332.

⁸Rom. 9:17;

⁹C. von Weizsäcker, The Apostolic Age, trans. J. Millar (2nd ed; London: Williams & Norgate, 1894), p. 132.

is the words of God which are quoted;¹ however, he does not, as Christ,² quote God as speaker when in the OT He does not so appear.³ Perhaps the finality with which Paul uses the absolute *γέγραπται* supplies as good an indication as any of his view of Scripture. Regarding this formula, Warfield's words are apropos: "No better index could be afforded of the sense of the unitary authority of the doctrine so cited which dominated the minds of the writers of the New Testament and of our Lord as reported by them."⁴

To what extent do Paul's IF reflect his appreciation of the 'human element' of Scripture? Vollmer notes the manner in which Paul distinguishes between the Torah, Nebim and Ketubim and cites the human author as the speaker; this is contrasted with the anarthrous *λέγει* prevalent in Hebrews.⁵ Michel, in a similar view, writes:

[Der] Verfasser immer unmittelbar an den göttlichen Ursprung des Orakels denkt, ohne irgendein Interesse für die menschliche Vermittlung des Wortes zu zeigen. Der tiefer~~e~~ Grund für diese stilistische Verschiedenheit liegt in der abweichenden Inspirationsvorstellung. Paulus hat für die menschliche Vermittlung des alttestamentlichen Gotteswortes Interesse; die alexandrinische Auffassung schaltet diese möglichst aus. Die philonische Inspiration wird durch das Wort charakterisiert: "Ein prophet sagt überhaupt nichts Eigenes, sondern er ist nur Dolmetscher, ein anderer gibt ihm alles, was er vorbringt, ein. So lange der Prophet in Begeisterung ist, ist er seiner selbst nicht bewusst, die Vernunft eilt fort und hat die Burg der Seele verlassen" (de. spec. leg. IV, 49). Die paulinische Auffassung der Inspiration wird dagegen durch das Wort Rom. 10:20f gekennzeichnet: "Jesaia wagt es und sagt . . ." Für Paulus bleibt also der Prophet eine Persönlichkeit,

¹Cf. Rom. 10:19f.

²Mt. 19:4.

³This is not particularly significant; Paul seldom quotes God specifically as speaker in any case, viz, 2 Cor. 6:16; 2 Cor. 6:2; Rom. 9:15.

⁴Warfield, op. cit., p. 147. ⁵Vollmer, op. cit., p. 73.

die mehr bedeutet als ein blosses Gefäss oder ein Musikinstrument für den göttlichen Geist.¹

While it is true that Paul gives full recognition to the human personalities of the writers of the Scripture, it is questionable whether this is the purpose or even the main point reflected by Paul's IF. Actually the contrast between the apostle's formulas and those of Hebrews and Philo is one of frequency rather than of disjunction or antipody.² In Hebrews the human author is adduced in two formulas;³ Philo too, for all his mechanical view of inspiration, occasionally mentions the human author in citing the OT.⁴ Paul, on the other hand, has four IF in which God is

¹Michel, *op. cit.*, p. 68, 69: "[The author of Hebrews] thinks immediately on the divine origin of the Oracle, without showing any interest in the human instrument communicating the Word. The deeper reason for this stylistic difference lies in their diverse view of inspiration. Paul has an interest in the spokesman of God's Word in the Old Testament; the Alexandrian view suppresses this as far as possible. Philonic inspiration is characterized by the saying 'A prophet says absolutely nothing on his own but is only an interpreter. Another inspires him with all that he says. So long as the prophet is, in the spirit, he knows nothing of himself; his reason withdraws and surrenders the citadel of the soul' (de. spec. leg. IV, 49, Colson, VIII, 27). The Pauline view of inspiration on the other hand, is seen in the expression of Rom. 10:20: 'Isaiah makes bold and says' For Paul therefore, the prophet remains a personality, more significant than a mere tool or musical instrument for the Divine Spirit."

²W. Leonard (*The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1939), who argues for the Palestinian background of Hebrews, points out some instances on the other side (pp. 265-282).

³Heb. 9:20 (Μωϋσῆς] λέγων); 12:21 (Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν); cf. Heb. 4:7. B. F. Westcott (*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London: MacMillan, 1892, pp. 469-495), does not consider these passages as quotations in the strict sense.

⁴de agric., 50 (Colson, III, 135): "the writer of the Psalms says;" de somn., II, 172 (Colson, V, 521): "one of the ancient prophets . . . said;" de poster. Caini, 12 (Colson II, 335): "But Moses will counsel;" (cf. de gigan., 6, Colson, II, 449).

the subject;¹ λέγει without a subject is found six times.² Moreover, the phrase, "saith the Lord," occurs a number of times within the quotation where it is not a part of the OT text,³ even when God is not the speaker.⁴ The Pauline formulas using the human author are found, with three exceptions,⁵ in Rom. 9-11, a discourse of special character.

The adduction of the Scripture writer in the Pauline IF probably is designed to fix the place of citation.⁶ Certainly Paul's usage gives due weight to the human aspect of Scripture and does not endorse Philo's mechanical explanation. But modern writers, in contrasting the 'human' and 'divine' element in first century views of inspiration, are viewing the writers through twentieth century glasses and reflecting emphases of their own day. In Paul the 'human' and 'divine' in Scripture appear as one

¹Rom. 9:15; 11:4; 2 Cor. 6:2, 16.

²Rom. 9:25; 10:21; 15:10; Gal. 3:16; Eph. 4:8; 5:14. Of the seven IF in Paul's discourses in the Acts (Ac. 13:32, 33, 34, 35, 40, 47: 23:5; 28:25) only one mentions the human author (28:25). In three God is the speaker, in one the Holy Spirit, in one the Lord; two are passive. It may be that this phenomena is editorial, but the other IF in Acts argue otherwise. Cf. Leonard, *op. cit.*, p. 268: "The book of Acts indicates that the omission of human names would have been more usual when quoting Scripture to Jews."

³Rom. 12:19; 1 Cor. 14:21; 2 Cor. 6:17f.

⁴1 Cor. 14:21 (Is. 28:11f); cf. 2 Cor. 6:17.

⁵Rom. 15:12; 1 Cor. 9:9; Rom. 4:6.

⁶Cf. Acts 13:32, 35, 40; Rom. 9:15, 25; 1 Cor. 9:9. E. Lohmeyer (*Kyrios Jesus*, Heidelberg: Winters, 1928, p. 13) compares Rom. 11:2 (ἐν Ἠρακλῆ) with Phil. 2:5 (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) and suggests that the Scripture is viewed as being in the prophet. Thackeray's (*Paul and Jewish Thought*, p. 182) explanation is much preferable: "This was a common and indeed . . . the only mode of more nearly locating a quotation."

inseparable whole, not as 'elements' to be contrasted. On his formula, "Isaiah waxes bold and says," nothing would puzzle him more than Vollmer's remark 'how human.'¹

In conclusion, Paul's IF do give important insights into his attitude toward the OT.² The Scripture is adduced as a final authority and one divinely planned whole whose significance is bound up inseparably with the New Covenant Community of Christians. However, the use and frequency of certain IF is not a sufficient basis for defining Paul's view of inspiration in contrast to that of other first century writers.

Τραγή and *Τράμμα* in Pauline Usage

The notable NT scholar, Adolf Schlatter, was once approached by an ardent admirer who poured forth his praise: "I've always wanted to meet a theologian who stands on the Word of God." Schlatter, in solemn mien, replied, "Thank you, sir. But I don't stand on the Word of God; I stand under it."³ This distinction between standing on or under the Word of God is seen in Paul's use of the OT. The essential difference between Paul and the Jews in their employment of Scripture was an interpretive one;⁴ and it is in this very area that the essence of *γρᾶφή* lay. In Paul's eyes

¹Vollmer, *op. cit.*, p. 73. However, Vollmer goes on to say that his starting point of absolute inspiration teaching is unmistakable.

²Cf. L.M.Sweet, "Quotations," *ISBE*, ed. J. Orr, Vol. IV (1949).

³Related to the writer in a conversation with Karl Heim.

⁴See *infra*, pp. 67-98.

the Jews stood on the Scripture; though they extolled it, they erred because they did not know it.¹ Their interpretations were only an exegesis in which their own ideas were grafted into Scripture; and its true meaning remained hidden from them.

Paul's concept of *γραφή* is bound up with his use of two other words, *γράμμα* and *πνεῦμα*.² *Γράμμα* is usually employed in an uncomplimentary manner in the Pauline epistles.³ Frequently it is set in opposition to *πνεῦμα* and, sometimes, to *νόμος* :

† Διὰ here may be διὰ of attendant circumstances: = "though you have the letter and circumcision, you break the law."

"Through[†] the letter and circumcision you break the law" (Rom. 2:27).

"(True) circumcision is . . . in the Spirit not in the letter" (Rom. 2:29).

"We are delivered from the law . . . that we might serve in the newness of the Spirit not in the oldness of the letter" (Rom. 7:6).

". . . ministers of the New Covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit because the letter kills but the Spirit makes alive" (2 Cor. 3:6).

". . . ministry of death in letters . . . ministry of the spirit" (2 Cor. 3:7).

For the most part *γράμμα* does not here signify merely letters (Buchstabe) but the legal system seen only as "written and prescribed" ordinances.⁴ In Rom. 2:29 circumcision "by" the Spirit is contrasted to circumcision "by" the letter. Even in

¹ Cf. Mt. 22:29.

² On *γράμμα* and ~~πνεῦμα~~ *γραφή* see KTW, op. cit., I, 749-769.

³ An exception is seen in 2Tim. 3:15: ". . . from a child you have known the *ἐν τῷ γράμματι* . . ."

⁴ KTW, op. cit., I, 765.

2 Cor. 3:7 where the sense is "in the form of letters," the wider significance of his earlier usages is not negated. According to Schrenk Paul is saying not only that "das Judentum buchstäbelnde Auslegung der Schrift habe . . . sondern das die ganze alte Phase der Offenbarung noch nicht durch Christus und seine Geist bestimmt ist."¹ This is true in the sense of 'law versus grace,' but the distinction should not be viewed merely as a temporal one.

Γραφή and *νόμος* both signify for Paul the revealed will of God.² But the law understood as a legal system apart from Christ could only bring death;³ so also the whole OT understood and applied without the illumination of the *πνεύμα* often resulted not in *γραφή* but only in *γράμμα*.⁴ In Judaism this ^{or} synthesis of Word and Spirit had been lost and the Scriptures had become mere 'letters'; the Law had become an end in itself rather than a means to evoke faith in God's grace; through their false interpretations the Word of God had been made ineffectual.⁵ The issue of the law versus Christ here passes into Paul's understanding of the nature of Scripture itself. *Γραφή* is the Spirit-carried letter, the Spirit-interpreted letter. Therefore, Paul

¹Ibid., I, 767: "...Judaism has a pedantic exegesis of Scripture . . . but that the whole old phase of revelation is not yet channeled through Christ and his Spirit."

²Cf. Rom. 7:14.

³E.g., Rom. 7:6.

⁴Paul, of course, considered the OT to be Divine revelation in an objective sense. The defect lay not in the writings but in the sin-clouded minds of the readers, and, in some cases, was God's judgment upon their sin. Cf. Acts 28:25ff (Mk. 4:11f); Rom. 11:7ff; 1 Cor. 14:37f.

⁵Cf. Mt. 15:6.

does not hesitate to give his OT citations as interpretive renderings; and he is convinced that he conveys the true (i.e., the Spirit's) meaning best in this way. Thus Paul rejects the Law, yet he uses the Law; the apparent antinomy is resolved by differing between the Jewish and spiritual understanding of it.¹ In First and Second Corinthians Paul teaches expressly that a correct understanding of Scripture is impossible without the Holy Spirit.² In Michel's words:

Die *γραφή* kann nur gesund bleiben, wenn sie mit dem *πνεύμα* ganz eng verbunden bleibt. Das *πνεύμα* muss aus der Schrift sprechen.³

The place of the Spirit does not lessen the authority of the OT for Paul; nor is there any antithesis between the Scripture and the Spirit.⁴ The apostle does not answer the problem of two persons having the Spirit and yet differing as to the interpretation of Scripture. It may be that the Spirit's meaning is to be found through some such procedure as Acts 15; many answers may have to be qualified with a frank admission of uncertainty.⁵ In

¹Cf. Vollmer, op. cit., pp. 73ff.

²Cf. 1 Cor. 2; 2 Cor. 3:14.

³Michel, op. cit., p. 178. "The *γραφή* can remain beneficial only if it remains entirely bound together with *πνεύμα*. The *πνεύμα* must speak out of the Scripture."

⁴Michel, following Luther (see editor's preface in M. Luther, Epistle to the Galatians, London: Clarke, 1943, pp. 1-15), views the relationship as a circle. One must have the Spirit to understand the Scripture; on the other hand it is through the Scripture that the Spirit is given. (Michel, op. cit., p. 179). (Cf. G. W. Bromiley, "The Authority of Scripture," The New Bible Commentary (2nd ed.; London: IVF, 1954), pp. 16, 18f, 22.

⁵So, 1 Cor. 7:40. But in 1 Cor. 14:37 Paul does not hesitate to ascribe a contrary opinion to a lack of spiritual discrimination in interpreting either the OT or a teaching of Christ.

any case, Paul thinks of the *γραφὴ-πνεύμα* relationship as a whole and does not attempt to give a detailed application of the principles involved.¹

The Relation of *Γραφή* to other Authority

Besides the Scripture there are several other authorities to which Paul appeals to support his assertions. There are the law of nature, the conscience of the individual, his own revelation from Christ or the Holy Spirit, and the teaching of Christ as received through oral or written apostolic tradition. Although the natural order is the source of many analogies,² it is evoked only a few times as an authority; in Rom. 1:18ff (cf. Rom. 2:14ff) God's power and Deity are declared to be taught by nature; distinction between the sexes in manner of appearance and dress is also in the very nature of things.³ The authority of the individual conscience plays an important part for Paul: Regarding eating food offered to idols, one's own conscience is to be obeyed, and the consciences of others not to be offended;⁴ by disobeying

¹Cf. Michel, *op. cit.*, p. 179. No solution, however, lies in Michel's suggestion that on particular Scriptures two Spirit-filled persons could interpret "ganz anders." The whole relationship cannot be so divorced from its concrete application.

²Analogies of law (Rom. 7:1-3; Gal. 3:15; 4:1ff), occupations (Rom. 9:21; 1 Cor. 3:7, 24ff) and natural phenomena (Rom. 11:16-24; 1 Cor. 12:14) are common. The OT is used in this manner as well, e.g., 2 Cor. 4:6, 13, as is the example of Christ, e.g., 2 Cor. 8:8-9. They serve only as illustrations, however, and not as an appeal to authority; their propriety depends upon the authority of the user or their appeal to the logic of the hearer.

³1 Cor. 14:11.

⁴1 Cor. 8:7ff; 10:25ff; Cf. Rom. 14:23. Also Rom. 2:15; 13:5 may be viewed as referring to a sort of universal conscience.

the voice of conscience the faith of some has been made shipwreck.¹ Writing to the Galatians, the apostle grounds the very nature of his gospel in a personal revelation from Jesus Christ;² it is only after citing this authority and the witness of their own experience that the evidence of the OT is brought to bear.³ The condemnation of the Corinthians for their desecrations of the Lord's Supper is founded upon Christ's own words as to the nature of that service;⁴ Paul's command against divorce is similarly based upon the known teaching of the Lord.⁵ These appeals to other authorities is not inconsistent with the apostle's appeal to Scriptural authority.⁶ They are complementary and, with some qualifications in the case of *ουρελθῆναι*, are all different manifestations of the same Divine authority.⁷

This appeal to different authorities is at times found in close combination though there seems to be no consistent pattern

¹ 1 Tim. 1:19.

² Gal. 1:11, 16ff; 2:5 (but contrast Rom. 1:2); cf. 1 Thess. 4:15. The instances in Rom. 14:14 (cf. 1 Cor. 7:40) seem to be more in the nature of a 'witness of the Spirit' than specific revelation; cf. Col. 3:16.

³ Gal. 3:1-5, 6ff.

⁴ 1 Cor. 11:23ff.

⁵ 1 Cor. 7:10 (Mt. 7:31); cf. 1 Cor. 9:14 (Mt. 10:10); Gal. 6:2 (Jn. 13:34). See C. H. Dodd, "ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ" Zwaan, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-110; 1 Cor. 5:6; Gal. 5:9 (Mt. 16:6-12). Further, cf. C. H. Dodd, Gospel and Law (Cambridge: University Press, 1951), pp. 64-81.

⁶ There are authorities inconsistent with Scripture which Paul condemns; any authority contrary to his gospel (Gal. 1:8f) and the wisdom of this world (1 Cor. 1-3; cf. Rom. 1:22; Col. 2:23). The touchstone for judgment is not to go "beyond that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6).

⁷ But Paul does not, as Test. Neph. 5:8 (CAP, II, 338), label as *ὑποφάνη* a revelation in a vision. Cf. KTW, I, 751.

of association. For example, in 1 Cor. 9:7-14 Paul proceeds from the analogy of nature to the witness of the OT; immediately he returns to another analogy, the practice of the temple, and clinches the whole argument citing the command of Christ directly bearing on the subject.¹ 1 Cor. 15:3-11 is even more noteworthy: Christ's resurrection is grounded in the OT, the apostolic tradition, and Paul's personal revelation. The *ἐν Χριστῷ* concept and OT evidence is then adduced to show that this necessitates the resurrection of believers.² Paul's own authority plays a much larger role in his epistles than is usually assigned to it. A few times it is of a very qualified nature,³ but for the most part it is asserted with no indication of being anything less than absolute. He does not often state its basis, but it appears to arise from his firm conviction of guidance from the Holy Spirit and from his authority as an apostle. Paul concludes his discussion of glossolalia with the words: "If anyone thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that what I am writing to you is a command of the Lord."⁴ With reticence but firmness he warns the Corinthians in his second letter of the authority that he has from the Lord.⁵ Instructions concerning the

¹Michel (*op. cit.*, p. 164) sees the progression as analogy: Scripture :: analogy: Word of Christ, i.e., the Scripture and the Herrenwort are equated.

²*Viz.*, the Adam typology (1 Cor. 15:21f) and the promises to Christ (1 Cor. 15:25ff).

³Cf. 1 Cor. 7:12, 25, 40.

⁴1 Cor. 14:37. The verse may refer to a teaching of Christ; but the words imply primarily the guidance of the Spirit. Cf. Dodd, "*ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ*," p. 105.

⁵2 Cor. 10:8; 13:10.

Christian's relation to the State are enjoined without citing an authority,¹ as are his commands regarding spiritual gifts.² Many other themes are developed at least in part without reference to any rule apart from his own. It is true that sometimes OT texts³ and his former instructions⁴ underlie the words, but they do not account for all of his paraenetic and doctrinal teachings. It is impossible, of course, to know just how much knowledge of the OT and the apostolic traditions [that] Paul assumes on the part of his readers; this precludes any finally definite conclusions in the matter.

The important place which authorities other than the OT occupy in Paul's letters gave rise to Harnack's novel thesis that Paul never intended the OT to be the Erbauungsbuch of Christianity at all:⁵ Paul's quotations are virtually confined to his four Hauptbriefe, and since they are dominated by a 'Law versus Gospel' dispute which necessitated the use of the OT, they cannot be regarded as the norm for Pauline teaching. An investigation of the five other Pauline letters (omitting Philemon as irrelevant and the Pastorals as non-Pauline) reveals an entirely different

¹Rom. 13:1-7 (but cf. Mt. 22:21).

²1 Cor. 12-14.

³E.g., Rom. 2:13; cf. Rom. 10:5; Gal. 3:12 (Lv. 18:5).

⁴Former instructions from Scripture or the apostolic traditions appears implied in the repeated use of οὐκ ὀφείλουτε in 1 Cor. 6:3, 9, 15, 16; only the last instance is followed by an OT citation (cf. 1 Cor. 3:16; 2 Cor. 6:16). It may, however, only refer to their Christian common-sense.

⁵A. von Harnack, "Das Alte Testament in den Paulinischen Briefen und in den Paulinischen Gemeinden," pp. 124-141.

treatment of the OT.¹ Although covering a variety of subjects, there is in general no appeal to the Scripture; it is never cited under *γραφή* or *γέγραπται*, and only one of the two formula quotations refers to the canonical writings.² In these epistles it is to the 'Word of the Lord' (i.e., the Christian Verkündigung not the OT),³ to the Gospel,⁴ to Paul's own authority, revelation or example,⁵ and to their former teaching⁶ that appeal is made. In Colossians one looks in vain for an invocation of the OT against the Gnostic influence; even the theme of righteousness by faith in Philippians occasions no reference to the OT.⁷ In these epistles, according to Harnack, one sees the real Paul⁸--an apostle for whom the gospel and the Spirit were primary, whose teaching of Christ, salvation, and ethics is developed independently of the OT, and whose OT allusions were not even designed to be

¹B. Weiss, (Biblical Theology of the New Testament, trans. D. Eaton, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882, I, 381) had also noted that there were no quotations "in the epistles to the purely Gentile-Christian churches of Thessalonica, Philippi, and Colossae."

²Eph. 4:8; 5:14.

³1 Thess. 1:6, 8; 2:13; 2 Thess. 2:15; 3:1.

⁴1 Thess. 2:2, 8, 9; 3:2.

⁵1 Thess. 4:15; 2 Thess. 3:6. In Colossians and Philippians also appeal to the OT is passed over time and again as the apostle speaks in his own authority.

⁶1 Thess. 1:4; 4:2; 5:2. ⁷Phil. 3:9.

⁸In Harnack's opinion even First Corinthians is not inconsistent with this picture. The quotations in chapters 1-4, 9 are ad hominem, to satisfy the readers' desire for ingenious exegesis. Other OT quotations (6:2, 16ff) are quoted not as the *γραφή* of a holy book but simply as Gottespruch (Harnack, op. cit., pp. 129-137).

recognized as such by his Gentile readers.¹ The question arises: If Paul subordinated the OT to the gospel and the Spirit, how did Christianity become a 'book-religion?' Harnack describes this development, which was in firm-mold after First Clement, as resulting from two factors.² First, there was from the beginning a large faction for whom Christianity had two points of reference, the Gospel and a 'holy book.' Second, Paul, though desiring a Christianity based upon the Spirit rather than upon a Book, unwittingly aided this process by his typological exegesis and his occasional appeal to the authority of the OT. "Mit dem $\delta\iota\prime\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta$ [in 1 Cor. 9:10] beginnt die Geschichte des AT als Erbauungsbuch in den Kirche aus den Heiden . . ."³

Harnack's thesis is an important contribution to Pauline studies in calling attention to questions formerly neglected. It demonstrates, too, the weakness of the argument that Paul used OT proofs like patches from a rag-bag--anything to fit the argument; he did not need to resort to such expedients. But the main issue raised turns on the interpretation of a fundamental component of Pauline thought. Does the place of the OT in Paul's teaching, especially as evidenced in his four Hauptbriefe, represent only an ad hominem usage or at best a subordinate authority

¹It is doubtful to Harnack that Paul's churches had Scripture readings from the beginning; $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta\upsilon$ (1 Cor. 14:26) is not so taken by Harnack (op. cit., p. 137). But cf. O. Cullman, Early Christian Worship (London: SCM, 1953), pp. 29f.

²Harnack, op. cit., pp. 138-141.

³Ibid., p. 138: ~~English translation:~~ "With the $\delta\iota\prime\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta$ [in 1 Cor. 9:10] begins the history of the OT as Erbauungsbuch in the church of the Gentiles. . ."

suiting to a particular argument? Harnack's position is modified by Lohmeyer who contends that Paul can, equally well, use the OT as his Gospel source-book (Romans and Galatians) or establish his teachings entirely independent of it (the smaller epistles).¹ But even with this modification the question remains: Is the lack of citations in the smaller epistles so significant for Paul's attitude toward the OT as Harnack believes?

Michel, against Harnack, points to the use Paul makes of the OT in describing his own missionary labors; the discourses of the Acts also militate strongly against the view that Paul's attachment to the OT is only one of convenience.² The tendency in Harnack's thesis is to equate the Scripture with the *γρῶμα* of the Jews and then to contrast this with the Spirit and the Gospel. But the OT was not one of those things which Paul counted loss for the sake of Christ; indeed, it could be understood only in the light of Christ.³ There are many reasons to explain Paul's infrequent use of the OT in the shorter letters, and Harnack's is one of the least likely. The use of an authority other than the Jewish Scriptures may well have been more suitable for many questions which arose, especially in a young Gentile assembly. But it does

¹E. Lohmeyer, Grundlagen der Paulinischen Theologie (Tübingen: Mohr, 1928), p. 104. H. Windisch (Paulus und das Judentum, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 71-73) gives a similar view: One may, as Harnack, play down Paul's use of the OT, or, as others, exaggerate it; in truth Paul is both an OT Biblicist and a Christian teacher; and with a young Gentile church he can do without the OT very well.

²Michel, op. cit., pp. 130f; cf. Acts 23:5; 24:14; 26:23; Rom. 8:36; 10:15-18; 14:11.

³Cf. KTW, I, 768: Paul argues against a 'Book-religion' to the extent of its being a mere occupation with the letters; but that does not mean that with the execution of the *γρῶμα* the *γρῶμα* is also done away with.

not follow that thereby the OT was set aside or subordinated any more than a citation from Isaiah implies a lower view of Jeremiah. The shorter epistles, usually written with one or two specific and immediate questions in view, do not provide a comprehensive criterion for Paul's teaching to his Gemeinde regarding regulative authorities. The variegated usage in the Hauptbriefe is much more representative in this respect.¹ For Paul, Jesus was above all the Christ; to divorce the Messiah from the 'book-religion' of the OT was hardly a task for a Jew--even one converted through personal revelation.

The Extent of *Γραφή* : Paul's Canon

It is a reasonable inference that the body of writings accepted as authoritative by the first century Jewish community serves as Paul's criterion of canonical authority as well. A problem arises, therefore, when in Paul's letters one finds quotations or references which are not to be found in the Jewish body of authority and yet which, from their context and IF, refer to authoritative writings. Several possible solutions to the dilemma present themselves:

1. Paul is freely paraphrasing one or several canonical passages or repeating a paraphrase in common use.
2. He is quoting a non-canonical writing, which itself makes use of a scriptural paraphrase, as an appropriate rendering of the OT and with no intention of vesting authority in the apocryphal document.
3. The apostle's canon differs from Palestinian Judaism in

¹The writer's discussion of authorities for Paul other than *Γραφή* was made with Harnack's dictum in mind and primarily considers the Hauptbriefe (cf. supra, pp. 29-32).

including oral and recorded sayings of Jesus, and psalms and oracles of the apostles and/or early Christian prophets. Certain of his quotations stem from this source.

4. His canon embraces certain apocryphal Jewish literature, ^{writings,} and he uses these on occasion in an authoritative sense.

There is considerable evidence that the Jewish canon was in completed form in the first century and that it embraced the writings commonly received by Protestant churches today.¹ The enumeration of Josephus--five books of Moses, thirteen of the prophets,² four of hymns and moral precepts³--reflects a current view of the extent and designated divisions of the Jewish OT.⁴ These divisions, without enumeration, are cited in the prologue to Sirach (c. 132 B. C.)⁵ and by the Lord.⁶ Philo might be expected to reveal any Alexandrian accretions to or variances from the Palestinian canon. However, "he makes no quotations from the Apocrypha, and he gives

¹Cf. J. Leipoldt, Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1907), p. 5-27. W. Staerk, "Der Schrift und Kanon-Begriff der Jüdischen Bibel," ZFST, VI (1928), 101-119. For the origin and development of the Hebrew Canon see W. H. Green, An Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon (London: Murray, 1899).

²Judges-Ruth, ^{Joshua,} Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, ^{Esther, Job, Isaiah,} Jeremiah-Lamentations, ^{Ezekiel,} and ^{Daniel} Minor Prophets were each on one roll and probably so counted. In Josephus' list Daniel seems to be included in the 'Prophets.'

³Probably Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon.

⁴Josephus, contra Apion 40, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray (London: Heinemann, 1926), I, 179; cf. Ta. 8a (SBT, p. 31). For the consistency of this testimony with other witnesses see, Buhl, op. cit., pp. 18-32. The disputes arising in first century Jewry (e.g., at Jamnia) were not to establish a canon but to answer objections made against some of the received books (Buhl, p. 27). Such objections were recurrent in Jewish circles until as late as the third century; cf. H. E. Ryle, The Canon of the Old Testament, (London: MacMillan, 1892), pp. 177f.

⁵Charles, op. cit., I, 293.

⁶Luke 24:44.

not the slightest ground for the supposition that the Jews of Alexandria of his time were disposed to accept any of the books of the Apocrypha in their canon of Holy Scripture."¹ It is true that Philo is concerned almost exclusively with the Pentateuch and may just never have had occasion to quote the Apocrypha.² But if there were a controversy between the diaspora and Palestine concerning the canon, one would expect some hint of it in Philo; and there is none.

There are a few quotations in the Pauline epistles which do not appear at first blush to be derived from the OT. The passages most often questioned in this regard are 1 Cor. 2:9 (IF : γέγραπται), Eph. 4:8 (IF : λέγει) and Eph. 5:14 (IF : λέγει). Probably 1 Cor. 15:45b (IF : γέγραπται) and 1 Tim. 5:18b (IF : ἡ γραφή λέγει) should be included in the same category. Each of these passages is introduced with an IF normally used in the NT and Jewish literature for citing Scripture,³ although only one (1 Tim. 5:18) expressly uses the word γραφή .

¹H. E. Ryle, Philo and Holy Scripture, p. xxxiii: There is some affinity in subject matter and phraseology, particularly with the Wisdom literature, but it is not sufficient to suggest actual allusion.

²Some OT books are not quoted either: Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel (ibid., p. xxxi).

³Some hold that the anarthrous λέγει (cf. Eph. 4:8; 5:14) does not imply a scriptural citation (cf. Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, p. 248); but it certainly has that significance in Hebrews, Philo and the Mishnah; cf. A. Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (London: Longman, Green, 1889), I, 187. And many commentators so view it here; cf. Toy, op. cit., p. 198. Clemen, op. cit., p. 220; Warfield, op. cit., p. 118. On δὲ λέγει cf. Heb. 3:7; 10:5; Jas. 4:6.

In the case of the first three citations the lack of a solution is not the result of a paucity of suggestions. 1 Cor. 2:9 has been attributed to an apocryphal writing,¹ an apocryphal phraseology of OT texts,² a Jewish anthology of OT passages³ (and an apocryphal passage),⁴ and a free paraphrase of the OT by Paul.⁵ Eph. 4:8 is generally taken to be a Pauline use of a common Jewish interpretation of the OT passage.⁶ On Eph. 5:14, older commentators have generally assigned it to an exegetical paraphrase or summary of Is. 60:1, 19ff (cf. Is. 9:2; 26:19; 52:1)⁷ or, with Jerome, to an

¹Ascension of Isaiah; So, Origen on Mt. 27:9; cf. B. Weiss, op. cit., p. 383; Huhn, op. cit., pp. 270f; Leitzmann, op. cit., p. 33; Michel, op. cit., p. 37. Origen's suggestion is rejected by Jerome; if true, it was probably a Christian interpolation; cf. Lightfoot, Notes, pp. 176f.

²F. B. Denio, "Quotations," HDCG, ed. J. Hastings, Vol. II, (1907).

³Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, p. 244; cf. B. P. W. S. Hunt, Primitive Gospel Sources (London: Clarke, 1951).

⁴Vollmer, op. cit., pp. 47f. (Is. 65:15 / Sirach 1:10).

⁵E.g., Is. 64:4 / 65:16; cf. Jas. 1:12; G. B. Stevens, The Pauline Theology (London: Dickenson, 1892), p. 65; J. B. Lightfoot, Notes, p. 176; J. Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938), p. 30; F. Johnson, op. cit., p. 149.

⁶So, E. F. Scott, The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930), p. 207; Abbott, op. cit., p. 112; Jerome on Is. 64:4 and Epistula 57:9 "ad Pammachium"; cf. Michel, op. cit., p. 34.

⁷Cf. B. Weiss, op. cit., p. 383; Denio, op. cit.; Stevens, op. cit., p. 66; Toy, op. cit., p. 199; F. H. Woods, op. cit.; M. W. Jacobus, "The Citation Eph. 5:14 as affecting the Paulinity of the Epistle," Theologische Studien, B. Weiss, Festschrift, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1897, pp. 9-29) argues at length that the reference is to Johan 1:6, taken by Paul as Messianic typology.

apocryphal source.¹ Recent writers have suggested a verbum Christi² or, more often, an early Christian hymn giving a Messianic paraphrase of several OT passages.³

While no dogmatic answer can be given regarding these passages, at least some priority may be assigned to the several possibilities. The presence of an IF raises the inference of an immediate or ultimate OT source;⁴ another factor pointing in this direction is the use by Paul in other places of paraphrastic renderings and merged quotations.⁵ If Paul had a variant Greek text closer to his quotations, a textual solution is not improbable for 1 Cor. 2:9 and Eph. 4:8.⁶ In the latter case the problem lies in the interpretation of the Hebrew $\Pi \rho \xi$ (Ps. 67(68):19) as $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$ rather than the LXX $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\varsigma$. The Syriac Version and a Targum

¹Huhn, op. cit., pp. 270f; Leitzmann, An die Galater, p. 33; cf. Abbott, op. cit., p. 157.

²Cf. Abbott, op. cit., p. 157.

³Hunt, op. cit., p. 131; M. Dibelius, An die Kolosser, Epheser, Philemon (Tübingen: Mohr, 1927), p. 69; A. M. Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors (London: Nicholson and Watson, 1940), p. 44; E. G. Selwyn, The First Epistle to Peter (London: MacMillan, 1952), p. 417; E. F. Scott, op. cit., p. 231.

⁴For IF in Jewish literature see infra, pp. 58-60.

⁵See Appendix II, III. Quotations giving the general tenor of Scripture are also found in Jer. 7:28 and Jas. 4:5.

⁶The text of 1 Cor. 2:9 in Clement of Rome (34:8) and The Martyrdom of Polycarp (2:3) lies between Paul and the LXX; cf. Lightfoot, Notes, p. 176. Paul's rendering is found in a Jewish collection (Mikropresbutikon, Basle, 1950, p. 316) suggesting its use in first century Jewish circles; cf. Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, p. 243. Paul's order (seeing and hearing) is followed in First Clement and the Apostolic Constitutions (7:32). The LXX order appears in 2 Clement 11:7 and in the Martyrdom of Polycarp; cf. Michel, op. cit., p. 35.

give the same interpretation as Paul.¹ The manner in which the two Ephesian citations are introduced does not suggest an ad hoc rendering; it is probable that the apostle follows an OT text or interpretive paraphrase familiar to his readers. The word *Χριστός* in Eph. 5:14 rules out any immediate citation of the OT. It may well be an early Christian paraphrase giving the import of several OT passages.²

The quotations in 1 Cor. 15:45 and 1 Tim. 5:18, both cited as Scripture, suggest another answer to the whole problem.³ The latter clause in each of these passages seems logically and grammatically within the quotation,⁴ yet neither is from the OT. 1 Tim. 5:18b is a saying of Jesus;⁵ the former passage (1 Cor. 15:45b) of undetermined origin.⁶

If early Christians had an extended concept of *γραφή*, it is not likely that it lay in the direction of Jewish apocryphal writings.⁷ A departure of this kind surely would have aroused some

¹Cf. SBK, III, 596ff. The Hebrew verb may be taken proleptically "to fetch," i.e., to take in order to give. Cf. Abbott, op. cit., pp. 110ff; H. A. W. Meyer, The Epistles to the Ephesians and Philemon, trans. M. F. Evans (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1880), p. 206.

²See infra, pp.

³Cf. also 2 Tim. 2:19; 2 Cor. 6:2; 1 Tim. 3:16.

⁴E.g., the argument in 1 Cor. 15 partly rests on that portion of the quotation.

⁵Mt. 10:10; Lk. 10:7; cf. Acts 20:35.

⁶That this properly belongs within the quotation is argued by M. Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," SJT, 7, (June 1954), pp. 170ff.

⁷Jewish apocalyptic literature often lends itself to an interpretation akin to NT eschatology, yet not once are these documents

vocal repercussions in canon-conscious first century Judaism. Yet there was an extension of the concept of γραφή in the apostolic community--an extension in another direction: The sayings of Christ were regarded as the Word of God by Paul,¹ and 2 Pet. 3:16 appears to equate the Pauline writings with Scripture; furthermore, the exercise of the gift of prophecy was no less from the Holy Spirit than the oracles of the OT prophets. If these observations are correct, and if Eph. 5:14 does not find its ultimate source in the OT, the most probable alternative source is a saying either of Jesus or of a Christian prophet.³

cited as Scripture. If the Ascension of Isaiah (cf. 1 Cor. 2:9) is post-apostolic, Jude 14 is the only NT citation with a certain apocryphal parallel. Although the IF in Jude does occur once in the NT introducing Scripture (Mt. 15:7), it more commonly signifies only the oracular saying (cf. Lk. 1:6, 7; Jn. 11:5; Acts 19:6; cf. 1 Cor. 14). The polyrhizal character of the Book of Enoch (cf. CAP, II, 163ff) favors the possibility, at least, that the Enoch saying had an independent existence in Jewish tradition. If the Book of Enoch was Jude's source, it does not necessarily follow that he considered it Scripture. Contrast the IF in Barnabus 16:5.

¹C. G. Dodd ("ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ", pp. 96-110) argues convincingly that ο νόμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (cf. Gal. 6:2) refers to specific teachings or commands of Christ and that they formed "in some sort elements of a new Torah" (p. 107) for Paul and the early Church. The use of λέτα βεν (1 Cor. 9:14) favors such a view. Dodd here withdraws his former view (The Bible and the Greeks, p. 37) equating νόμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ with νόμος τοῦ πνευματικῆς. The former, in distinction, conveys the idea of ἐπιτάγαι or διατάγματα κυρίου.

²Cf. Acts 2:16ff; 19:6; 21:4, 9ff; 1 Cor. 14. These Spirit-inspired utterances evidently included hymns as well; cf. 1 Cor. 14:15.

³Cf. Rom. 13:11; Jn. 5:25; cf. E. Lohmeyer, Kyrios Jesus on Phil. 2:5ff and 1 Tim. 3:16. Κατὰ τὰς γραφάς in 1 Cor. 15:3ff has been attributed to an early Christian passion narrative. (cf. V. Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, London: MacMillan, 1949, pp. 48ff). Others relate it to Hos. 6:1ff. Cf. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 103. However, it may refer only to the general teaching of the OT with 'the third day' given as a recitation of the fact, not covered by the κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.

The influence of non-canonical Jewish writings in the Pauline epistles is discussed in the following chapter. Whatever the extent of their use by the apostle, it was in the nature of a vehicle or intermedium to the OT; they did not serve as a seat of authority in themselves. The only divergence from the Palestinian canon revealed by Paul's quotations lay within the tradition of the Apostolic Church, from which was to emerge the *γραφή* of the New Covenant.¹

¹Paul's quotations from pagan writers (cf. Acts 17:28, Aratus; 1 Cor. 15:33, Meander; Tit. 1:12, Epimenides) are of course not references to *γραφή*. For similar OT citations from various documents cf. Nu. 21:14; Josh. 10:12; 1 Kg. 11:41; 2 Chron. 12:15.

CHAPTER II

PAUL AND JUDAISM

Introduction

This and the following chapter consider Paul's use of the OT in the light of two significant elements of his environment, first century Judaism and the early Christian community. "If God wished to give his people a series of letters like Paul's," writes Warfield, "he prepared a Paul to write them, and the Paul he brought to the task was a Paul who spontaneously would write just such letters."¹ The Paul God prepared was a Jew, a Pharisee, and a rabbi; more than all, he was a slave of Christ whose heart and mind had been renewed to proclaim the Gospel of God.

Without doubt the apostle's understanding of the OT was completely revolutionized after his conversion; nevertheless his Jewish heritage remained of fundamental importance for his understanding and use of the Bible. His reverence for and study of the Scriptures long preceded his knowledge of Christ. Reading habits, methodology, and hermeneutical norms were firmly implanted by his parents, his synagogue, and most of all, his teacher in rabbinics--Gamaliel. Indeed, apart from Christianity itself, it is most probable that Palestinian Judaism was the only determinative influence in Paul's life.² It is certainly adequate to explain any of his OT

¹Warfield, op. cit., p. 155.

²W. C. van Unnik (Tarsus of Jerusalem, De Stadt van Paulus' Jeugd, Amsterdam: Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1952), in a very

relationships not grounded in the practice of the early Church or originating in his own thought.¹ Klausner, in a considered opinion, goes even further: "Intensive research over many years has brought the writer of the present book to a deep conviction that there is nothing in the teaching of Paul--not even the most mystical elements in it--that did not come from authentic Judaism."²

Having recognized the place of Judaism in Paul's thought,

acute argument, contends that Paul went to Jerusalem as an infant. His hypothesis rests basically upon Acts 22:3 and Acts 26:4,5. In the former text Paul declares that he was "brought up" (ἀνατετραμένος) in Jerusalem; van Unnik refers this, not to Gamaliel's teaching, but to Paul's parental "upbringing." The subsequent verb παιδεύω properly applies to the educational guidance of a teacher and follows (i.e., is not simultaneous with) the ἀνατετραμένος at home. The assertion of Acts 26:4, 5 retains its argumentative worth only on the supposition that Paul came to Jerusalem at a very early age. van Unnik's summary is translated in W. E. Phipps, "The Attitude of the Apostle Paul toward Scripture," Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews, 1954; pp. 32-36. Paul could have acquired even his Greek language and literature at Gamaliel's school; cf. Sotah 49 (SBT, pp. 265, 269f).

¹Alexandrian Judaism is also to be considered, but its importance is secondary and probably mediate. The significance of Hellenism, even for Paul's thought as a whole, has been revised sharply downward since the days of Adolph Deissmann. C. A. A. Scott (Christianity According to St. Paul, Cambridge: University Press, 1939) regards it as negligible: "So far as the content of his preaching was not due to the fact of Christ, its content and also its form were derived almost exclusively from Judaism" (p. vii). In his ministry "he starts from Jewish postulates, assumes the validity of Jewish Scriptures, and operates with Jewish argument and illustration" (p. 9). The influence of Greek mystery religions in Pauline thought is critiqued in J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), pp. 66ff. Cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions. Literary practices similar to the Stoic 'Diatribē' and the συνομιλίαι (infra, p. 65) appear in the Pauline Epistles but relate to matters of style rather than content. Cf. R. Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe (Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Reprecht, 1910; A. Bonhoffer, Epiktet und das Neue Testament (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1911).

²J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul (London: Allen and Urwin, 1942), p. 466.

a note of caution should be added. From that day on the Damascus road, the home of Paul's heart and of his mind never again lay in Judaism; if his name could ever have graced a rabbinic tractate as 'R. Saul,' it is certain that 'St. Paul's' writings are of a different genus altogether. Dom Gregory's words are pertinent and apt:

St. Paul has by now stood his trial on the charge of Hellenizing Christianity to make it acceptable to the Greeks--and the verdict is decisively 'Not Guilty' . . . It would not be altogether surprising if in a few years' time he had to stand another trial, on a charge of 'Rabbinizing' a Galilean Gospel and making it unintelligible to Greeks. However, St. Paul had much experience of trials and usually managed to come off fairly well.¹

Contemporary Jewish Exegesis²

To determine the character of first century Jewish exegesis there are three main sources apart from the NT to which one may appeal: rabbinic literature, writings of later Palestinian Judaism (i.e., 150 B. C. -100 A. D.), and works emanating from the Jewish community in Alexandria.

The rabbinic literature, as finally codified in the Targums, Talmud, and Midrash, represents a development of almost a thousand years.³ After the return from the Babylonian Exile in

¹G. Dix, Jew and Greek (London: Dacre, 1953), p. 3.

²Cf. C. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, trans. S. H. Hooke (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Trubner, 1939); G. F. Moore, Judaism (3 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927); E. Schürer, op. cit.

³See J. W. Etheridge, The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan . . . with Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum (London: Longman and Green, 1865); I. Epstein, ed., The Babylonian Talmud (London: Socino Press, 1935), Seder Nezikin, pp. xiii-xxvii; H. Freedman, The Midrash (London: Socino Press, 1939), I, pp. ix-xxiii; J. Z. Lauterbach, Mekilta (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1935), I, xiiff. For a good introductory survey see R. A. Stewart, The

the fifth century B.C., oral teaching became a fixed and growing supplement to the Holy Scriptures.¹ The Targums, reduced to writing comparatively early,² were Aramaic paraphrases designed to render the OT text in the vernacular; in the very nature of the case, however, they assumed an interpretive character. Exegesis proper took the form of Midrash (וִּשְׁתַּחֲוֹת = investigate),³ a running commentary on the text, and of the Mishnah, a topical commentary on related texts and traditions.⁴ The latter (second-third century), with its own commentary--the Gemara, formed the Talmud (compiled ca. fifth century) in which the Scriptures were ingeniously interpreted to accommodate the laws and traditions of the

Earlier Rabbinic Tradition (London: IVF¹⁹⁴⁹); cf. H. Danby, The Mishnah (Oxford: Clarendon, 1933), pp. xiiiff.

¹According to Jewish tradition revelation, which began with the Patriarchs, ceased with Malachi. Cf. F. Weber, Judische Theologie (Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1897), pp. 80ff; Josephus, contra Apion, I, 41, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray (London: Heinemann, 1926), I, 179. L. Zunz (Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, Frankfurt: Kauffmann, 1892, pp. xviii-xx), sought to narrow the gap between the written and oral law by showing that later portions of the OT were often liturgical interpretations of the older and that oral traditions exhibited something of the same character. This may explain why in the NT the major prophet--Isaiah, Jeremiah--is often named even though the secondary writing--Zechariah, Malachi--is more directly cited. Cf. Mk. 1:2; Mt. 27:9.

²Gamaliel (first century) is said to have possessed a targum of Job. Zunz contends that most OT books were in translation about that time. (Zunz, op. cit., pp. 61f, 64; cf. Shab. 115a; SBT, p. 565.

³Cf. Ezra 7:10.

⁴This difference of form, and the tendency of the Mishnah-form to depart further and further from any Scriptural reference, caused them to develop into separate and competing disciplines. Cf. Freedman, op. cit., I, xiv.

rabbis.¹

Although the Peshat (פשוט), or primary meaning, theoretically remained supreme, rabbinical exegesis almost exclusively applied the texts to contemporary situations by means of Halacha (הלכה) and Haggada (הגדה).² The former, largely used in the Talmud,³ related to the exposition of legal provisions; Haggada encompassed everything else.⁴ Mielziner finds an example of both types in Lev. 19:3: Halachic exposition notes that "man" (אדם) not only means male but also includes woman; the Haggada explains that "mother" stands before "father" to counter-balance the natural tendency of a child to fear his father.⁵

The oldest norms of rabbinic interpretation are the seven rules of Hillel (ca. 30 B. C.--):

1. a. fortiori (הבבא דאורייתא)

¹E.g., the rabbinical custom of an early breakfast in summer is derived from Is. 49:10: "They shall not hunger nor thirst, neither shall the heat or sun smite them;" cf. B. K. 92ab (SBT, p. 534). Rabbinical rulings had a value independent of Scripture, and often Scripture proofs were recognized as a mere formality if not superfluous. Cf. Weber, op. cit., p. 92; Z. H. Chajes, The Students Guide Through the Talmud, trans. J. Shachter (London: East and West Library, 1952), pp. 29-32; BK. 46b (SBT, p. 264).

²M. Mielziner, Introduction to the Talmud (3rd ed.; New York: Block, 1925), pp. 117ff; cf. W. Bacher, "Bible Exegesis-- Jewish;" SJE, III, 162-174; G. Aicher, Das Alte Testament in der Mishna (Freiburg: Herdersche, 1906), pp. 107-140.

³Though considerable Haggadic matter is also there. Cf. Shab. 30a-33b (SBT, pp. xxxiv, 131-158); Ber. 54a-64a (SBT, pp. 327-405); Mielziner, op. cit., p. 57.

⁴E.g., parables, legends, homiletical illustrations and ethical teaching; cf. Mielziner, op. cit., pp. 56ff; W. Bacher, "The Origin of the Word Haggada," JQR, IV, (1892), 406-409.

⁵Kid. 30b-31a (SBT, pp. 148f); cf. Mielziner, op. cit., pp. 148f; Gn. R., LXXXVII, 5; XCIV, 9 (SMR, II, 808-877).

2. analogy of expressions ($\pi\iota\upsilon$ $\pi\tau\iota\lambda$)
- 3.4. generalization ($\tau\pi\alpha$ $\beta\iota\gamma\delta$ ϵ ζ)
5. general and particular ($\delta\epsilon\zeta$) $\{\xi\}$
6. analogy of a similar passage ($\tau\pi\alpha$ $\beta\iota\gamma\delta$ ϵ ζ)
7. contextual explanation ($\beta\iota\gamma\delta$ $\epsilon\zeta$)

For example, a bailee must pay if a rented animal is stolen, but not if it dies (Ex. 22:9f); a fortiori, a gratuitous bailee, who is bound if the animal dies, must pay if it is stolen, though the scripture does not specifically so teach (Ex. 22:14).¹ If "sixty years" (lev. 27:7) be interpreted as over sixty (i.e., sixty-one and over), by analogy, so should "twenty years" in the preceding context since the same word, $\pi\iota\upsilon$, is used.² A millstone shall not be taken as security because it is a man's "life" (Dt. 24:6); the rule may be generalized to include anything used to prepare food.³ Since the particular phrase, "to do evil or . . . good" (Lev. 5:4), implies the future, the general injunction, "If a soul swear . . .," applies only to oaths of the future; for the general is only as inclusive as the particular.⁴ Ex. 16:29 is qualified by the context; otherwise it would forbid leaving one's house at all on the Sabbath.⁵

Sources
of above
parables?

These rules are a type of reasonable inference which is as old as logic, and they find parallels in all literature; but the casuistical use to which the rabbis put them produced conclusions far beyond the 'reasonable inference' of most minds.

¹B. M. 95a (SBT, p. 549).

²Ar. 18a (SBT, pp. 106f).

³B. M. 115b (SBT, p. 656).

⁴Shebu. 26a (SBT, pp. 137f).

⁵Shab. 1 (SBT, p. 1).

For example, no Israelite could suffer in Gehenna: The gold plate on the altar resisted fire, how much more a transgressor in Israel.¹ Not bad in themselves, they were susceptible to abuse; and for this abuse the rabbis are well known.²

After the destruction of the temple in 70 A. D. a rival method of exegesis, popularized by Akiba, extended exegetical casuistry to unknown lengths.³ Although opposed at first,⁴ its ensuing dominance is responsible for many of the extravagances of rabbinic exegesis,⁵ e.g., the emphasis on Gematria,⁶ Notarikon,⁷ and Themoura.⁸

There are several objections to taking the rabbinics of the Talmud and Midrash as representative of first century Judaism.

¹Hag. 27a (SBT, p. 171).

²Although not accounting for all their rabbinical fancies, some of their exposition was given with tongue in cheek: "The greatest fault to be found . . . is perhaps that they did not observe the wise rule of Johnson who said to Boswell on a certain occasion 'Let us get serious, for there comes a fool!' And the fools did come in the shape of certain Jewish commentators and Christian controversialists who took as serious things which were only the expression of momentary impulse . . ." S. Schechter, Studies in Judaism (London: A. and C. Black, 1896), p. 240.

³Cf. Gn. R., LIII, 15 (SMR, I, 474).

⁴Cf. Shebu. 26a (SBT, p. 138) for one controversy between Ishmael and Akiba.

⁵Cf. Mielziner, op. cit., pp. 124ff; Singer, op. cit., pp. 164ff; P. P. Levertoff, Midrash Sifre on Numbers (London: SPCK, p. xiv.

⁶I.e., exegesis by letter-number equivalence; cf. Nu. R., XIII, 15f; XVIII (SMR, VI, 535f, 734ff); F. Weber, op. cit., pp. 121f.

⁷I.e., constructing words from the letters of a word.

⁸I.e., commutation of Letters to fit a secret meaning; cf. F. W. Farrar, "Rabbinic Exegesis," The Expositor, Second Series, 5 (1877), 362-378.

The literature is late and includes only the views of the Pharisaic element which became dominant after 70 A.D. The destruction of Jerusalem and the subsequent dispersion, as well as the rise of Christianity, doubtless affected the literature.¹ Nevertheless, in general one may accept as genuine the NT parallels in the Talmud; it is not likely that alterations were in the direction of Christianity to any extent.²

The apocalyptic writings of later Judaism have an entirely different spirit from the rabbinic tomes. Formerly regarded as popular and individualistic,³ it is now realized that this literature also had its 'schools'⁴ and in them--their messianic emphasis

¹An attempt at approximate dating is made in C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, A Rabbinic Anthology (London: MacMillan, 1938), p. 709-737. Some talmudic references are applied to Paul (e.g., Ab. III, 11f; SBT, pp. 34f; cf. J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, trans. W. E. Stinespring, New York: MacMillan, 1943, pp. 600ff), and passages mentioning the Minim (מ'י'י'ב) or heretics are understood of Christians (e.g., Shab. 116 (SBT, pp. 567ff); cf. R. T. Herford, Christianity in the Talmud and Midrash (London: Williams and Norgate, 1903). In Sanh. 38b (SBT, p. 244) the Minim are definitely distinguished from Gentiles and identified with apostate Jewish (Christian-?) elements. Because of the late character of the writings Schweitzer concluded that we know practically nothing of first century Rabbinism. A. Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 48; cf. A. S. Peake, "Quintessence of Paulinism" Bulletin of the John Ryland's Library, IV (September 1917), 9, 10.

²cf. C. G. Montefiore, Rabbinical Literature and Gospel Teachings (London: MacMillan, 1930), p. xvii; Edersheim (Jesus the Messiah, II, 710) holds that interpretations were altered in opposition to Christian teaching.

³Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, pp. 13f; Schürer, op. cit., II, 48f. See Thackeray for a discussion of the respective books.

⁴The Dead Sea Scrolls reveal not only a sectarian community but a school of thought with considerable affinity to the NT. The composite character of first Enoch, also suggests something more than isolated individuals; CAP, II, 193ff; cf. infra, pp. 167ff.



and their interpretive methods--is evidenced a truer line of succession from the Prophets to Christ than the Judaism of the rabbinic order. Indeed, Fourth Ezra and the Apocalypse of Baruch, written shortly after Paul's day, "in their wide survey of the ordering of the world, offer the largest field of illustration for the Pauline epistles."¹

The recently discovered manuscripts of the Qumran Sect shed considerable light on apocalyptic Judaism of the first century B. C.² Although the precise nature of the community is still undetermined, they were dissenters from orthodox Pharisaism with some affinities with, and differences from, the Essenes.³ Their prophetic emphasis⁴ (contra the rabbis and Philo) and the peculiar character of their exegesis make them especially interesting from the NT point of view.

The writings of this party, evidently including the well-

¹Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, p. 20; cf. Peake, "Quintessence of Paulinism," pp. 10f.

²The dating of the scrolls has been a matter of controversy, but the vast majority of opinion favors the first or second century B. C. Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, trans. E. M. Rowley (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952), p. 32. For a bibliography on the DSS see H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952).

³Cf. B. J. Roberts, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Old Testament Scriptures (Manchester: John Ryland's Library, 1953), p. 75; M. H. Gottstein, "Anti-Essene Traits in the Dead Sea Scrolls" VT, VI (April 1954), 141-147; Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., pp. 70, 85-96; CAP, II, 788ff.

⁴Cf. OT quotations in the Zadokite Fragments: Law (ten times), Prophets (eleven times), Hagiographa (once). In Paul the emphasis is the Pentateuch, Psalms, Isaiah; in Zadokite Fragments, the Pentateuch, the Twelve, Isaiah.

known Zadokite Work, contain much apocalyptic material.¹ Brownlee classified the hermeneutic of the Habakkuk Scroll and, apart from its eschatological character, found the form to be essentially rabbinic midrash.² He detects various rabbinic devices used to obtain the desired interpretation. For example, the first word of Hab. 1:9 is read with the preceding verse.³ The practice of Notarikon and Themoura as well as the influence of Hillel's rules are, according to Brownlee, also in evidence.⁴ As in the rabbis, allegorical interpretation is a minor element; but, in contrast, DSH makes no appeal to other Scriptures.

While Brownlee minimizes the relation of DSS exegesis with the NT,⁵ other writers have noted their hermeneutical affinities:

¹E.g., Habakkuk, portions of Micah, Ps. 68, 107. Cf. B. J. Roberts, "The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls: A survey," The Congregational Quarterly, XXXII (April 1954), 114-124.

²Brownlee here defines midrash not as is usually done--a style or form of writing--but as an exegetical method devoting itself to the derivation of hidden meanings (p. 76). W. H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," BA, XIV (September 1951), 54-76.

³Cf. Gamaliel's proof of the resurrection: "Behold thou shalt sleep with thy fathers and rise up" (Dt. 31:16); Sanh. 90b (SBT, p. 605).

⁴E.g., Hab. 1:12: 7151 ("O Rock") in the text and ¹("will be distressed") in the commentary; cf. Brownlee, op. cit., pp. 54ff, 73, 74ff. However, it is not at all certain that the commentary's interpretation rests merely on cabalism. The text (Hab. 1:8f) mentions a coming in violence with faces set toward the East; the commentary elaborates that they come in anger with nostrils dilated with wrath. Brownlee sees here an equation of Jewish and Aramaic synonyms (faces = nostrils = anger). Such practices may occur, but, on the other hand, Kahle discerns the literature's influence on the Karites (ca. eighth century) whose renewed emphasis on the Peshat was in contrast to the cabalism of their day. P. Kahle, "The Karites and the Manuscripts," VT, III(1953), 834; cf. Bacher, "Bible Exegesis," p. 165; CAP, II, 794.

⁵Brownlee, op. cit., p. 74f: "[The] Gospels never depart

In this type of exegesis the prophetic oracles are specifically made to refer to the historical person who is the author of the interpretation and to the historical circumstances he brings about, including the final redemption of all who believe in him. One cannot but sense the fundamental difference between this interpretation and the casuistic pilpulism of the Mishnaic appeal to Scripture and the ingenious metaphorical expansions of Philo. Whereas the Rabbis seem to have had a genius for inductive reasoning and the Jewish Greeks made the Scripture merely an allegory, apocalyptic passionately expounds the interpretation of the Divine promise of the Saviour and the Salvation which has been kept hidden in the Word of God until the time of its fulfilment. This seems to be basic to the story of Jesus at Nazareth, Lk. IV, 16ff, and equally basic to the Teacher of Righteousness in the Habakkuk scroll.¹

Roberts views their exegesis as 'growing out' of the original context with no violence to the essential OT teaching.²

Stendahl compares the method with Matthew's use of the OT and concludes that exegesis in the latter is not principally halachic or haggadic but approaches "the midrash pesher of the Qumran Sect, in which the OT texts were not primarily the source of rules, but the prophecy which was shown to be fulfilled."³

Jewish exegesis outside of Palestine centered in Alexandria with Philo as its major representative. As the rabbis sought to harmonize Jewish customs with the Scripture, Philonic exegesis interpreted the OT in terms of Hellenistic philosophy. Its principle characteristic was the extensive use of allegory through which the Pentateuch was shown to exemplify Greek philosophical

from the simple meaning of the words unless it be in the supposed verbal play which derives Nazarene from branch (n s r) (Mt. 2:23; Is. 11:1)"

¹Roberts, Scrolls and Old Testament Scriptures, p. 79.

²Ibid., pp. 79f; cf. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, pp. 126ff.

³K. Stendahl, op. cit., p. 35.

ideas. Some apocalyptic writings also stem from Alexandria (e.g., Wisdom); but they do not differ essentially from their Palestinian counterpart.

Is Wisdom apocalyptic?

Pauline and Jewish Literary Methods¹

General

Much methodological procedure is common to all writers and is worthy of comment only if it does not occur. Döpke, asserting the rabbinic manner of NT citation, advanced such 'proofs' as free and exegetical paraphrase and composite quotations, which were about as rabbinic as the use of papyrus.² Employing a citation in a sense differing from its original context, noted by Thackeray and Lietzmann as rabbinical, is in the same category.³ The commonly used fragmentary quotation, with the continuance of the given portion sometimes implied;⁴ the insertion of hortatory, ethical sections;⁵ and other procedures more distinctively Jewish were

¹Midrash peshet as a hermeneutical method in Paul is considered in Chapter Four. Infra, pp. 187ff.

²Döpke, op. cit.; cf. F. Johnson, (op. cit., pp. 382-387) for a detailed critique. Bonsirven (op. cit., pp. 335f) points out a difference from the rabbinical practice in Paul's free quotations; the rabbis normally stick to the letter; when they do depart, they indicate it by the formula al tigre.

³Lietzmann, An Die Galater, p. 34; Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, p. 187; cf. F. Johnson, op. cit., pp. 167ff. Illustration from daily life is another universal procedure common to Paul and the rabbis. But, as Michel observes, for Paul it is merely an accessory, but in the rabbis the עוב is given the role of proof. (op. cit., p. 10).

⁴E.g., 1 Cor. 2:9; cf. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 47; F. Johnson, op. cit., pp. 62-73.

⁵Cf. D. G. Bradley, "The Topos as a form in the Pauline Paraenesis," JBL, LXXII (December 1953), 238-246; F. Delitzsch, Brief an die Römer (Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1870), p. 16.

probably acquired by Paul in his training for the rabbinate. It is most natural, and not in the least derogatory, to find these methods in his epistles. As Prat well states, "the interests of truth did not require him to unlearn all that he had been taught."¹

Some methods more peculiar to Jewish commentators are the use of midrash, or running commentary;² the practice of quoting from the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa; and the employment of Hillel's rules and emphasis upon grammatical exegesis (although these too are found in general usage). In Rom. 9-11 and Gal. 3, Paul employs the ancient midrashic form of commentary;³ but his incisive manner and compact, integrated treatment is quite at odds with the rabbinic system. Often to support an opinion the rabbis quote the Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa in succession and Paul also adopts this custom on occasion.⁴ It is not habitual with the apostle, however, and probably represents only an incidental reminiscence. Hillel's principles of a fortiori and analogy are implicit in many Pauline passages,⁵ but here too the

¹Prat, op. cit., I, 23.

²As well as Halacha and Haggada. Cf. D. W. Dugmore, The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office (London: Milford, 1944).

³Cf. Rom. 4; 1 Cor. 10; Gal. 4. On Paul's contrasting and reconciling of texts (Rom. 9) cf. Ber. 25a (SBT, p. 151). The reference to V776 in 2 Chron. 24:27; 13:22 may point to the ancestry of this practice.

⁴Cf. Rom. 11:8-10; 15:9-12. See Appendix III; cf. Mak. 10b (SBT, p. 67); Num. 22:12, 20; Is. 58:17; Pr. 3:34; B. K. 92b (SBT, p. 536); Gen. 28:9; Jud 9:3; Eccl. 13:15; Sanh. 90b (SBT, p. 605); Dt. 31:16; Is. 26:19; S.S. 7:9; cf. Surenhusius, op. cit., pp. 49f. The custom is evidenced in Christ as well; cf. Lk. 24:44; Mt. 12:3-8; Lk. 16:16, 29.

⁵E.g., Rom. 4-5. Paul's exposition in 1 Cor. 7 is an example of NT halacha; the allegory in Gal. 4 is haggada.

rabbinic affinities can be overly stressed. One instance of a fortiori which arises in connection with an OT quotation is found in 1 Cor. 9:9.¹ Some have interpreted Paul as ruling out the literal meaning of the OT altogether here.² The question largely hangs on whether *παντως* (vs. 10) is taken as 'entirely' or as 'undoubtedly.' In view of the other NT usage,³ the character of Pauline typology,⁴ and general Jewish interpretation, the latter meaning denoting an a fortiori argument is much to be preferred.⁵ It is not a 'proof-text' but an appeal to the mind of the reader made under the general assumption that what "was written beforehand" (Rom. 15:4) had significance for the messianic age. The

¹This text (Dt. 25:4) was interpreted by the rabbis, in the light of the succeeding context, to allow a woman to object to a levirate marriage. Yeb. 4a (SBT, p. 10); cf. Bonsirven, op. cit., pp. 288f.

²E.g., J. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 117; C. H. Dodd's (The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932, p. 180) conjecture is quite uncalled for: "Paul had the limitations of the town bred man. He thought is absurd that God should care for cattle."

³It is found only in Luke and Paul. The former (cf. Lk. 4:23; Acts 18:21 mg; 21:22; 28:4) uniformly has "undoubtedly"; Paul, with the negative, has "certainly not" (Rom. 3:9; 1 Cor. 5:10; 16:12), and the only other is "by all means" (1 Cor. 9:22).

⁴Infra, pp. 167ff. For Paul the whole relationship of OT to NT depends upon its being real history; to find the contrary here would be inconsistent with this pattern.

⁵So Thackeray, op. cit., pp. 193ff. Philo (de somni, I, xvi; Colson, V, 345ff), reasoning that God is not concerned about a debtor's cloak, allegorizes Ex. 22:27. Cf. The Letter of Aristaeas 144-150 (CAP, II, 108): "It was not for the sake of mice and weasels that Moses drew up his laws but for righteousness; the animals are brought in to teach moral lessons." But even Philo does not view the symbolic interpretation of the laws as always abrogating its literal significance: "Why we shall be ignoring the sanctity of the temple and a thousand other things if we are going to pay heed to nothing except what is shown to us by the inner meaning of things. . . ." (de mig. Abr., XVI, 92f; Colson, IV,

rabbis were as conscious of grammatical minutia^a as modern commentators, but perhaps with more dubious results. For example, in prayer one must bow his head before the mention of the Divine name because Mal. 2:5 says "bowed before thy name" (not at thy name).¹ The differentiation between the singular and plural accounts for the assertion that the Torah was given with five voices.² The distinction which Paul makes between the singular and plural of *σπέρμα* (*y71*) in Gal. 3:16 has been pointed to as an example of rabbinical artifice in the apostle. As to method it is common both to the rabbis and modern commentators; whether the interpretation is the result of an arbitrary rabbinical twist is discussed below.³

Beside the procedures mentioned above, certain other Pauline practices may be compared with Jewish methods: his introductory formulas (IF), his combined quotations, and his use of allegory.

Introductory Formulas

The nature of Paul's IF has already been considered. For the most part they are formulas traditional to the Jews and

185). This text (Dt. 25:4) is given a very literal interpretation as an example of Moses' kindness to animals (de virtu., 145; Colson, VIII, 253). The rabbis, for their part, forbade allegorical interpretation of passages regarding kindness to animals (Jerus. Berakoth 5; cf. Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, p. 195).

¹Ber. 6b (SBT, p. 69). Also, the resurrection of the dead is shown in Dt. 11:21 because the land was promised to 'them' (i.e., the Patriarchs) not to 'you.' Sanh. 90b (SBT, p. 605). Cf. Mk. 12:26f. !

²Ber. 6b (SBT, p. 29).

³Infra, pp. 90ff.

and find parallels even in the OT;¹ their congruity with IF in rabbinical literature has been noted from the time of Surenhusius.² The rabbis, in the great majority of cases, use some form of $\gamma\beta\delta$; most frequently found is the Niphal $\gamma\beta\delta\text{I}\psi$ (Danby: "as it is written").³ Similarly, in the Zadokite Work and Habakkuk commentary this verb is most usual.⁴ The following may be compared:

Zad. Frag.

9:1,5,6,40- $\gamma\beta\delta$ $\gamma\psi\delta\text{I}\psi$

9:19- $\zeta\delta$ $\gamma\beta\delta$ $\gamma\psi\delta$

7:4; 10:3; 14:1- $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$

9:8- $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$ $\gamma\psi\delta\text{I}\psi$

7:10- $\gamma\beta\delta$ $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$

8:8- $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$ $\gamma\beta\delta$ $\gamma\psi\delta$

Pes. 81b(SBT,p.426)- $\gamma\beta\delta$ $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$

Yeb. 39a(SBT,p.248)- $\gamma\beta\delta$ $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$

Aboth 3:7(SBT,p.31)⁵-

- $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$ $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$

Yoma 35b, 66a(SBT, pp. 165-308)- $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$ $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$

2 Cor. 6:16- καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεός

Gal. 3:13- ὅτι γέγραπται

Rom. 1:17- καθὼς γέγραπται

Rom. 10:19- Μωϋσῆς λέγει

Rom. 10:16- Ἡσαΐας λέγει

Rom. 4:3- ἡ γραφή λέγει

Rom. 11:2- ἐν Ἡλίαι τί λέγει
ἡ γραφή

1 Cor. 9:9- ἐν τῷ Μωϋσεως νόμῳ γέγραπται

¹Cf. 2 Ezra 20:34: ὡς γέγραπται ; 4 Kg. 14:6; Dan. 9:13: καθὼς γέγραπται ; 2 Ezra 16:6: ἦν γεγραμμένον ; Ex. 24:4: ἐγράφη Μωϋσῆς . See Appendix IV. Cf. 2 Chron. 36:2; 3 Kg. 2:27: πληρωθήτω τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου; 2 Chron. 20:37: ἐπροθή- τευσεν Ἐλεάσα.

²Surenhusius, *op. cit.*, pp. 25f; Döpke, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-69. For parallels in Greek and Latin writers cf. J. Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

³See B. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Questions of Scripture in the New Testament and the Mishnah," *JBL*, LXX (December 1951), 297-307; cf. Danby, *op. cit.*

⁴Cf. CAP, II, 789; M. Burrows, "The Meaning of $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$ $\text{I}\psi\text{I}\psi$ in DSH," *VT*, II, (July 1952), 255-260.

⁵Referring to 1 Chron. 29:14.

⁶Referring to 1 Kg. 19:14.

Sanh. 2a(SBT, p. 2)-

- 7b18) ... 7b210

Rom. 15:9f- καθὼς γέγραπται...
καὶ πάλιν λέγει

Kid. 82a(SBT, p. 423)- 7b18 17b

Rom. 10:8- ἀλλὰ τὶ λέγει

The above parallels indicate the extensive agreement between the IF in Paul and Jewish writings, even, as in the last two examples, in interrogative and combined IF. Metzger finds, on the whole, a greater variety of IF in the NT; also the Mishnah shows a preference for verbs of saying in contrast to Paul's "it is written."¹ Both the NT and the Mishnah recognize the instrumentality of the human author, their IF indicates that both "had the very highest view of the inspiration of the Scriptures which they quote."² Warfield's words are apropos:

There is probably not a single mode of alluding to or citing Scripture in all the NT which does not find its exact parallel among the Rabbis. The New Testament so far evinces itself a thoroughly Jewish book.³

Combined Quotations

Two forms of combined quotations are found in the Pauline letters: merged or amalgamated quotations, and chain quotations or haraz (רָצַח). The latter method, according to Edersheim, had its origin in the preaching of the synagogues in which the preacher quoted from the Pentateuch and then strung on similar passages from the Prophets and Hagiographa.⁴ In the Talmud this type of

¹Metzger, op. cit., pp. 305f. Cf. Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, I, 187n. For frequent use of 'it is written' cf. Shab. 33a (SBT, pp. 151ff). The frequency of different formulas seems to vary with the particular tractate or section, with clusters of one or another type.

²Metzger, op. cit., p. 306. ³Warfield, op. cit., pp. 118f.

⁴Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, I, 449; cf. Swete, op. cit., p. 252. J. Scott (op. cit., p. 27) finds combined quotations in the

combination is not uncommon, but Paul seldom follows this order.¹ The apostle never introduces his haraz in the explicit rabbinical manner, i.e., The Law says . . . , the Prophets say . . . , the Writings say However, the rationale behind the Jewish usage, "not as though the word of the Law needed confirmation, but to show how the Scripture emphasizes the lesson by iteration,"² is evidently operative also in Paul's mind.

Neither do Paul's combinations rest merely on the basis of a 'key-word.' Although, as Vollmer and Michel have pointed out, a number of Pauline citations appear to be united under a Stichwort;³ the significance is far deeper than a verbal congruence.⁴ The recurrence of the Stichwort is perhaps a designed mnemonic; but at times it is only a natural coincidence in the subject-matter. Certainly it is the sense-element that is basic for Paul. The verbal aspect is in the nature of effect; it is not the underlying cause.⁵

OT (e.g., Jer. 30:8 from Is. 10:27 and Nahum 1:13), but they only faintly resemble the NT type.

¹ *Supra*, pp. 3f. See Appendix III; cf. E. v. Dobschutz, "Zum paulinischen Schriftbeweis," *ZNTW*, 24 (1925), 306f.

² Moore, *op. cit.*, I, 239f. Cf. Meg. 31a (SBT, p. 188).

³ E.g., *λίθος* : Rom. 9:33 (Is. 8:14; 28:16); *λαός* : Rom. 9:25f (Hos. 2:23; 1:10); (unseeing) *ὁ φθαλμὸς* : Rom. 11:8, 19 (Is. 29:10; Dt. 29:4; Ps. 68(69):23f); *ζώνη* : Rom. 15:9-12 (Ps. 17(18):40; Dt. 32:43; Ps. 116(117):1); *στόμα* : 1 Cor. 3:19 (Job 5:13; Ps. 93:11, implied); *θάνατος* : 1 Cor. 15:54f (Is. 25:8; Hos. 13:14); cf. 2 Cor. 6:16ff. See Vollmer, *op. cit.*, p. 36. Michel, *op. cit.*, pp. 86f, 95f.

⁴ *Infra*, pp. 136ff, 187ff.

⁵ In a secondary sense the presence of the key-word may be the cause for the selection of a particular verse from the relevant passage; cf. *Infra*, pp. . . . In any case they illustrate the unity of the quotation as a whole.

Examples of the haraz, so frequent in Rom. 9-11, 15 are numerous in the Talmud. The conjunction is usually 'and'¹ or 'and then';² though sometimes a longer connective occurs.³ In Mak. 24a (SBT, p. 173) successive verses (Amos 7:5, 6) have an IF inserted in similar fashion to Paul's citation in Rom. 10:20, 21. A haraz reminiscent of Rom. 9-11 is found in the same section of the tractate in which Moses, Jeremiah, Moses, Ezekiel, Moses and Isaiah are cited successively with the writer's name being adduced in the Pauline manner.

Merged quotations are a rarity in the rabbis. Especially of note is the amalgamation of nine passages in Sanh. 38b (SBT, p. 244f).⁴ Two passages are also merged in Shab. 20a (SBT, p. 85), but, as edited, the first ends a paragraph and the second begins the succeeding one.⁵ The scarcity of such combinations may be the result of the maxim: "One Biblical verse may contain several teachings but a single teaching cannot be deduced from different Scriptural verses."⁶ At any rate, Bonsirven's conclusion appears

¹E.g., Ber. 18a (SBT, p. 109); Pv. 19:17; 14:31; Mak. 13b (SBT, p. 95) cf. 1 Tim. 5:18; 2 Tim. 2:19 cf. Surenhusio, op. cit., pp. 45ff; SBK, III, 314 (on Rom. 15:10).

²E.g., Mak. 16a (SBT, p. 114); Dt. 24:10-13; 19-21 and Lv. 19:13; 5:23; cf. Rom. 15:11.

³E.g., "and it says" cf. Ber. 6a (SBT, p. 25f); Pes. 7b, 8a (SBT, p. 31f); Rom. 15:10.

⁴Viz., Gen. 1:26, 27; 11:7, 5; 35:7, 3; Dt. 4:7; 2 Sam. 7:23; Dan. 7:9 (referring, against the Minim, the alternating singular and plural verbs to God and his heavenly court); also cf. Sanh. 39a (SBT, p. 246); Nu. R. II, 15f (SMR, V, 51ff); Jer. 2:2f and Hos. 2:4, 2; 1:9 and Is. 1:18, 16.

⁵Ezk. 15:4; Jer. 36:22.

⁶Based on Ps. 62:12 and Jer. 23:9; cf. Sanh. 34a (SBT, p. 214).

to be borne out:

Fréquemment, il est vrai, les rabbins utilisent plusieurs textes pour prouver une thèse, mais alors ils introduisent chaque texte une formule (ordinairement: "il dit"); il est rare de les voir amalgamer plusieurs sentences bibliques. ¹ / par

In the haraz, then, Paul follows the practice of the rabbis; but for the source of his frequently used merged quotations one must look elsewhere.²

Allegory

The similarity of Pauline allegory to that of the Jewish world depends on the definition of the word. Taken merely as an extended metaphor (as contrasted with the parable or extended simile) the method is employed by the apostle in connection with a divinely designed type³ or with the illustrative use of an OT passage.⁴

In rabbinic literature several passages are classified as allegory:⁵ The Midrash on Gen. 40:9 identifies the vine of Pharaoh's dream with Israel, and its three branches with Moses, Aaron and Miriam.⁶ The Song of Solomon was interpreted throughout as an

¹Bonsirven, op. cit., p. 336: "Frequently, it is true, the rabbis utilize several texts to prove a point but then they introduce each text by a formula (ordinarily: 'it says'); it is rare to see several biblical verses amalgamated."

²See Infra, pp. 112ff.

³E.g., 1 Cor. 10:4: "That Rock was Christ."

⁴Cf. Gal. 4:25: "this Hagar is Mt. Sinai." However, the text here is questionable. Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 193ff.

⁵Cf. W. Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten (Strassbourg: Trübner, 1890), II, 112, 515. Cf. Michel, op. cit., pp. 99f.

⁶Gn. R., LXXXVIII, 5 (SMR, II, 815f).

allegorical description of God and Israel.¹ The Mashal (*משל*) or parable is the more frequent form however;² and the few allegorical interpretations which do occur are rather seedy.³

The whole of Paul's typological exegesis has more in common, as a method, with the Alexandrian school than with the rabbis.⁴ The same passages which form the backbone of Pauline typology--the Creation, Patriarchal, and Exodus narratives--also serve as the subject of much of Philo's exegesis. However, the similarity is more formal than real. For Paul these things are actual history--molded by the Lord of history--whose significance is only revealed in Christ; for Philo, who is one with the Greeks in this, there is no historical perspective. The literal sense is only the 'body' of appearance whose 'soul' lies in the allegorical meaning.⁵

The allegory of the two covenants in Gal. 4:21-31 is the Pauline text most often compared with Philonic exegesis. Apart from its allegorical aspect, the alleged use of Gematria (i.e.,

¹Cf. SMR, op. cit., IX, vii. ²Cf. Sanh. 39a (SBT, p. 246f).

³Bonsirven, op. cit., pp. 207-251, esp. pp. 246f; W. O. E. Oesterley, "The Exegesis of the Old Testament," Record and Revelation, ed. H. W. Robinson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1938), p. 404. The condemnations in Aboth III, 11; IV, 2 have been interpreted as directed against the Alexandrian allegorists who depreciated the literal sense of the Torah; cf. SBT, p. 35.

⁴Beside the allegories of Philo cf. The Letter of Aristeas, 143-167 (CAP, II, 108-110): Clovenfooted animals are to the initiated the symbol of memory. D. Windfuhr ("Der Apostel Paulus als Haggadist," ZATW (1926), pp. 327-330), in comparing some Pauline typology (e.g., 2 Cor. 6:16ff) with Jewish haggada, overlooks the more significant element in the apostle's exegesis. However, it is true that the rabbis have the nucleus of an Exodus typology although they do not formulate it as such. Cf. infra, pp. 167ff.

⁵Cf. de migr. Abr. pp. 199f. (Colson, IV, 248); de Abr., p. 200 (Colson, VI, 99).

the numerical valuation of letters) and onomatology raise further questions concerning Paul's methodology. In so far as onomatology may enter into the passage, there is nothing particularly Alexandrian or rabbinic in it. The significance of names is a frequent phenomenon in the OT itself, both as mere word-play and as illustrative of significant relationships.¹ Its presence in this text (viz., the equation of Hagar and Sinai, vs. 25) is conjectural however; probably the Hagar-Sinai parallelism is of no more etymological significance than the other $\sigma\upsilon\nu\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\chi\omicron\iota$.² More speculative is the suggestion that Paul's parallelism employs or is based upon a fanciful Gematria. Aside from being entirely superfluous to any sane interpretation of Paul, the system also fails to work textually.³

¹Cf. Gen. 17:5; 21:3-6; 32:28; Ber. 7b (SBT, p. 36); Sanh. 19b (SBT, pp. 102f); Gn. R. XXV, 2 (SMR, I, 205); Philo, leg. alleg., III, 244 (Colson, I, 467).

²Cf. E. deW. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1921), pp. 259-262; Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 192-198. The use of $\sigma\upsilon\nu\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ (vs. 25) possibly alludes to a columnar arrangement of the elements in the narrative which, according to Dodd, was an accepted practice. Cf. Ibid.; C. H. Dodd, "A Problem of Interpretation," Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, II (1951), 11; J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914-1929), p. 612. The parallel arrangement in the Galatians passage follows this order:

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Hagar	Ishmael (flesh)	Sarah	Isaac (Promise)
Sinai Covenant		New Covenant	
Present Jerusalem	Children of the Present Jerusalem	New Jerusalem above	Children of the New Jerusalem above

³Cf. A. F. Puuko, "Paulus und das Judentum," Studia Orientalis, II (1925), 75. H. Lietzmann (An die Galater, p. 31) does not consider Paul incapable of it but finds it unworkable. Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 370. In the rabbinic see supra, p. 50. In the Greek world cf. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, pp. 275ff. In Rev. 13:18 some system of numerics is employed, not to

Even in this passage, which Paul designates as "ἀ' τ' υ' α' ἔστιν ἀλλήγορεύμενα" (Gal. 4:24), one finds an interpretation more in accord with Pauline typology than with Alexandrian allegory. The illustration of the 'law versus promise' theme from the Hagar story and the recognition of its historicity is in marked contrast to the symbolics of Philo which often ignore anything apart from the pure allegorical.¹ Michel concludes his discussion of the passage with a pertinent remark concerning its essential typological character:

Auch an dieser Stelle handelt es sich doch mehr um eine typologische Beziehung als um eine Allegorie selbst (Hagar ist typus der mosaischen Gesetzgebung am Sinai und entspricht dem jetzigen Jerusalem). So zeigt sich auch hier die Besonderheit des paulinischen Schriftverständnisses: Paulus denkt mehr typologisch als allegorisch im eigentlichen Sinne.²

In conclusion, Paul's treatment of the OT often finds much in common with the methods of his day as reflected in Jewish literature; his IF and haraz are especially of note in this regard. In

exegete Scripture but to spell out a name or symbol. Contrast Gn. R., XLIII, 2 (SMR, I, 353): Abraham's servants were named Eliezer because it says 318 (Gen. 14:14), and the letter value of 318 is Eliezer: $\aleph(1) + \zeta(30) + \eta(10) + \gamma(70) + \lambda(7) + \tau(200) = 318$. Only a rabbi could get this from the OT, and only a rabbi would find it in Paul.

¹Cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, Philo's Contribution to Religion (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919), pp. 40f. Philo allegorizes the same story (de congress. erud. grae. 11-24), Colson, IV, 463f; Quaes. in Gen. III, 21; R. Marcus, Philo Supplement, London: Heinemann, 1953, I, 206f) along a different line: Abraham is a learner; Hagar represents his preliminary instruction, and Sarah follows as the chief goal of learning--true virtue.

²Michel, op. cit., p. 110: "This passage also is treated more as a typical relationship than as allegory proper. (Hagar is a type of the Mosaic legislation at Sinai and corresponds with the present Jerusalem). Thus special character of the Pauline understanding of Scripture is also shown here: Paul thinks more typologically than in a specifically allegorical sense."

other respects Pauline methods find few parallels in contemporary Jewish writings. The use of merged quotations is little found in the rabbis. In contrast to Philo, Paul's use of allegory is very minor and its character altogether different from that of Alexandrian writers; and his typological view of OT history is a rare, if not unknown, element in contemporary Jewish exegesis. In all things but allegorical interpretation, Paul's Jewish methodology reflects a Palestinian milieu, and even in that the Alexandrian contact does not appear to be close or direct.¹ The apostle is not adverse to using methods from his Jewish training as they suit his purpose; on the other hand, some of his methods seem to arise from a Christian hermeneutic and from the practices of the apostolic community and cannot be explained by his Jewish background.

Pauline and Jewish Exegesis

The influence of Paul's general cultural milieu, and in some particulars his rabbinic training, on his style and dialectical methods is quite apparent. There remains, however, a second question as to the extent to which contemporary Jewish interpretations find parallels or echoes in the Pauline literature. Furthermore, do such parallels represent merely a legitimate interpretation common to the whole or part of Judaism, or do they evidence the adoption of rabbinical speculations quite extraneous to any reasonable view of the OT text? The relation of Pauline theology to Judaism is a large subject; the ensuing section,

¹G. H. Box, "The Value and Significance of the Old Testament in Relation to the New," The People and the Book, ed. A. S. Peake (Oxford, Clarendon, 1925), p. 464, concludes that "the apostle derived his knowledge of the method not directly from Alexandria, but from his general rabbinic training."

therefore, confines itself to passages quoting from or bearing upon the OT.¹

General

A number of apocryphal and rabbinic parallels are in the nature of a common phraseology or literary custom with little or no interpretive significance.² For example, the words of Dt. 30: 11-14 are employed in Baruch to describe the inaccessibility of Wisdom;³ Paul (Rom. 10:6-8) uses the language of the same passage to represent the accessibility of salvation in Christ. The wording of 1 Cor. 2:9 also seems to have been traditional in Judaism to depict the glory of the future age.⁴ The mention of Jannes and Jambres in 2Tim. 3:8 is probably no more than a convenient labeling from Jewish oral tradition.⁵

¹Paul's general hermeneutic is determined by the fact of Jesus as Messiah and is, of course, at variance with anything in Judaism. Its affinities, as a method, with the Qumran community are discussed in a later chapter. Infra, pp. 187ff.

²E.g., "they that sleep," "the last trump." In his introduction to the various apocryphal books Charles (op. cit.) lists such NT parallels. See also Ryle, Philo, pp. xxxiiff; Nageli, op. cit., pp. 68-75.

³Who hath gone up into heaven and taken her
and brought her down from the clouds
Who hath gone over the sea and found her
and will bring her for choice gold
--(Baruch 3:29f; CAP, I, 590).

Cf. 4 Ezra 4:8; Targ. Jer. II: "O, that we had one like Jonah who could descend into the depths of the sea and bring it to us."
(Quoted in Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, pp. 153f).

⁴W.D. Davies, St. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (Cambridge: University Press, 1948), p. 307. Thackeray, (Paul and Jewish Thought, pp. 185f) ascribes it to a Jewish anthology or a paraphrase of Is. 64:3. The latter passage is interpreted of the world to come, as contrasted with the Messianic Age, in Ber. 34b (SBT, p. 215) and applied variously, e.g., the reward of scholars, wine to feast the righteous; cf. Sanh. 99a (SBT, p. 670).

⁵Whether Paul regarded the names as genuine is impossible

In other passages a common interpretative element appears more pronounced. Paul probably shares a common view of $P\pi\varsigma$ in Ex. 32:6 as implying idolatry (1 Cor. 10:7);¹ and in Eph. 4:8 he evidently agrees (against the LXX) with a targumic interpretation of $\Pi\rho\zeta$ in Ps. 67(68):19.² The reference in Gal. 4:29 to the persecution ($\epsilon\delta\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$) of Isaac by Ishmael is sometimes adduced as a rabbinic interpretation of $P\tau\varsigma\eta$ in Gen. 21:9f;³ however, Paul probably has in mind more the hostility of their descendents though the other may be present as well. The

to say, but there is no reason to refer his use to an apocryphal book; the appellation, with slight variation, was widespread, and Paul's ascriptions are entirely within the Biblical narrative. Cf. Pliny, Historia Naturalis, xxxi, 11; Eusebius, Praep. Evangelica, ix, 8; Zad. Frag. 7:19; Men. 85a (SBT, p. 513); K. Kohler, "Jannes and Jambres," SJE, VII, 71f.

¹Cf. Ex. R., I, 1 (SMR, III, 1). On the other hand Paul does not employ the passage with reference to immorality (1 Cor. 10:8) in contrast with the rabbinic idea that the words "sat down" are always connected with moral degradation; cf. Levertoff, op. cit., pp. 133f.

²I.e., in taking the meaning "to fetch" or "to receive in order to give;" supra, p. 10; Cf. Prat, op. cit., I, 416f. Abbot (op. cit., p. 112) regards it as an ancient Jewish interpretation. Cf. A. Edersheim, Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1885), p. 116f: "For popular use the Scriptures were no longer quoted in the Hebrew, which was not spoken, or from the LXX, which was under the Rabbinic ban, but targumed, rendered into the vernacular; the principle being very strongly expressed that, in so doing, it was not the letter but the meaning of the passage which was to be given."

³The LXX has $\Pi\delta\iota\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ and adds $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\text{I}\rho\alpha\lambda\kappa$. . . , perhaps indicating a lacuna in the MT. $P\tau\varsigma\eta$ may mean either playing or mocking; Sarah's anger implies the latter. In this context, as in Ex. 32:6, the Midrash applies the word to idolatry not persecution; but the same narrative goes on to say that, while pretending to play, Ishmael shot arrows at Isaac. That Paul's analogy for the persecution of Christians by Jews rests on this tradition is rather doubtful, but there may be a common interpretive tradition through which the two are related.

chronology (430 years) of Gal. 3:17 is possibly another instance of a mutual exegesis of an OT text (Ex. 12:40).¹

As to more general themes, the classic quotations from Gen. 15:6 (Rom. 4:3) and Hab. 2:4 (Rom. 1:17) occur in rabbinic literature, occasionally together, but with a different import.² In DSH the interpretation of Hab. 2:4 is much closer to the NT concept, viz., deliverance from judgment through faith in the Teacher of Righteousness.³ Philo's words also show a remarkable similarity to Pauline thought:

For the soul, clinging in utter dependence on a good hope, and deeming that things not present are beyond question already present by reason of the sure steadfastness of Him that promised them, has won as its meed faith, a perfect good; for we read a little later "Abraham believed God" (Gen. 15:6).⁴

¹Paul's chronology is in accord with the LXX, Samaritan Pentateuch, and Jubilees. Actually, as Kahle (Cairo Geniza, pp. 337ff) points out, this is probably a textual rather than hermeneutical tradition. Cf. Burton, op. cit., pp. 183f.

²E.g., Ex. R. XXXIII, 5, (SMR, III, 284): Abraham believed God (Gen. 15:6) and Israel inherited this faith (Hab. 2:4); therefore through Abraham's merit Israel sings in the messianic age. Mak. 24a (SBT, p. 173): The myriad of Torah injunctions are reduced by the prophets; e.g., Isaiah reduced them to two principles, to do justice and righteousness (Is. 56:1), and Habakkuk to one, the righteous shall live in his faith (Hab. 2:4). However, as Strack points out, these are not contrary to justification by works; faith itself is viewed as a work; cf. SBK, III, 186.

³Cf. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 44. It is true that DSH refers this "to all those who practice ^{the} law," but this need not involve a syncretism any more than the NT's usage, e.g., Jn. 5:29; Rom. 7:16; 8:7, 13; 1 Jn. 3:7. Dupont-Sommer (op. cit., pp. 63f) identifies the Master of Justice with the Messiah in the Zadokite Fragments, but that work evidently distinguishes them (Zad. Frag. 9:29; GAP, II, 820).

⁴Philo, de. migr. Abr., 43f (Colson, IV, 157).

Messianic Consciousness

The messianism of pre-Christian Judaism is quite germane to Paul's use of the OT even though it stands only as a shadow to the real. The whole secret of the Christology of the NT, writes Gunkel, lies in the fact that it was the Christology of pre-Christian Judaism.¹ In the rabbis it was a standing principle to refer the predictions of the prophets to the "days of the Messiah,"² and this principle is almost always in evidence in Paul's interpretations. In apocalyptic writings, besides DSS, the Testament of Levi 18:1ff (CAP, II, 314f) gives important information for messianic doctrine in late Judaism.³

Coming to specific Pauline quotations, one finds that Ps. 18:49ff (Rom. 15:9) is explained messianically in the Midrash,⁴ as evidently is Is. 52:12 (2 Cor. 6:17).⁵ The frequently used Ps. 110 (cf. Rom. 8:34; 1 Cor. 15:25; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1) is also

¹H. Gunkel, Zur religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testament, p. 93, quoted in B. B. Warfield, "The Divine Messiah in the OT," Princeton Theological Review, XIV (July 1916), 377. Whether Gunkel regarded the idea as true is, of course, another question.

²Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936), p. 37; Ber. 34b (SBT, p. 215).

³Cf. M. Black, "The Messiah in the Testament of Levi, XVIII," ET, 60 (1948-1949), 321f. The presence of fragments of the "Testaments" in DSS evidently points to their pre-Christian origin (cf. Vincent Taylor's comment in ET, 66 (December 1954), 76). For further NT parallels cf. Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, II, 710-737.

⁴Lam. R. I, 16, 51 (SMR, VII, 138).

⁵Ex. R. XV, 18 (SMR, VII, 183).

referred to the Messiah,¹ but the most usual rabbinic application is to Abraham.² The Talmud applies Is. 59:19f (Rom. 11:26) and Is 11:2 (cf. Rom. 15:12 on Is. 11:10) to messianic times;³ the Targum also interprets the latter chapter of the Messiah, and this is probably its meaning in the significant passage, Is. 28:16 (Rom. 10:11).⁴

Taken as a whole, however, such parallels are not frequent, and where they do occur, are only partial. Almost a century ago Westcott examined the question and found that of ninety-four passages quoted messianically in the NT only forty-four were interpreted in the same manner in Jewish writings; there are few revisions of that estimate to be made today.⁵ Whether there were changes for controversial purposes⁶ or whether the extant rabbinic literature just does not stand in the mainstream of messianic Judaism, one cannot be certain. In the light of Jewish apocalyptic, one suspects that both reasons are true. There are general

¹Gen. R. LXXX, 9 (SMR, II, 795). Edersheim (Jesus the Messiah, II, 720) finds other messianic applications of the Psalm, but he overstates the case in saying that it is "throughout applied to the Messiah."

²Lev. R. XXV, 6 (SMR, IV, 320); Gen. R. XXXIX, 8 (SMR, I, 316); Ned. 32b (SBT, p. 99); Sanh. 108b (SBT, p. 747).

³Sanh. 98a, 93b (SBT, pp. 626, 663).

⁴Stenning, op. cit., pp. 40, 88: Is. 28:16 "concerns a strong king in Zion under whom the believing righteous are not to be dismayed." Rashi takes it to mean the Messiah; cf. Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, II, 725.

⁵B. F. Westcott, An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels (Cambridge: MacMillan, 1860), p. 144. A. Vis (Messianic Psalm in the New Testament, Amsterdam: Hertzberger, 1939) finds virtually no trace of parallel rabbinic interpretations.

⁶^{Quotations} Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, II, 710.

parallels of messianic interpretations between Jewish writings and the NT and undoubtedly these provided a bridge for many Jews to accept Jesus as the Messiah.¹ But the principal sources for Paul's messianic interpretations of the OT are the principles and emphases received from the apostolic tradition and his own exegesis of the OT as a Christian. One would be hard put to root this element of his thought immediately in Judaism.

The Doctrine of the Fall

The Pauline interpretation of the early passages of Genesis has been compared with Jewish thought in several respects: (1) Adam's sin as affecting his posterity; (2) the occasion of the fall as involving Eve's chastity; (3) the male alone as the *δὸς* of God; (4) the Adam-Christ typology as a Gnostic or Philonic doctrine of the Heavenly Man.

The locus classicus of Paul's doctrine of the Fall is Rom. 5:12ff.² Although the passage is celebrated as having enunciated the principle of original sin, this was not Paul's primary purpose at all. The immediate question asked how one could be made righteous by the merit or act of Christ. To answer this Paul drew the classic analogy of Adam and Christ; as all *ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ* had been involved in the sin and death of Adam so all *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ* were involved in the righteousness and life of Christ. The analogy is based upon an extension of the OT doctrine of temporal

¹The cases of Simeon and Anna (Lk. 2:25ff, 36ff) are not in point since theirs was a supernatural revelation. Charles (CAP, II, 794) suggests that the beliefs and emphases of the Zadokites (= Qumranites?) makes it not improbable that they were among the "great company of the priests" (Acts 6:7) who became Christians.

²It is implicit in 1 Cor. 15:21f as well.

solidarity to a matter of eternal significance.¹ The logical progression is as follows:²

1. Death is the penalty of sin
2. Sin is not counted if there is no law
3. Yet death came upon people before the law of Moses was given
4. Death even came upon people who did not sin in the way Adam did, that is, upon infants who had not sinned against the law of conscience or of natural or special revelation.³
5. Hence, their death is the result of Adam's sin.

In the rabbinic doctrine of the yetzer hara (יָצֵר הָרָע) or evil impulse and in the apocalyptic writings the effect of Adam's sin on his posterity is, as in Paul, clearly present.⁴

For though it was thou [Adam] who sinned, the fall was not thine alone, but ours also who are thy descendents (4 Ezra 7:118; CAP, II, 591).

God created man for incorruption . . . , but by the envy of the Devil death entered into the world, and they that belong to this realm experience it (Wisdom 2:23; CAP, I, 538).

When [Adam] saw that through him death was ordained as a punishment, he spent 130 years in fasting . . . (Er. 18b; SBT, p. 127).

¹Cf. E. E. Ellis, "The Biblical Concept of the Solidarity of the Human Race as Seen in Blessing and Punishment," Unpublished B.D. Thesis, Wheaton College Graduate School, 1953; pp. 58-76.

²Rom. 5:12ff; cf. Gen. 2:7; 17; 2:17; 19.

³Cf. Gen. 6:5. This is not explicitly so stated but seems to be reasonably inferred.

⁴See Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, pp. 30-40; F. R. Tennant, The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin (Cambridge: University Press, 1903), pp. 145-234; Weber, op. cit., pp. 218ff. Tennant (pp. 169-176), contra Weber, finds very little evidence for associating the doctrine of the yetzer hara specifically with the effects of Adam's sin.

When Adam sinned and death was decreed against those who should be born, then the multitude of those who should be born was numbered (2 Baruch 23:4; CAP, II, 495).

From a woman did sin originate, and because of her we all must die (Sirach 25:24; CAP, I, 402).

For though Adam first sinned and brought untimely death upon all, yet of those who were born from him each one has prepared for his own soul torment to come, and again each one of them has chosen for himself glories to come . . . Adam is therefore not the cause, save only of his own soul, but each of us has been the Adam of his own Soul (2 Baruch 54:15, 19; CAP, II, 511f).¹

As is evident in the above selections the doctrine received much more emphasis in the apocalyptic writings than in the rabbis. Thackeray, holding that Rom. 5:12ff. teaches only an inherited moral corruption and liability to sin, finds this passage in general agreement with current Jewish thought.² Tennant also concludes that Paul connects sinfulness with the Fall in an undefined way.³ In any case, the yetzer hara of the rabbis in no way inhibits man's free will or his capacity to control his evil inclinations; "herein lies the main difference between the teaching of the synagogues and that of the church."⁴

Some rabbis may have regarded death as something more

¹Cf. 4 Ezra 3:21, 26f.

²Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, p. 37. Contrast CAP, I, 402.

³Tennant, op. cit., p. 267. Contrast N. P. Williams, The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin (London: Longmans, Green, 1927), pp. 123ff.

⁴Ibid., pp. 175f. The yetzer hara evidently does not enter into the constitutive nature or will of man but acts as an external force upon a weakened or susceptible nature. Sometimes it is equated with Satan. E.g., B. B. 16a (SBT, p. 79); cf. Yoma 69b, (SBT, p. 327f).

than a natural consequence arising from Adam's sin,¹ but there is little support for an involment in Adam's sin or guilt. Paul, on the other hand, definitely places the condemnation (κατάκριμα) for Adam's sin upon all and concludes that through his disobedience "many were constituted (καθίσταται) sinners."² Granting the importance of man's responsibility in Paul's theology, it is difficult to agree with Thackeray's view of the passage.³ The very ground of the analogy depends upon some sort of involvement in Adam's sin and guilt; whatever the deficiencies of the Federal and Augustinian theories, this much they recognize.⁴ The passage seems better understood on the basis of a solidarity relationship grounded in the nature of man and the world order. But any explanation which views man's guilt as Adam's disobedience plus his own sin must either ignore the very point of the analogy or regard righteousness as accruing from Christ's obedience plus man's own good works. This surely is not what Paul had in mind.

In conclusion, Paul is in general agreement with his contemporaries in attributing the presence of death to the consequence of Adam's sin. But in explaining this as a punishment accruing through a solidarity relationship and gathering from it the rationale under which God makes men righteous, the apostle goes far beyond anything in Jewish literature.

¹E.g., Er. 18b, supra, p. 74 . ²Rom. 5:16, 18f.

³The words ἐφ' ἃ, whatever their precise connotation, are not the decisive element in the passage.

⁴For objections to these views see Ellis, op. cit., pp. 62-70.

The Nature of Eve's Sin

In Jewish writings there are several instances in which lust for Eve is viewed as Satan's motive in tempting man.¹ Compare, for example, Yeb. 103b (SBT, p. 711): "When the serpent copulated with Eve, he infused her with lust." A similar thought is found in Sotah 9b (SBT, p. 40): "[The serpent] said, I will kill Adam and marry Eve."² However, in other cases the motive is malice,³ or when lust is cited, it is viewed as an effect on the race resulting from the eating of the fruit rather than the occasion of the Fall;⁴ with few, if any, exceptions the Genesis account of the 'fruit' is accepted in literal fashion.⁵

The writings cited above are quite late; and when one attempts to trace the roots of the legend into the first century its character becomes very tenuous. The fullest account of the temptation in the earlier writings is in the Apocalypse of Moses xv-xxii (CAP, II, 145ff), where Eve recounts the events: The serpent climbed the tree and, coating the fruit with the poison of lust, he bent the branch for Eve to eat. She, in accordance with her oath, gave the fruit to Adam. The story (with some Christian theologians) identifies lust--in the general not necessarily sexual

¹Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, pp. 50ff; SBK, III, 525; Weber, op. cit., p. 219.

²Cf. Gn.R. XVIII, 6 (SMR, I, 147). The story that Adam and Eve cohabited with demons after the fall is irrelevant. Cf. Gn.R. XXXIV, 6 (SMR, I, 203); Gen. 5:3.

³Shab. 63a (SBT, p. 299); cf. Wisdom 2:24 (CAP, I, 538).

⁴Apoc. Moses xv-xxii (CAP, II, 145ff); cf. Shab. 146a (SBT, p. 738); A. Z. 22b (SBT, p. 114).

⁵E.g., Sanh. 29a (SBT, p. 178); A.Z. 5b (SBT, p. 22).

sense--as the root of all sin; and perhaps it is the source of the rabbinical idea of lust being injected into Eve. But only with the most forced and unrealistic symbolics can Eve's chastity be brought into question. Nor do the phrases elsewhere that Satan deceived or seduced Eve or that Eve hearkened to the serpent necessarily involve more than the Genesis account.¹ The only first century (?) document even slightly resembling the later Talmudic tractate² is 4 Macc. 18:6 (CAP, II, 684), and it is not at all certain that the allusion is to the Fall. There, speaking of her chastity, a woman says that "no beguiling serpent sullied the purity of my maidenhood."

The rabbinic fable has been suggested to lie behind Paul's thought in 2 Cor. 11:2f, 11.³ Paul declares that he has espoused the Church as a chaste virgin to Christ; but he fears that "as the serpent beguiled (*ἐξήπατησεν*)⁴ Eve by his subtlety (*πανουργία*)⁵ so also the Church might be led away from Christ. The analogy, false apostles : Church :: serpent : Eve, is made in a

¹2 Enoch 31:6, 2 Baruch 48:42 (CAP, II, 451, 507). Cf. G. Friedlander, Perke de Rabbi Eliezer (London: Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1916), pp. 97ff.

²I.e., Yeb. 103b (SBT, p. 711). This is the only talmudic reference which actually states that Eve had intercourse with Satan. Thackeray (Paul and Jewish Thought, p. 50) gives one other which says that Cain is the offspring of Eve and Satan (Jalk. Schim. Beresch. 42). Other passages only cite Satan's lust as the motive for his desire to secure Adam's death through sin.

³Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, pp. 50ff. 1 Tim. 2:13f. is also cited but is not in point; that the woman was the one deceived is no more than a reasonable deduction from the Genesis account.

⁴Cf. Philo, leg. alleg., III, 59 (Colson, I, 341).

⁵Not *επιθυμία* ; cf. 1 Cor. 3:19.

context in which conjugal loyalty forms the setting, at least for one side of the equation. That this figure of conjugal loyalty should find its realization in the sin of Eve not only would be in keeping with the analogy but would heighten and amplify its effect considerably.¹ Satan's recognized power to tempt to incontinency² and the admonition for women to veil themselves "because of the angels"³ are noted as generally supporting the idea in 1 Cor. 11; but for establishing the specific nature of Eve's temptation they are gratuitous.

If the legend had had general currency in the first century and if Paul's analogy of Eve and the Church were confined to this instance, the case for their connection would be virtually absolute.⁴ However, it is probable that the lust-laden apple of the Apocalypse of Moses went through several rabbinic centuries before it emerged as the unchaste Eve. Stories of sexual intercourse with angelic beings in the pre-flood age were not unusual,

¹Viz., unfaithful church : Christ :: unfaithful Eve : Adam.

²1 Cor. 7:5.

³1 Cor. 11:10. The reference is to good, possibly guardian angels (cf. Mt. 18:10; Acts 12:15), not evil angelic powers (cf. 2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 6, 14), whose influence over Christians was forever abolished by Christ's victory (cf. G.H.C. MacGregor, "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought," New Testament Studies, I, 1: September 1954, 22f). Gen. 6:2 (LXX-A: οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ) is not in point; the meaning is, rather, that the flouting of this mark of subjection is offensive not only to their fellow Christians but also to the angels present. Cf. Ps. 137(138):1 LXX; Lk. 12:8, 9; 15:7, 10; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1911), pp. 233f; SBK, III, 437f.

⁴It is only used in illustration in any case, but it implies a credulity and fancy that elsewhere sets Paul apart from the rabbis. Also, Paul often couches important teaching in just such analogous form, e.g., Rom. 5:12ff.

but there is little if any first century material ascribing to this the occasion of Eve's temptation.

Even assuming the limited use of the fable in the first century, it does not follow that it is involved in Paul's analogy. The Church as Christ's bride or virgin is a figure found elsewhere in Paul's letters;¹ this, plus the Pauline concept of Christ as the second Adam, gives an adequate basis for the comparison without any recourse to a later legend. The emphasis Paul makes is not that as Eve committed a certain sin so the Church is in danger of the same offense, but, passively, as Eve was deceived by Satan speaking through the serpent ^{so} ~~as~~ the Church is in danger of being deceived by Satan working through false apostles.² If the legend was in mind it would, of course, extend the force of the analogy; but there is no sufficient evidence, either in Jewish literature or in Paul, to warrant finding it in this passage.

The Priority of the Male in Creation

Paul might agree with the little boy's maxim that "girls are all right as long as they stay in their place;" for the apostle had definite opinions as to the place of women in the life of his churches. Ordinarily his instructions are in application of a principle involved in the order of creation and in Eve's susceptibility in the first sin.³ In 1 Cor. 11:7ff Paul comes into contact with a rabbinic tradition in declaring that man "is the image

¹Eph. 5:30ff; cf. Mt. 25:1ff; Rev. 19:7.

²2 Cor. 11:13ff.

³1 Cor. 11:8; † Tim. 2:13f.

(εἰκὼν = Πῶς) and glory (δόξα = Τιζο) of God, but the woman is the glory of the man." The rabbis also make the point that "the glory of the Holy One" is derived from the males¹ and woman is the man's glory.² It is noteworthy that Paul, as the rabbis, contrasts the sexes as to δόξα not as to εἰκὼν which Gen. 1:27 ascribes to both. The view is not contrary to the general tenor of the Genesis narrative (the probable ultimate source), but it finds no explicit formulation there. It is probable, therefore, that Paul and the later rabbinical writings share a common exegetical tradition at this point.

The Doctrine of the Second Adam

In 1 Cor. 15:45 Paul, continuing the earlier (vs. 22) Adam-Christ typology, distinguishes between the natural man (ψυχὴν ζῶσαν) and the immortalizing spirit (πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν). His ^{quotation} question (Gen. 2:7) is quite free and the latter half entirely missing from the OT text.³ The former is named ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπιτος Ἀδάμ and the latter, ὁ ἑσχάτος Ἀδάμ. Paul goes on to identify the last Adam as the "Lord from heaven" and "the heavenly one" (ὁ ἐπουράνιος, vs. 48).

The argument concludes:

Mortality is the form or likeness of the first Adam. . . ; Adam's descendents are involved in Adam's fate (vs. 48). But we shall likewise participate in the destiny of the 'heavenly

¹Nu. R. III, 8. (SMR, V, 81) on Num. 3:15. Perhaps Paul would not go along with the included attitude of resignation that sons are a heritage from the Lord (Ps. 126(127):3), "and if females come, they also are a reward."

²Rashi on Is. 44:13; cf. SBK, III, 424, 435; Moore, *op. cit.*, I, 449; Michel, *op. cit.*, pp. 20f.

³*Supra*, pp. 8, 41 ; *infra*, pp. 187ff.

one; we shall bear his likeness by ourselves becoming immortal or heavenly beings (vs. 49).¹

Philo (on Gen. 2:7) contrasts two types of men, a heavenly man (οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος) and an earthly one (ὁ γήϊνος).² The distinction is essentially Platonic³ and based upon the repetitive Genesis account (Gen. 1:27; 2:7).⁴ The first is 'a miniature^a heaven,'⁵ "altogether without part or lot in corruptible and terrestrial substance;"⁶ the earthly man is made of clay. Both are placed in the garden, but it is to ὁ γήϊνος that Eve is given and the present creation belongs.⁷

Paul's argument in 1 Cor. 15 has been interpreted as pointing to a Gnostic or Philonic view of the early Genesis narrative, but there are a number of objections to such an explanation. Paul never uses the term, 'heavenly man' (οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος), and his expression, 'earthly one' (ὁ κοίμος), differs from Philo's. The use of Gen. 1:27 (1 Cor. 11:7) in connection with 'earthly' men thwarts any suggestion that the apostle shares a Philonic view of double creation. Furthermore, the sequence which

¹Black, "Doctrine of the Second Adam," p. 171.

²Philo, leg. alleg., I, 31ff, 53ff, 88f. (Colson, I, 167ff, 181f, 205).

³Philo treats them as two distinct men, but at times it seems only to be a way of distinguishing the 'soul' and 'body' of man. Cf. Moore, op. cit., I, 452.

⁴Cf. Philo, de opific. mun., 69, 82 (Colson, I, 55, 67).

⁵Ibid.

⁶Philo, leg. alleg., I, 31 (Colson, I, 167).

⁷Ibid., I, 53f; II, 4f (Colson, I, 181, 227).

Paul gives (earthly--heavenly) is antithetical to Philo's picture (heavenly-earthly); Christ, for Paul, is the last Adam, the head of a new race. Black evaluates the relation of Paul and Philo at this point:

If the Apostle was familiar with Philonic or pre-Philonic teaching, he is interpreting it in terms of his own mystical experience of the risen Christ. Or rather, he is making restrained and cautious use of current theologumena to give expression to his own Christology.¹

It is a baseless conjecture to equate Paul's second Adam in 1 Cor. 15 with the Gnostic figure of Ur-mensch.² As Michel well points out, if Paul knew of a tradition identifying Messiah and Ur-mensch, he does not take over the idea but rather fights it (vs. 46f).³ It is not Ur-mensch but "the second man" ὁ δευτέρου ἄνθρωπος (Rom. 5:14) who is the Lord from heaven. In Stewart's strongly worded indictment, "Paul's great thought of the eternal Christ owes nothing whatsoever to the picture of the 'Heavenly Man' in the Book of Enoch or elsewhere; it is sheer blindness and banality to suggest, as has not been infrequently done, that a mechanical equating of Jesus with the ready made concepts of a pre-Christian Messianism was the origin of Paul's glowing and inspired Christology."⁴ The Gnostic conception of a Heavenly Man, Black

¹Black, "Doctrine of the Second Adam," p. 171. Cf. Vollmer, op. cit., pp. 54f.

²Cf. J. Weiss, Der Erste Korintherbrief (Göttingen: Vandenhöck and Ruprecht, 1925), p. 375; R. Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (Leipzig: Teubner, 1927), pp. 346ff. For a criticism of Reitzenstein cf. H. Gressman, "Das Religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Ursprungs der hellenistischen Erlösungsreligion," ZFK, XL (1922), 172-191; LXI (1923), 154-180.

³Michel, op. cit., p. 24.

⁴Stewart, op. cit., p. 48. Cf. G. A. F. Knight, From Moses to Paul (London: Lutterworth, 1949), pp. 141f.

concludes,

. . . so far as it can be regarded as 'pre-Christian,' proves on closer examination to be largely a reconstruction from sources some as late as Islamic times, others even later. . . there is no unequivocal evidence pointing to the existence of such a conception in pre-Christian sources, particularly within Judaism.¹

The Angels at Sinai

Apart from the early chapters of Genesis there are several other similarities in Pauline and Jewish exegesis which merit consideration in some detail. The role of angels in the giving of the law, the legend of the following rock, and the interpretation of 'seed' in Gal. 3:16 are three cases in point.

In the first instance Paul states in Gal. 3:19 that the law was enacted (*διὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων*) "through the agency of angels in the hands of a mediator," i.e., Moses;² the promise, in contrast, was given directly to Abraham by God. The presence of angels at Sinai is mentioned occasionally in Jewish writings and in the NT,³ and evidently is based upon Ps. 67(68):17(18).⁴ The LXX text in Dt. 33:2, which has the reading *ἀγγελος μετ' αὐτοῦ* , discloses the same picture. The Hebrew text is unclear; if the LXX

¹Black, "Doctrine of the Second Adam," p. 177.

²Cf. Burton, *op. cit.*, pp. 189f.

³E.g., Acts 7:38, 53; Heb. 2:2; cf. Col. 2:14f; Shab. 88 (SBT, pp. 417f, 421f); Josephus, *Antiquities*, XV, 136, trans. W. Whiston (London: Routledge, 1906), p. 44; Ex. R. XXIX, 2 (SMR, III, 337f); Nu. R. XI, 3, 7 (SMR, V, 419, 443); cf. SBK, III, 554ff. According to Sanh. 38b (SBT, p. 245) God consults his angels on all things; cf. Jub. 2:1 (CAP, II, 13). In Ex. R. XXVIII, 1 (SMR, III, 31) the angels are depicted as opposing the giving of the Law; cf. Shab. 88b (SBT, pp. 421f).

⁴Cf. P. Delitzsch, *The Psalms* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1888), II, 296.

reading is not correct, it may well give an ancient exegetical gloss on the Hebrew *וְטָר*.¹ In any event its place in the LXX and the Psalms points to a very ancient interpretation of the passage and obviates any reference on Paul's part to Jewish writings. Both got it from a common source--the OT, and the rabbinical accretions find no place in Paul's text.

The Following Rock

In the Exodus typology of 1 Cor. 10:1ff Paul speaks of a spiritual rock which followed (*πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας*) the Israelites in the wilderness and identifies this rock with Christ. There is a cumulative legend in rabbinic literature to which the Pauline phrase has been related in one degree or another.² Thackeray, who is certain that Paul has this legend in mind, traces the source of the tradition to a targumic interpretation of Num. 21:17.³ It does appear that, throughout, the rabbinic references to the legend have to do almost exclusively with this text.⁴

In full flower the legend went somewhat as follows:⁵ A

¹Cf. Puukko, op. cit., p. 80.

²Envelopment in the cloud (1 Cor. 10:1f) is also mentioned in Jewish sources; however, Paul's reference probably stems directly from an interpretation of Ex. 40:34, 38 or Ps. 104(105):39. Cf. Wisdom 10:17; Josephus, Antiquities, III, 79 (Thackeray, IV, 355); Ta'an. 9a (SBT, p. 38).

³Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, pp. 205ff; cf. Targ. Onkelos on Num. 21 (Etheridge, p. 300).

⁴Lv. R. X, 9 (SMR, IV, 134) on Num. 20:10 most probably does not refer to the well.

⁵This synthetic reconstruction naturally has no facsimile in the rabbinic material.

moveable well, rock-shaped and resembling a sieve, was given the Israelites in the desert. As to origin, it was one of the ten things created on the evening of the Sixth Day. About the size of an oven or beehive, it rolled along after the wanderers through hills and valleys and, when they camped, settled at the tent of meeting. When the princes called "Rise up, O well" (Num. 21:17), water flowed from its many openings as from a flask.¹ The well performed many services: Occasionally it gave everyone a drink at the door of his tent.² Sending forth a river of water to the sea, it brought back all the delights of the world.³ The fertile ground along its banks grew grass which served as an effective deodorant;⁴ fruits, vegetables, and trees which produced a perfume for the women also grew along its course.⁵ The water, too, had healing properties for all who used it.⁶ Though no larger than a beehive, this devoted servant of Israel once swelled up and filled a whole valley; thus it killed and collected the bones of Israel's enemies in a victory not equaled since the Red Sea swallowed Pharaoh.⁷ At the death of Miriam the well dried up and disappeared;

¹Tosephta Sukka 3, 11ff (SBK, III, 406f); Nu. R. I, 2 (SMR, V, 4f); Shab. 35a (SBT, p. 164); Nu. R. XIX, 26 (SMR, VI, 777); Aboth 5, 6 (SBT, p. 63); Pes. 54a (SBT, pp. 264, 267).

²Targ. Jerus. on Num. 21 (Etheridge, p. 412).

³Tosephta Sukka 3:11ff (SBK, III, 406).

⁴Dt. R. VI, 11 (SMR, VII, 145).

⁵s. s. R. 12:3; 14:1 (SMR, IX, 223, 225).

⁶Nu. R. XVIII, 22 (SMR, VI, 742); Eccl. R. V., 8, 5 (SMR, VIII, 143f).

⁷Nu. R. XIX, 25 (SMR, VI, 773ff).

for it was given for her merit.¹ But for the sake of the Patriarchs it was restored, and continued with the Israelites until they reached the Sea of Tiberias; there it found its final resting place. And if one has clear eyes, he can stand on a summit and see its reflection in the depths to this day.²

Such is the story of the 'well.' There seem to be two distinct strands of tradition--the following beehive or rock and the following stream; the latter is probably the earlier of them. The Targum of Onkelos is not clear in this regard;³ Midrash Sifre (ca. 125 A.D.?) on Num. 11:21 is certainly in the 'stream' tradition: "Did not a brook follow them in the wilderness and provide them with fat fish more than they needed?"⁴ Pseudo-Philo (ca. 100 A. D. ?) strikes a similar note.⁵ It is quite difficult to determine the precise character of the fable in the first century; apart from the above mentioned sources there is little evidence.⁶

¹Ta'an. 9a (SBT, p. 38); Lv. R. XXVII, 6 (SMR, IV, 351); Nu. R. I, 2 (SMR, V, 4f); S. S. R. IV, 5, 2; 12, 3 (SMR, IX, 200, 223); cf. Num. 20:1f: "And Miriam died . . . and there was no water."

²Shab. 35a (SBT, p. 164); Lv. R. XXII, 4 (SMR, IV, 282); Nu. R. XVIII, 22; XIX, 26 (SMR, VI, 742, 777).

³Etheridge, *op. cit.*, p. 300: ". . . and from [the time] that it was given to them it descended with them to the rivers, and from the rivers it went up with them to the height."

⁴Levertoff, *op. cit.*, p. 77. On its ancient origin see pp. viiif.

⁵M. R. James, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (London: SPCK, 1917), pp. 7, 105ff: ". . . well of water following them, brought He forth for them" (X, 7); . . . "The water of Merah was made sweet and followed them in the desert 40 years, and went up into the hills and came down into the plains. . ." (XI, 14 on Ex. 15:23).

⁶The supposed connection of the Targum on Isa. 16:1 with the legend is quite improbable: "They shall bring tribute to the

Certainly the rabbinical references are not lacking (as in the case of Eve's temptation), and their abundance points to the early existence of the legend in some form. The story grew erratically with each writer so as to preclude any definite classification at a given date; but it is probable that the first century version spoke only of a following stream of water. While the well is spoken of in two late accounts¹ as being in the shape of a rock or crag (יֶעָב), it is nowhere called a rock; also, "it is to be noticed that the legend is based entirely upon the well of Num. 21:17f and is unrelated either with the rock (רֹס) of Ex. 17:5f or with the crag (יֶעָב) of Num. 20:7-11 (though it is brought into connection with the latter by some later writers, e.g., Rashi)."²

Between 1 Cor. 10:1ff and the Well Legend there are one or two points of comparison. Both refer to water from which Israel drank, Paul from one passage (Ex. 17:6; cf. Num. 20:7ff) and the legend from another (Num. 21:16ff; cf. Ex. 15:23ff). Paul speaks of a "spiritual following rock" in the wilderness, the legend concerns a following stream or, later, a rock-shaped well. The correspondence is not especially close, but the phraseology, "spiritual following rock," is peculiar enough to be suggestive.

appointed one of Israel, who has prevailed over him who was as a wilderness . . ." J. F. Stenning, The Targum of Isaiah (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), p. 52.

¹Nu. R. I, 2 (SMR, V, 4f): Tosephta Sukka 3:11f (SBK, III, 406f). The Midrash Rabban is very late, probably 12th Century (SMR, I, vii).

²S. R. Driver, "Notes on Three Passages in St. Paul's Epistle," The Expositor, Third Series, IX (1889), 17.

When the story of a following stream exists in a closely parallel context, some relationship is not altogether improbable. Certainly the adoption of such a puerile fable would be "totally out of harmony" with the character of Paul's mind.¹ But Driver's suggestion of a merely verbal relationship is a possible explanation:

St. Paul views the water which the Israelites drank in the wilderness as provided for them by Christ in his pre-existent Divine nature, who attended and watched over his people, whom he represents under the figure of a rock, accompanying them through their journeyings. The particular expression chosen by the apostle may have been suggested to him by his acquaintance with the legend current among the Jews; but it is evident that he gives it an entirely different application, and that he uses it not in a literal sense, but figuratively.²

Although the word-play of the Targum of Onkelos on Num. 21:16ff accounts for a part of the legend's inception, it is not the ultimate or most important factor in the origin of the 'following stream' tradition.³ In Isaiah and the Psalms there are several references to the water from the rock:

. . . the waters gushed out (ἐρρύσαν) and the streams overflowed (κατὰκλύθυσαν) .--Ps. 77(78):20.

. . . the waters gushed out and ran (ἐπρορεύθυσαν) in the dry places like a river.--Ps. 104(105):41.

X . . . and if they thirsted, through (διὰ) the desert he brought (ἐξέει) water to them . . . from the rock he brought forth (ἐξέει) water to them . . . and the waters gushed out.--Is. 48:21 LXX.

These LXX verbs are futures.

Each of these passages bear upon the same OT text that Paul alludes to in 1 Cor. 10. The ἐπρορεύθυσαν and δι' ἐρήμου ἐξέει may well provide the origin for the 'following stream' tradition.

¹Driver, op. cit., p. 18.

²Ibid. Cf. Dt. 32:4, 10ff, 15, 18, 30ff.

³Contra Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, pp. 206ff.

Perhaps the rock "might justly be spoken of as following them, if the waters flowing from it pursued for a time the same course."¹ Such an interpretation could also have provided the inspiration for the Targum's word-play on another passage (Num. 21:16ff); if so, Paul and the Targum are related more directly to a particular interpretation of the passages by the prophets than to each other. The Targum, applying it to Num. 21:16ff, either sets the legend in motion or applies an inchoate form of it to this particular passage. Paul, on the other hand, takes the prophetic description and employs it for his own typological purpose.²

The Seed of Abraham

No discussion of rabbinical affinities in the Pauline letters would be complete without some reference to Gal. 3:16. Paul has been arguing that the true children of Abraham are those who share Abraham's faith and that any dependence upon the law for righteousness is diametrically opposed to such a status. (Gal. 3: 6f, 9ff). Furthermore, this Abrahamic righteousness is available alike to Gentiles and Jews through Jesus Christ. The apostle notes in verse 16 that the promises, upon which Israel's hope of a

¹P. Fairbairn, The Typology of Scripture (London: Oliphants, 1953), pp. 53ff.

²Beside Philo's equation of the rock with the wisdom or word of God (Philo, leg. alleg., II, 86; quod. deter. 115ff; Colson, I, 279; II, 279f), a further parallel with 1 Cor. 10:4 has been observed in the figure of Metatron. The following presence of Metatron is compared to Paul's following presence of Christ; cf. Sanh. 38b (SBT, p. 246 on Ex. 33:15). A. Murtonen ("The Figure of Metatron," VT, III (1953), 409-411) concludes that the Talmudic Metatron in origin and evolution is a sort of Jewish counterpart to Jesus.

future kingdom rested, were given to Abraham and to his seed (τῷ σπέρματι).¹ In halachic fashion, Paul points out that God did not say "to seeds" (τοῖς σπέρμασιν) as of many, but "to his seed"; this seed is Christ, whom God has made the heir of all things. The conclusion, then, is that all who belong to Christ are Abraham's seed (σπέρμα) and heirs according to the promise (vs. 29).

The distinction between the singular and the plural in Gal. 3:16 is paralleled in the Talmud; there can be little doubt that the apostle agrees with rabbinic methods in this respect.² The important question, however, is whether Paul ^{is} employing this grammatical exegesis indulges in an "extremely fanciful and sophistical" argument.³ The argument has been reconstructed thus: If Abraham's descendents were in view, a plural (e.g., נִי־יִצְחָק) would be required; but God used the singular יִצְחָק. Therefore it must refer to one person, i.e., Christ. If this is Paul's argument, then it must be confessed that its baseless caprice outrabbits the rabbis; only Akiba could applaud it and even he would substitute something more intricate. This view of the passage assumes that Paul the Hebrew was entirely ignorant of the fact that the singular יִצְחָק was used continually in the Hebrew (and

¹See Burton's discussion (op. cit., pp. 505-510).

²E.g., Shab. 84b (SBT, p. 403) on Is. 61:11: seed (of one kind) and seeds (of diverse kinds); cf. Peah. 5:3 (SBT, p. 25); but in B. B. 19a (SBT, p. 98) the plural used is of the same kind of seed. Sanh 37a (SBT, pp. 233f) and Gn. R. XXII, 9 (SMR, I, 189) on Gen. 4:10: blood of Abel and bloods of his descendents (= seeds: נִי־יִצְחָק). Philo (and modern commentators for that matter) also argues from the use of a singular; e.g., ΤΕΚΝΟΝ in Gen. 17:16 (de. mut. nom., 145ff; Colson, V, 217).

³Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, p. 70.

Greek) OT as a collective denoting one's descendents,¹ and that the singular number, therefore, could not be determinative for his usage. Or it puts the apostle in the role of a charlatan fooling his audience with a bit of chicanery. But Paul was neither naive nor deceitful; if anything is known of his character, certainly this is.

However, to dismiss an improbable exegesis does not determine the true meaning of the passage. Its problematic character is precisely the reason that the 'rabbinic artifice' explanation continues to serve as a simple alternative. Burton at length despairs of a solution and concludes that the text has been corrupted.²

The true significance of Paul's usage lies in the argument running throughout the chapter.³ It is whether the 'faith' descendents or the 'law' descendents are the true seed; Paul argues that it is only to the former class of posterity that the promises belong. The Jews employ the same restricted use of 'seed' with regard to Isaac and Ishmael; Paul takes the collective character of the word to imply a class restriction of a different

¹Cf. Burton, op. cit., pp. 505f. The singular is sometimes used of an individual descendent or a particular class or line of descendents (e.g., Gen. 4:25; 21:13; 1 Sam. 1:11; 2 Sam. 7:12; 1 Chron. 17:11). Among the later writings the plural 'seeds' is occasionally used to denote descendents. See Targ. Onkelos and Sanh. 37a (SBT, p. 233) on Gen. 4:10. The significance of the collective nature of $\gamma\eta$ and $\sigma\tau\epsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$ for Paul's interpretation is no modern discovery; in 1650 Drusius (op. cit., p. 1316) noted the fact in his exegesis.

²Ibid., p. 509.

³The Sarah-Hagar allegory (Gal. 4:21ff) follows the same line of thought.

kind. "A plural substantive would be inconsistent with the interpretation given; the singular collective if it admits of plurality (as it is interpreted by Paul himself, Rom. 4:18; 9:7),¹ at the same time it involves the idea of unity."²

Although the seed of Abraham meant the Jewish people, this concept had a peculiar significance for Pauline and NT thought. Israel was embodied in Messiah, and the Christian community formed the remnant of true Israel. Not all were Jews who called themselves Jews (Rom. 2:28f; Rev. 2:9); the faith-less majority were as separate from the true posterity as were the descendents of Ishmael (Gal. 3:7; Rom. 9-11).³ It was to the faith-seed that the promises belonged, and this class was determined not by physical descent but by faith-union with Messiah. Rom. 4:13 forms a fitting commentary on the Galatians passage: "For the promise that he should be heir of the world was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith."⁴ Even Abraham's heirship rested in this faith-union although its many Messianic implications were as yet unrevealed. And so the conclusion, "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise."

¹And, in the course of the present argument, Gal. 3:29. Cf. Acts 3:25.

²Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 142; cf. Fairbairn, op. cit., pp. 386ff.

³Paul makes some reservations in Rom. 11. The physical seed are beloved "for the fathers' sake," and God will incorporate them once more, as a group, into the true Israel of faith. However, this is not in contrast to Paul's view elsewhere; the physical-seed has no separate inheritance but rather is made a part of the faith-seed. See infra, pp. .

⁴Cf. Rom. 9:6.

Burton rightly objects that to take the mere $\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ in a corporate sense (of the body of Christ) or to take $\sigma\pi\epsilon\mu\alpha$ in an individual sense is contrary to Paul's usage elsewhere. However, it is probable that the use of $\chi\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ here is exceptional. To view Messiah in a corporate sense is not contrary to Paul or the OT.¹ The $\epsilon\upsilon\ \chi\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ relationship and the Adam-Christ typology involve a solidarity concept that may well be present in this passage also.

Paul was not unaware of the grammar; his point was that the grammar was aptly suited to contain his exegesis. The grammar alone could never do more than circumscribe the meaning; while most often it was a collective denoting one's posterity in general, it also represented a restricted class of posterity and sometimes even an individual. Paul found the true meaning of the promise by interpreting it of Christ. In the end, then, the passage does not involve a question of grammatical accuracy but of theological interpretation,² and Paul's interpretation involves no rabbinical sophistry. He notes that it is a collective and not a simple plural and, within the limits of the grammar interprets it of Christ, or better, of that particular type of seed which is identified with and headed up in Christ.

¹Note especially the 'Servant of the Lord' passages in Isaiah. Israel was viewed in a corporate sense, and this 'corporate body' was--as Abraham's true 'seed'--finally embodied in the One, Jesus Christ; it is now in Him that the true Israel--Christ's 'body'--inheres. Cf. F. Delitzsch, Isaiah, trans. S. R. Driver (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1890), II, 236; O. Cullmann, Christ and Time (London: SCM Press, 1951), p. 116; T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: University Press, 1931), pp. 227ff; C. R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (Oxford: University Press, 1948), pp. 44f, 215ff.

²Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 142f.

In concluding the consideration of Pauline affinities with Judaism, a few other similarities of interpretation should be noted. Paul takes Hos. 2:25; 1:10 (Rom. 9:25f) of judgment on Israel because of their rejection of Messiah, and sees in the remnant (the Messianic community) the true sons of God. Similarly Zad. Frag. 9:4Off (CAP, II, 821) applies Hos. 3:4 to God's judgment of Israel for their rejection of the New Covenant; the Covenant community, however, is to be blessed of God. Behind the thought of Lk. 2:34a probably lies the texts of Is. 8:14; 28:16 (Rom. 9:33);¹ it may be that this points to a messianic use of the texts in pre-Christian Judaism. On the whole, however, agreements in thought are not frequent. Only about half a dozen of Paul's quotations are used with any frequency in the Talmud,² and about twenty are not found at all.

The Beggarly Elements

When Paul warned Timothy and Titus to beware of Jewish fables and commandments of men (1 Tim. 1:4; Tit. 1:14; 3:9), no doubt he had in mind many of the things exemplified in the rabbinic literature. Although some of their exegesis is praiseworthy and sometimes ingenious in justifying good traditions or judicial rights, nevertheless, its essential character is indeed "weak and beggarly."³ Prat has well summarized it: "In the slough of Apocryphal and rabbinical writings a few particles of gold can sometimes

¹Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), p. 114.

²Gen. 2:7 (1 Cor. 15:45); 2:24 (1 Cor. 6:16); Ex. 20:12-17 (Rom. 13:9; Eph. 6:2-3); Lv. 19:18 (Rom. 10:5); Dt. 19:15 (2 Cor. 13:1); 25:4 (1 Cor. 9:9).

³Gal. 4:9.

be met with, but with how much dross they are combined."¹ To realize the great gulf which separates Paul's use of the OT from that of the rabbis, one need only observe a few examples from Talmudic literature:

1. The dust of the first man was gathered from all over the earth, because Ps. 139:16 says God saw the unformed substance, and Zech. 4:10 says the eyes of the Lord run to and fro through the whole earth (Sanh. 38b; SBT, p. 241).
2. That God says his prayers is proved when Is. 66:7 says my (i.e., God's) house of prayer (Ber. 7a; SBT, p. 30).
3. The laws of the Torah are suspended when life is endangered for Lv. 18:5 says "he shall live (not die) in them." (Yom. 85b, SBT, pp. 421f; A. Z. 27b, SBT, p. 137; Chajes, op. cit., p. 198). Contrast Rom. 10:5; Gal. 3:12.
4. Why did Obadiah hide fifty prophets in the cave (1 Kg. 18:4)? Because the cave would only hold fifty (Sanh. 39b; SBT, p. 253).
5. The first man had two faces because Ps. 139:5 says, "Thou hast formed me behind and before (Ber. 61a; SBT, p. 381).
6. The first man reached from earth to heaven because it says (Dt. 4:32), "since the day God created man upon the earth and from one end of the heaven." (Sanh. 38b; SBT, p. 243).
7. As for prayer instructions, R. Shesheth bowed like a reed (i.e., abruptly) and came up like a serpent (i.e., showily) (Ber. 12a; SBT, p. 69).
8. Whoever places his bed north and south will have male children because Ps. 17:14 says, "Whose belly thou fillest with treasure, who have sons in plenty." Treasure, ת י ש, also means north (Ber. 5b; SBT, p. 22).
9. Michael is greater than Gabriel because he reached his goal in one flight (Dan. 10:13) while Gabriel took two (Dan. 9:21; 'fly' occurs twice). (Ber. 4b; SBT, p. 15).
10. Hos. 1:10 shows that the Holy One, blessed be He, having given vent to harsh utterances against Israel, could not stand it and relented in the same context (Nu. R. II, 16; SMR, V, 53). Contrast Rom. 9:26.

Some of these need little change to fit them for twentieth

¹Prat, op. cit., II, 357.

century vaudeville. Although there are exceptions¹ and the above examples are particularly graphic, they are by no means untypical or extreme and can be adduced ad infinitum et ad nauseam from almost any section of the Talmud. The ruling principle of rabbinic exposition of Scripture is well expressed in Sanh. 34a (SBT, p. 214): A verse is capable of as many interpretations as splinters of a rock crushed by a hammer, for Jer. 23:29 says, "Like a hammer that breaketh a rock in pieces . . ."

Their splinterized, purposeless, speculative musings which "suspend dogmatic mountains on textual hairs"² have not the remotest kinship with Paul's theology or hermeneutical principles. While some peripheral methodological procedures are held in common with the rabbis, it is no less than superficial and shallow to write, as Johannes Weiss has done, that "one must recognize a fixed, stereotyped rabbinical method as forming the basis of all the apostle's theological thinking . . ."³ The contrast which Bonsirven draws shows a much saner appreciation of the facts: The rabbis worshipped the letter and sought to justify their traditions by arbitrary exegesis; Paul's usage, on the other hand, is not

¹Rabbinic juristic rulings are sometimes quite adroit; e.g., the onus probandi in a law suit falls on the plaintiff because Ex. 24:14 says, "If any man have any matters to do, let him come to them." Other rabbis object that this is only common sense; the real purpose of the verse is to show judges that they should give prior consideration to the petition of the plaintiff. Exception is then made if the defendant's property is in serious danger of depreciation (B. K. 46b; SBT, p. 264).

²F. W. Farrar, The Life and Work of St. Paul (London: Cassel, Petter, Galkin, 1879), I, 49.

³Weiss, Primitive Christianity, p. 440. Toy (op. cit., p. xxiii) goes almost as far in equating NT exegesis with "that of the Talmud only far more cautious and reserved. . . ."

arbitrary or against the literal sense if the typological usage be granted.¹ Toy sums up the rabbinic exegesis in the principle "that every sentence and every word of the Scripture was credited with any meaning that it could possibly be made to bear. . ."² Reuss, too, recognized "the superiority of apostolic hermeneutics to the Jewish . . ."³

Concerning Paul's relation to Jewish thought Kennedy has given a better evaluation than most:

It is indeed a current fashion to minimize his relation to the ancient Scriptures of his people, as compared with his indebtedness to the teachings of post-canonical Judaistic literature, in its various branches . . . His writings reveal every here and there affinities with his native environment. But the remarkable fact remains that these affinities are largely superficial, that they disclose themselves at the circumference rather than at the centre of his thought.⁴

Paul's Use of Non-Canonical Literature

General

The question of Paul's knowledge and use of Jewish apocryphal has been debated since Eichhorn's introduction to apocryphal literature in 1795,⁵ and it continues to be a matter of dispute. His knowledge of Palestinian writings in general circulation may

¹Bonsirven, op. cit., pp. 337f.

²Toy, op. cit., xxiii; cf. F. W. Farrar, "Rabbinic Exegesis," pp. 362-378.

³Reuss, History of the New Testament, p. 530, as quoted in Johnson, op. cit., p. 381.

⁴H. A. A. Kennedy, St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904), pp. 43ff; cf. G. B. Stevens, op. cit., p. 59.

⁵J. G. Eichhorn, Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des Alte Testaments (Leipzig: Weidmannschen, 1895).

be presumed; as for the literature of the diaspora the problem becomes more complex. In either case the question is quite theoretical if divorced from the question of Paul's use of this material in his writings. What writings were in general circulation? Which ones would be seen and used by a student for the rabbinate? How far does the extant literature represent the really 'important' literature of Paul's day, and for his party?

Paul's only non-canonical citations are from Greek literature; the use of Greek literary forms such as *συνοτολιχειν* (Gal. 4:25) and the Stoic diatribe evidence a probable acquaintance with Hellenistic writings.¹ Charles cites Pauline parallels with a number of apocrypha and pseudepigrapha,² but for the most part they are only in the nature of a similar phraseology. The agreements with Sirach are altogether of this type, displaying at best only such phrases as "pass the flower of her age" (Sir. 42:9; 1 Cor. 7:36), or "treasures of wisdom" (Sir. 1:25; Col. 2:3).³

In the apocalyptic books, Enoch (62:4), describing the judgment, speaks of "pain . . . as on a woman in travail"; Paul (1 Thess. 5:3) similarly writes, "destruction . . . as travail upon a woman with child." But the use of this figure elsewhere⁴

¹Cf. Puukko, op. cit., II, 35. These practices may, of course, have been common stock.

²Viz., Tobit, Wisdom, Enoch, Letter of Aristeas, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 4th Ezra (CAP, I, 199, 526f; II, 92, 163ff, 292, 559). Cf. James, op. cit., pp. 59f.

³Cf. Sir. 5:3 (1 Thess. 4:6); 7:34 (Rom. 12:15); 37:28 (1 Cor. 6:12); A. R. Gordon, "Quotations," HDAC, Vol. II, (1918). The affinities claimed by P. C. Spicq (Les Epitres Pastorales, Paris: Gabalda, 1947, pp. cxxxiff) are not very convincing. The least unlikely is a common sentiment on not trusting worldly riches (Sir. 5:2, 8; 1 Tim. 6:17).

⁴E.g., Ps. 48:6; Jer. 13:21; Mic. 4:9.

suggests that it is only an idiom in common use. This is also true of other phrases such as "according to his good pleasure" (Eph. 1:9; Enoch 49:4) and "God blessed forever" (Rom. 9:5; cf. Enoch 77:1). Some parallels are more striking (e.g., "the wrath of the Lord came upon them to the uttermost"; Test. Levi. 6:11; cf. 1 Thess. 2:16), but none warrant affirming a direct acquaintance.¹ Jowett is probably correct in regarding all Pauline similarities with apocalyptic writings to be explainable on the supposition of a common source.²

In the light of the above observations Paul's use of non-canonical Jewish literature is very doubtful at best. There are, however, some Jewish writings whose correspondence with Paul extend beyond terminological resemblance. Of these, 4th Ezra, the Wisdom of Solomon, and Philo show the greatest number of similarities. The first is somewhat later than Paul; but the relation of the last two to the apostle has been a matter of some debate.

The Wisdom of Solomon

A short article by Eduard Grafe in 1892 was most influential in convincing the theological world of Paul's dependence upon Wisdom.³ His conclusions were accepted in the English world and,

¹Certainly Charles' supposition that the Testaments were a vade mecum for Paul is a shot in the dark (CAP, II, 292).

²Jowett, *op. cit.*, p. 200. However, F. C. Porter is probably mistaken (and has defined 'apocalyptic' too narrowly) in contending that Paul's disinterest in the whole idea is the reason for his disuse of Jewish apocalyptic ("The Place of Apocryphal Conceptions in the Thought of Paul," *JBL*, XLI (1922), pp. 183-204.

³E. Grafe, "Das Verhältnis der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salominis," *Theologische Abhandlung für C. von Weizsäcker* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1892), pp. 251-286. Grafe's was the significant

to a considerable extent, by continental theology. At the turn of the century Thackeray regarded Paul's use of apocrypha to be established "only in the case of one work--the Wisdom of Solomon."¹ Holmes argues at length for Grafe's position.² On the continent the development after Grafe was rather different. Though he was not without support,³ many were not impressed with his conclusions. Gunkel, in his second edition of Wirkungen des Heiligen Geistes in 1899, continued of the opinion that "die Ähnlichkeit der Gedankenreihen ist rein formal, ein Einfluss auf Paulus sehr unwahrscheinlich."⁴ Focke's "Introduction" also opposed Grafe's conclusions.⁵ Several fundamental parallels between Paul and Wisdom are adduced by Grafe: (1) the power of God versus the nothingness of man; (2) God's patience toward his enemies, though he knows it profits them nothing; (3) the contrast between the fate of God's enemies and his children.⁶ In addition, similarities are found in the description

work though others had previously noted a relationship. Farrar (Life and Work of Paul, II, 643) marked such passages as Wis. 2:24 (Rom. 5:12); 3:8 (1 Cor. 6:2); 9:15 (2 Cor. 5:2); 11:23ff (Rom. 11:32).

¹Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, p. 223. So, with reservations, Sanday and Headlam (op. cit., p. 269): "If St. Paul learnt from the Book of Wisdom illustrations of the Divine Power, and a general aspect of the question, he obtained nothing further. His broad views and deep insight are his own."

²GAP, I, 526f.

³E.g., Lietzmann, An die Galater, p. 33; Schürer, op. cit., II, III, 234.

⁴H. Gunkel, Wirkungen des Heiligen Geistes (Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1899), pp. 79f: "The similarity of their train of thought is purely formal, an influence on Paul very improbable."

⁵F. Focke, Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos (Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1913), pp. 113-126.

⁶Cf. Rom. 9:19-23 and Wis. 11:22; 12:8-20.

of heathen idolatry¹ and of the body-soul relationship.² Grafe concludes that although the borrowing is more a formal adoption of concepts than an essential dependence, nevertheless, Paul has been substantially influenced by this Alexandrian writing.³

In a convincing criticism Focke questioned whether the above similarities were to be explained on the basis of a Pauline dependence, or whether each writing merely stemmed from the same soil. Grafe had only observed the formal side of the question, and in this lay the weakness of his position; their essential difference of viewpoint, even where formal agreement occurred, was fatal to Grafe's hypothesis.⁴

Michel, agreeing with Focke's analysis, found in Rom. 1: 18ff and Wis. 12-14 the most significant congruities between the two writers.⁵ The similarity here is not merely common opposition to idolatry; both aver that through the creation the creator can be known, and both distinguish a definite judgment upon men for the sin of idolatry. Nevertheless, a number of differences appear: (1) according to Rom. 1:20f the heathen recognized the Utoffenbarung of God in nature but rejected it and turned to idols; Wisdom, contrariwise, views the heathen idolatry as a childish ignorance persisted in, but which is done in a genuine attempt to

¹Rom. 1:18ff, 24-32; Gal. 2:8-10 and Wis. 12-14.

²2 Cor. 5:1ff and Wis. 9:15.

³The provenance of the book is almost certainly Egypt. Cf. Oesterley, An Introduction to the Apocrypha, pp. 209f; CAP, I, 524f.

⁴Focke, op. cit.

⁵Michel, op. cit., pp. 16ff; After a close study of the related texts Bonsirven concludes, with Focke and Michel, that it is very doubtful that Paul made use of Wisdom (op. cit., p. 291).

find God.¹ The fundamental concept in Romans that idolatry resulted from a deliberate disaffection of the will from God is entirely lacking in the apocryphal book.² (2) The judgment of idolatry also differs. Paul notes the declining state of the pagan world from image worship (Rom. 1:23) to creature (κτίσις) worship (vs. 25) to utter spiritual indifference (vs. 28); and the progression is not merely rhetorical. In contrast, Wisdom distinguishes a better and worse type paganism. Worship of the creation draws only a mild rebuke (Wis. 13:1-9, n.b., vss. 6, 8) while the worship of images or animals is judged more sharply (Wis. 12:24; 13:10f).

In spite of the similar material and formal agreements³ the picture given by the two writers is quite distinct. For the author of Wisdom the basic fault is in the intellect, for Paul it is in the will. Over against the progressive spiritual deterioration in Romans stand two relatively guilty types of idolatry in Wisdom. For Paul the result is their abandonment by God to increasing licentiousness culminating in a judgment of death; Wisdom views God's judgment as first a child's corrective (Wis. 12:25f), which if unheeded brings greater evils and God's punishment (Wis. 14:22ff). In the overall picture, Paul sees guilty men under God's judgment, while Wisdom thinks of foolish men deceived by child's play.

¹Wis. 13:2, 6ff; 14:1f, 11 (CAP, I, 556ff).

²Weber (op. cit., pp. 65ff) and Michel (op. cit., p. 17) are probably mistaken in finding in Paul's text an allusion to the rabbinical notion that the Torah was first offered to the heathen but rejected. Cf. Ex. R. XVII, 2 (SMR, III, 212). However, references to Gentile rejection of earlier revelations are pertinent (e.g., Yalkut, I, 765; Weber, pp. 66f).

³Grafe, op. cit., pp. 272f: ἐπιγνώσις (Rom. 1:28) and ἐπιγινώσκουσιν (Wis. 13:1); νοεῖν (Rom. 1:20; Wis. 13:4); ἀνοήτως (Rom. 1:21; Wis. 11:15).

There is very little unity in the essential character of the two passages.¹

In the correspondence of other passages as well the evidence points more to a mutual tradition, often originating immediately in the OT,² than to a Pauline dependence on the apocryphal work. God's purpose in deferring judgment is depicted quite differently by Paul and Wisdom.³ If Oesterley's dating of Wisdom as "40 A.D. or a few years later" is correct, it is very doubtful indeed that the work could have exerted the influence on Paul that is asserted for it.⁴ Michel has properly concluded that both Paul and Wisdom "sind von einer bestimmten apologetischen Tradition abhängig," and any further profitable research will lie in this direction.⁵

¹Cf. Puukko, op. cit., p. 43; Michel, op. cit., pp. 17f.

²E.g., on the power of God and nothingness of man cf. Job 9:19; Jer. 27:44; Nah. 1:6; Ps. 75(76):8; on Rom. 1:23 cf. Ps. 105 (106):20f. Paul's illustration of the potter and the clay (Rom. 9:21ff) is also in contrast to its use in Wisdom (15:7) and points to the OT. Cf. Is. 29:16; 45:9; Jer. 18:6.

³Cf. Rom. 9:22-24; Wis. 12:1-11. In Wisdom it is to give the wicked time to repent; Paul views God as enduring evil in order to shape and use it for his own good purposes.

⁴Oesterley, An Introduction to the Apocrypha, p. 209. Many writers see a direct influence of Wisdom on Paul and date the book considerably earlier; cf. CAP, I, 520f, 526f. Sanday and Headlam (op. cit., pp. 51ff, 267ff) give such an estimate: "[It is clear] that at sometime in his life St. Paul must have bestowed upon the Book of Wisdom a considerable amount of study . . . [His indebtedness] did not extend to any of the leading ideas of Christianity, and affected the form rather than the matter of the arguments to which it did extend" (p. 52). In viewing Wisdom as a source for Paul, however, these writers may have underestimated the possibility of a common tradition as the bond between them.

⁵Michel, op. cit., p. 18: "[Both] are dependent upon a fixed apologetic tradition." Cf. Puukko, op. cit., p. 43; Focke, op. cit., pp. 120ff.

Philo

The only other influence from the Alexandrian school discerned in Paul's OT usage is that of Philo. The use of allegory (Gal. 4:21ff) and the identification of Christ with the rock in the wilderness are the two instances most often adduced.¹ If there were Philonic or other Alexandrian influences on the apostle, they were probably not direct. Vollmer, after studying the question of Paul's relation to Philo, considered the results inconclusive; the agreements which did occur only made Paul's acquaintance with the Alexandrian writer less improbable than before.² Puukko, also rejecting any direct relationship, suggests that Apollos may have introduced Paul to current Alexandrian thought.³ Paul's relation to Philo is best explained, as in the case of Wisdom, as mutual dependence upon a common tradition.⁴ The affinities between the two are not sufficient to establish any closer connection, although Puukko's conjecture is not an improbable one.

A number of concepts in Philo which have considerable affinity to Pauline thought have been noted by Kennedy:

[Although] along a very diverse line of development, Philo arrives at a position regarding the law which approximates to that of St. Paul. . . . Each in his own manner has come to

¹Supra, pp. . The faith of Abraham, the exegesis in 1 Cor. 9:9, and the 'heavenly man' are other instances of real or alleged similarity (see supra, pp.).

²Vollmer, op. cit., p. 98.

³Puukko, op. cit., pp. 39f, 70.

⁴So, Michel (Op. cit., p. 111) who cites the synagogue worship as the means by which such exegetical traditions spread. Philo's relation to the Apocrypha is similarly explained by Ryle (Philo and Scripture, p. xxxiii).

realize the accomplishment of Jeremiah's epoch-making utterances: "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts" (Jer. 31:33).¹

Philo also resembles Paul in making salvation totally dependent upon the work of God² and approaches Paul's idea of 'adoption' as sons of God. Speaking of Abraham as God's friend (Gen. 18:17) Philo says, "But he who has reached this portion . . . alone is nobly born, for he has registered God as his father and become by adoption His only son. . . ." ³ Philo's concept of the Spirit of God is also regarded by Kennedy as resembling the NT. But in Philo "it is one special description of a fluctuating and elusive category like the Logos, while St. Paul indissolubly associates it with . . . the person and activity of the living Lord."⁴

Kennedy recognizes that "a large amount of the material embodied in Philo's voluminous writings is quite obviously inherited tradition."⁵ Furthermore, it is doubtful whether attempts to relate Philo directly to NT writers "has led to important results."⁶ His study serves to strengthen the hypothesis of a common tradition underlying certain Philonic concepts which appear in clearer light in the NT, but there are no grounds for assuming a direct connection. Jowett's essay on 'St. Paul and Philo'⁷ sums up the relation of Christianity to Alexandrian Judaism:

[Alexandrianism] was mystical and dialectical, not moral and spiritual . . . ; it was a literature not a life It

¹H. A. A. Kennedy, Philo, p. 56; cf. H. Windisch, Die Frömmigkeit Philos (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909).

²Ibid., pp. 149ff. ³Philo, de sobr. 56 (Colson, III, 473).

⁴Kennedy, Philo, pp. 191f. ⁵Ibid., p. 9. ⁶Ibid., p. 23.

⁷Jowett, op. cit., I, 382-434.

spoke of a Holy Ghost; of a Word; of a divine man; of a first and second Adam; of the faith of Abraham; of bread which came down from heaven; but knew nothing of the God who had made of one blood all nations of the earth; of the victory over sin and death; of the cross of Christ. It was a picture, a shadow, a surface, a cloud above, catching the rising light ere He appeared. It was the reflection of a former world, not the birth of a new one. It lifted up the veil of the temple, to see in a glass only dreams of its own creation (p. 454).

Common Tradition

Because of its emphasis on placing Scripture in its historical environment modern biblical scholarship has often tended to convert parallels into influences and influences into sources.¹ Further, the limited number of extant contemporary documents has sometimes resulted in an exaggeration of their importance and in an underestimation of the general currency of a particular phrase or concept. Too often, also, the investigator has uncritically assumed that the biblical writer must have a 'source' but that the apocryphal literature can be taken as pure spring water. In comparing Pauline correspondence with the Apocryphal literature it has been the writer's impression throughout that they pointed not so much to a direct source of influence as to current theologumena and traditional concepts or interpretations. This seems to be the most probable explanation of Paul's relation to the Alexandrian writings discussed above. Knox's observation is appropriate:

Consequently, it is never possible to be certain how far a similarity of ideas and even language may not be due to the fact that two writers are borrowing from a common source. Further, since all Jewish writers appeal in the last resort to

¹Selwyn (op. cit., pp. 8f) gives a pertinent illustration from one of Chamberlain's speeches. Certain phraseology was attributed to Channing. After Chamberlain denied it, both were found to be unconsciously dependent upon a traditional idiom of expression.

the OT and use it in accordance with a more or less conventional system of interpretation, it is manifest that there are always wide possibilities of the occurrence of striking similarities which have no further relation to one another than a common use of the same passage of the OT.¹

Conclusion

The importance of Paul's Jewish heritage cannot be ignored if his writings are to be fully understood. The influence of Jewish literary methods particularly and of Scriptural interpretations to a lesser degree is frequently apparent. And where distinguishable, with few exceptions they point to a Palestinian rather than Hellenistic Judaism; in no case has a direct use of writings of the diaspora been established. As might be expected a greater correspondence is evidenced in procedures² such as IF and combined quotations than in hermeneutical principles or interpretations. However, Christianity appealed to an existing state of expectancy which was the outcome of a previous development;³ it would be very strange, therefore, if some continuity between Pauline and Jewish exegesis were not found. The important consideration is not that Paul borrowed a Jewish interpretation but that Christ's apostle, led by the Holy Spirit, used it as a true interpretation. Often, too, rabbinic parallels are important in giving illustrations for a Scriptural usage rather than its origin.⁴

¹W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (Cambridge: University Press, 1925), p. 126.

²Even these are sometimes only general literary methods without any rabbinic peculiarity. Cf. F. Johnson, op. cit., p. 375.

³Edersheim, Prophecy and History, p. 5.

⁴Cf. I. Abrahams, "Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis," Cambridge Biblical Essays (London: MacMillan, 1909), pp. 159-192.

The significant conclusion, however, is the great chasm separating the writings of Paul from the rabbis. The apostle's OT exegesis was not just an adoption of current traditions but reveals a vitality and understanding totally foreign to rabbinical literature. If Paul used Jewish interpretations, he culled and molded them to a Christological understanding of the OT; if he was a 'child of his times,' they were for Paul the times of Messiah, His cross and resurrection, and His revelation of the true meaning of Scripture. Paul was a disciple of Christ not Gamaliel.

Paul's use of Jewish legends has been exaggerated. The accusation that he "naively treats the Haggadic embellishments of OT stories on the same footing with the Scripture itself"¹ is an all too common cliché. But when all of the facts are assembled, such assertions are manifestly unjustified.

The Pauline use of the OT cannot really be understood in terms of ^{the Apostle's} his Jewish contemporaries. This is especially true where principles of interpretation are involved.² The affinities which occur are in peripheral areas and never reach to the heart of his thought. After his conversion the OT became a new book for Paul; all that went before now stood only as a prelude--a prelude set quite apart from all that was to follow. Although echoes of the prelude remain, the real meaning which the OT has for him lies at a different source. And to find it one must go to Christ and to the apostles.

¹Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 46.

²Exegesis is chiefly in mind here; as for hermeneutic methods, Paul's use of midrash pesher does have affinities with elements in apocalyptic Judaism. See infra, pp. .

CHAPTER III

PAUL AND THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH

Introduction

In emphasizing his direct revelation from Jesus Christ Paul asserts the independence of his message from any earthly authority:

For I would have you know, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not man's gospel. For I did not receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ.¹

Nevertheless, after his conversion the apostle did not remain forever in isolation; and the form of his kerygma evidences a common stock of early Christian teaching emanating both from Christ's ministry and from apostolic emphases and interpretations of His ministry.² One element of this common material relates to the use and interpretation of the OT by the apostles and by the Lord as reported by them.³ The present chapter is an examination of this

¹Gal. 1:11f RSV.

²P. Carrington (The Primitive Christian Catechism, Cambridge: University Press, 1940) develops this very suggestively along the lines of a prevalent catechetical pattern. Cf. G. E. Phillips, The Transmission of the Faith (London: Lutterworth, 1946), p. 58. Selwyn, *op. cit.*, p. 459: "That common catechetical and liturgical sources underlie most of the Epistles of the NT seems to be proven beyond a doubt."

³No attempt has been made to debate the credibility of the Gospel sources used. The extreme position of R. Bultman (cf. Die Geschichte der synoptische Tradition, 2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1931) has been justly characterized by V. Taylor (Gospel Tradition, p. 107) as one of "violent exaggeration." Getting 'behind' the Gospels is a difficult task even at the textual

element.

Paul's knowledge of Christ's teaching via the apostolic tradition is evident in various places, and it is probable that some parallels with the apostles find their ultimate source in Christ.¹ The correspondence in the use and interpretation of the OT is an especially significant aspect of the unified message of the early church; it affected not only their interpretations of Scripture but the biblical textual tradition as well.² There are only about a dozen OT passages quoted both by Paul and other NT writers,³ but this does not fully reveal the extent of intercur-
 rence. There is a significant correspondence in the use of typol-
 ogy, the emphasis placed upon certain sections of the OT, and the

and linguistic level; in typing the 'true' and 'false' tradition the critic's--perhaps unconscious--presuppositions as to what 'ought' to be true or false all too often determine the answer. The exemplum classicum is the 'Jesus of History' movement; after Schweitzer's death-blow, Bultmann completed the burial by removing any 'Jesus of History' to go back to. But his substituted 'Jesus of Mythology' is of the same clay, and signs of its mortality are already in evidence. Not the least of these is the increasing improbability of the Hellenistic influences upon which much of the theory depends. To be borne in mind also is the importance of the 'witness' in the Jewish mind (cf. A. Barr, "The Factor of Testimony in the Gospels," ET, XLIX (1937-38), 401) and the concern which is present in the early Church to give, and to receive, an accurate account (Lk. 1:1-4).

¹See supra, pp. 30f. Cf. 1 Cor. 9:24 (1 Tim. 5:18); 1 Thess. 4:15; Gal. 3:1; Rom. 12:14 (Mt. 5:44); 1 Thess. 4:8 (Mt. 10:40); 1 Cor. 13:2 (Mt. 17:20); *οὐκ οὐσατε* in 2 Cor. 7:2, 9, 15, 19 (Mt. 19:28; 13:42f; Jn. 15:5; 2:21f). After examining such passages, A. W. Argyle ("Parallels between the Pauline Epistles and Q," ET 60: 1948-49, 318-320) concludes that such similarities "imply that Paul's mind was steeped in the tradition of our Lord's ethical sayings . . ." (p. 320).

²Manson ("The Cairo Geniza: A Review," p. 184) rates the doctrinal and liturgical influences as most important in shaping first century textual traditions.

³See Appendix IV.

interpretations and application of quotations in common.¹ Certain methods, such as merged quotations and typological exegesis, associate Paul closely with other NT writings in contrast to contemporary Jewish literature. Selwyn has noted the "interdependence of the various Epistles on a common stock of teaching and hymnody current in the Church;"² there are some grounds for including the oracles and OT paraphrases of early Christian prophets in this classification.³

Pauline and New Testament Parallels

A continuity of OT interpretation from Christ through the apostolic tradition to Paul appears in a number of instances. The whole concept of Christianity being the true Israel lies embryonic in the earliest stages of the Christian movement. The figure of the bridegroom and bride, applied to God and Israel in the OT,⁴ is used in the NT of Christ and his people. The figure is found in John the Baptist's preaching (Jn. 3:29), the parables of Christ (e.g., Mt. 25:1ff), and the Pauline Epistles (2 Cor. 11:2f; Eph. 5:31f). Similarly, the spiritual nature of true Abrahamic sonship, so emphasized by Paul (Rom. 4; Gal. 3-4), is intimated much earlier in John the Baptist's message:

Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of repentance, and begin not to say within yourselves, "We have Abraham for our

¹Cf. E. Grafe, Das Urchristentum und das Alte Testament (Tübingen: Mohr, 1907). For their common hermeneutical method, see infra, pp. 187ff.

²Selwyn, op. cit., p. 19; cf. p. 459.

³Infra, pp. 140ff.

⁴Cf. Hos. 1-2; Ezk. 16:20. The Jewish interpretation of the Song of Solomon also follows this theme.

father." For I say to you that God¹ is able from these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.

In Jn. 8:33-43 Christ rejects the claim of the Pharisees to be Abraham's seed (σπέρμα, vs. 33) with this observation: "If you were Abraham's children (τέκνα, vs. 39), you would do the works of Abraham." In the Epistles this involves 'works' resting in and proceeding from Abraham's faith.² The Jews' rejection of Messiah is interpreted both in John (12:38) and Romans (10:16) as the fulfilment of Is. 53:1 and is in accordance with the veiled parabolic predictions of the Lord Himself.³ Again, Paul (Rom. 11:8) and the Fourth Gospel (Jn. 12:40) both attribute the rejection to a judicial blinding, although different OT Scriptures are cited.⁴ The 'rejected stone' imagery (Mt. 21:42; Mk. 12:10f; Acts 4:11; Rom. 9:33; 1 Pet. 2:6ff) in which Israel's rejection is implied also has its origin in the words of Christ.⁵ From these parallels one may reasonably assume that the identification of the followers of Christ with the 'true Israel' or the remnant, though finding clearest expression in the Apostles, is implicit in the teaching of John the Baptist and Christ. And some of the same OT passages which Paul employs in this regard are used with similar import by

¹Lk. 3:8f; cf. Mt. 3:9f; Jn. 6:29; Michel, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

²Cf. Gal. 3:7; Jas. 2:23.

³E.g., Mt. 22:1ff.

⁴Is. 29:10 (Dt. 29:4) and Is. 6:9. The Pauline citation may be a 'testimony' summary of several passages; cf. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 38. Cf. Mk. 3:5; 6:52; 8:17. For Christ's own usage cf. Mt. 13:14ff; Jn. 9:39.

⁵The primary element in the combination is Ps. 117(118):22f, a *verbum Christi*, although Paul omits it as irrelevant to his purpose; cf. Selwyn, *op. cit.*, p. 268; *infra*, pp. 116ff.

Christ and the Gospel writers.

In other subjects, too, Paul finds close affinity with the teachings of the Lord Jesus. The Apostle's insistence that righteousness through the law requires the keeping of the law ("for he who does these things shall live in them," Rom. 10:5; Gal. 3:12) echoes the sentiment voiced by Christ in his answer to the lawyer's query concerning eternal life. After the lawyer cited the commandments, Christ answered, "Do this and you will live" (Lk. 10:28).¹ With regard to the sanctity and significance of the marital bond both Christ (against divorce) and Paul (against fornication) appeal to the same Scripture.² Paul's statement that the whole law is fulfilled in one word, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Gal. 5:14), is a maxim for the whole of the NT: According to the Lord the Golden Rule is the law and the prophets (Mt. 7:12); and on the two commands, loving God and loving one's neighbor, hang all the law and prophets.³ Similarly, the philosophy of turning the other cheek, enunciated in the 'Sermon on the Mount' (Mt. 5:38-48) is also found in Romans; and in the context is a λέγει Κύριος quotation which appears to have been common to the early Church.⁴

¹Cf. Jas. 1:22; 2:10.

²Mt. 19:5; 1 Cor. 6:16; cf. Mk. 10:8; Eph. 5:31f. The *οὐ δὺο* is not in the Hebrew; the LXX wording enhances the *δὺο-μία* transition.

³In Lk. 10:25 the questioning lawyer sums up the law in the same way, thereby giving the occasion for the parable of the Good Samaritan. James (2:8) cites Lv. 19:18 as the "royal law" (νόμον βασιλικόν).

⁴Rom. 12:14-21; cf. vs. 19; Heb. 10:30. The quotation (Dt. 32:35), identical in Romans and Hebrews (λέγει Κύριος is textually uncertain in Hebrews), varies considerably from the OT;

Paul's typological use of the OT also reflects in large degree--and in a complex interlocking pattern--the teachings of Christ. The 'Rock' or 'stone' (mentioned above) as a messianic title was according to Selwyn, probably "first made by the Lord Himself."¹ Although this probably needs some qualification, there can be little doubt that Christ is the source of the NT usage (cf. Mt. 21:42). Paul also identifies Christ with the 'rock' in the Wilderness in 1 Cor. 10:1ff; this may be closely related to the 'rejected stone' tradition in the early Church. In any case, other elements in the Exodus Typology appear to be rooted in applications made by the Lord.² In John 6 Christ, taking the setting of the Exodus, depicts Himself as the true Manna:

I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead . . . I am the living bread which came down from heaven . . . Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day.³

closer to the NT is the targum: "Vengeance lies before me . . ." (Etheridge, op. cit., p. 668). Romans, in the same context (vs. 14), has a further affinity to the Matthean account. Cf. Rom. 2:1ff; 14:4; (Mt. 7:1ff); Rom. 2:13; 10:5 (Mt. 7:21ff).

¹Selwyn, op. cit., p. 158; cf. Davies, op. cit., pp. 152f; supra, p. . . The targum on Is. 28:16 has a strong messianic flavor: "Therefore, thus saith the Lord, Elohim, I will appoint in Zion a king, a strong king, powerful and terrible. I will make him strong and powerful, saith the prophet; but the righteous who have believed in these things shall not be dismayed when distress cometh" (Stenning, op. cit., p. 88). It would be strange, too, if the Jews never took the 'stone' in Dan. 2:34 messianically.

²Some figures, of course, are drawn directly from prophetic (e.g., Ps. 105-107; Is. 48:16) and midrashic descriptions of the significance of the Exodus. E.g., baptism in the sea; cf. SBK, I, 1054f. See supra, pp. ; infra, pp. 178f.

³Jn. 6:31-59, viz., 48f, 51, 54.

Paul refers to the Lord's Supper, the symbolic eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of His blood, in the same Exodus context;¹ and granting Paul's knowledge of Christ's typological application there is no reason to doubt that it--or a common apostolic typology derived from it--lies behind the apostle's usage.

In Eph. 2:19-22 Paul combines the 'stone' and 'temple' typology. The former, based upon Is. 28:16; 8:14; Ps. 117(118):22ff, has been clearly demonstrated by Dodd to be a pre-Pauline testimonium current in the early Church:²

1. Both Rom. 9:33 and 1 Pet. 2:6ff quote the two Isaiah passages in agreement with each other but at variance from the LXX.
2. Paul did not borrow from Peter, even assuming the earliest possible date for the latter.
3. That Peter borrowed from Romans is possible "only on the unlikely assumption that he first disentangled the conflated passages, and then supplemented them with parts of Is. 28:16 which Paul had omitted . . . [and yet] not from the LXX, since his version does not entirely agree with the LXX even where there is no Pauline parallel."³
4. "The simpler, and surely the more probable, hypothesis is that both Paul and the author of 1st Peter made use of a two-fold testimonium already current in the pre-canonical tradition"⁴

In Rom. 9:33 Paul does not employ the other OT text in First Peter, a verbum Christi from Ps. 117(118):22ff. But in Eph. 2:19ff he does allude to this text in a combination of the 'stone'

¹1 Cor. 10:1ff. Paul's comparison of the communion elements with the OT types is a warning that Christ's words are not to be taken with any idea of ex opere operato. Cf. Rev. 15:3f; C. F. Burney, The Gospel in the Old Testament (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1921), p. 44. For a further discussion of the Exodus typology cf. infra, pp. 167ff.

²Dodd, According to the Scriptures, pp. 35f, 41ff. See Appendix II for the texts.

³Ibid., p. 43.

⁴Ibid., p. 43.

and 'temple' imagery. With 1 Pet. 2:6 (cf. Mt. 21:42; Mk. 12:10f) Paul refers to Christ as the chief cornerstone (ἀκρογωννῆον), and both speak of Christians as the house of God. Although he does not, as Peter (vs. 5), explicitly call Christians "living stones" (λίθοι ζῶντες) of the building, this is clearly implied. It is probable, then, that the 'building of God' is as much a part of the testimonium as the 'cornerstone.'

Paul goes on to denominate Christians as the temple of God (ναὸς θεοῦ) and householder or members of God (οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ).¹ The designation ναὸς θεοῦ, is fairly common in Paul. The Corinthians are reminded of it as if it were basic to their Christian knowledge: "Know ye not (οὐκ οἴδατε) that ye are the temple of God" (1 Cor. 3:16; cf. 6:19). In 2 Cor. 6:16ff the apostle supports this concept with a catena of OT texts.² In the light of this temple typology the connection of Stephen's quotation in Acts 7:48f with Pauline thought becomes apparent. Paul's statement on Mars Hill that God does not dwell in temples made with hands (ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ, Acts 17:24) is almost verbatim with Stephen's words (ἐν χειροπολήτοις κατοικεῖ).³ In Eph. 2:21 Christians are the κατοικητήριον

¹Eph. 2:19ff. Ναὸς θεοῦ (as σῶμα χριστοῦ) usually has reference to Christians in a corporate sense. But there is apparently an oscillation between the part and the whole in Paul's thought which permits the figure to be used of the individual as well (cf. 1 Cor. 6:19) Cf. τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ in Acts 20:28; Gal. 1:13; etc.

²Lv. 26:11f; Ezk. 37:27; Is. 52:11; 2 Kg. (Sam.) 7:14.

³In Acts 7:48 ναοῖς is omitted but is definitely implied. In fact, Stephen's entire speech is largely a defense against the charge of destroying the temple (Acts 6:14) and, as Moule shows, hearkens back to the sayings of the Lord. Cf. C. F. D. Moule,

τοῦ Θεοῦ, and quite apparently this is the unrecorded goal of Stephen's argument: The 'tabernacles' built by the Jews--and Solomon's temple was no different--could never be God's permanent abode; and the prophecy in Is. 66:1 makes this very clear.¹ The quotation is a 'pointer' and it is in Is. 66:2 that the significant point is made. A concise summation was given by Alexander a century ago:

First, the temples made by men are contrasted with the great material temple of the universe; then this is itself disparaged by Jehovah as his own handiwork, and still more in comparison with the nobler temple of a spiritual nature, the renewed and contrite heart.²

The combined quotation in 2 Cor. 6:16ff does not include this passage; but Stephen's words are of the same typological structure; and his quotation should be considered a part of the 'temple-stone' testimonium which finds its fullest expression in 1 Pet. 2:5ff.³

In the Gospels it is Christ's body that is the temple; and the repeated reference to the Lord's claim to build the temple in three days evidences the significance of the idea for the Gospel writers.⁴ Paul's concept of the Church as the bride of Christ and

"Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament," JTS, Second Series, I (April 1950), 29-41.

¹The 'place of my rest' ($\tau\omicron\upsilon\pi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$) is applied to the temple in contrast to the moveable sanctuary in 2 Kg. (Sam.) 7:5ff; 2 Chron. 6:41; Ps. 131(132):8.

²J. A. Alexander, Prophecies of Isaiah (Edinburgh: Elliot, 1865), II, 459. Cf. Is. 57:15; 2 Cor. 6:16.

³Both Acts 7:49 and 2 Cor. 6:16 are $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\upsilon\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ quotations. See infra, pp. 140ff. The apologetic of Hebrews is also based upon the concept that Christians have a high priest, an altar, a sacrifice--a temple. Moule (op. cit., p. 41) finds the key-words of the whole temple typology in the sub-stratum of NT theology.

⁴In Jn. 2:19, 21; Mt. 26:61; 27:40; Mk. 14:58; 15:29; cf. Rev. 21:22.

the body of Christ (cf. Eph. 5:25-32; 2 Cor. 11:2f) is a part of the same pattern; and it is a pattern which is pre-Pauline and which points back, as does the 'stone' imagery, to a pregnant saying of the Lord.¹

A. Cole examines the 'temple' concept as a catechetical 'form' of the Church in the NT and finds that "the two issues, abolition of the old material temple and inclusion of the Gentiles, are closely linked both in the sayings of Jesus and in the later catechesis of the Church, so that the two problems are fundamentally one and the same."² Cole's argument, viewed in toto, is quite appealing: In the Fourth Gospel (Jn. 12:20ff) the 'Coming of the Greeks' is set forth as a sign to Jesus of his approaching death and resurrection (i.e., the destruction and rebuilding of the 'temple'); the cleansing of the temple takes place in this same context if the synoptic chronology is followed (cf. Mt. 21:9ff). In Acts, James (Acts 15:13ff) explicitly connects the rebuilt 'tabernacle' with the inclusion of the Gentiles, and the charge of violating the temple later brought against Paul (Acts 21:28) reveals the existing state of tension on this question.³

It is no accident that the attack on Stephen, forced by the Jewish authorities, leads directly, by clarifying the issue, to a Christian attack on the Jewish concept of a strictly 'visible church,' with its ordered worship and hierarchy. Again it is no accident that this realization by the Christians leads to the opening of the door to the 'peoples.'⁴

¹Cf. Moule, op. cit., p. 34; R. N. Flew, Jesus and His Church (London: Epworth, 1938), pp. 55-58.

²A. Cole, The New Temple (London: Tyndale, 1950), p. 31.

³Ibid., pp. 31-50.

⁴Ibid., p. 32.

The most important Pauline passage on this subject is Eph. 2:11, 19-3:6 where the temple typology is connected with the inclusion of the Gentiles within "the commonwealth of Israel." The identification of David's 'seed' (2 Sam. 7:14) lies in the same framework of common tradition; both Stephen (Acts 7:46ff) and Paul (2 Cor. 6:16; cf. Gal. 3:16, 29) refer it to Christ and his 'body.'¹ There is, then, an interrelated 'complex' of ideas covering such important Pauline themes as the 'seed' of David, the true Israel, the temple of God, the body of Christ, and the calling of the Gentiles. It is a pattern which lies in the sub-structure of NT theology, and, in its nucleus, it has its origin in the sayings of the Lord.

There are no definite NT parallels with Paul's Wisdom Typology in which Christ and His cross are declared to be the true wisdom.² But the apostle's several quotations (1 Cor. 1:19; 2:9, 16; 3:19f) describing the vanity of the "wisdom of this world" and its barren and foolish goal reflects somewhat the attitude of Christ:

¹It is possible that Acts 7 may refer only to Christ and that the Church as the 'body of Christ' and the 'new temple' is the later contribution of Paul (cf. G. Johnson, The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament, Cambridge: University Press, 1943, p. 75). However, Stephen's Isaiah citation argues otherwise; and the presence of the Semitic concept of 'corporate personality' makes it very likely that the Messianic community already viewed itself in this fashion, if not with this precise terminology. Cf. Cole, op. cit., pp. 52f. Dodd (Gospel and Law, p. 33f) observes that the Stoics also spoke of the community under the figure of the body and its members; regarding the 'body of Christ,' "the actual expression was apparently coined by Paul, but the idea is in no way peculiar to him." Cf. E. Best, One Body in Christ (London: SPCK, 1955), pp. 195, 203ff.

²Cf. 1 Cor. 1-3. It does bring to mind however, the Lord's comparison of Himself with Solomon (Mt. 12:42; Lk. 11:31; cf. Jn. 8:32; 14:6); the contrast between earthly wisdom and wisdom from

I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes.¹

The thought in each is that God reveals Himself not to the 'wise' but to the humble and simple; Paul, of course, carries the theme much further.

Several Pauline citations which have no reference to the sayings of Jesus are common to other NT writers.² These deutero-graph citations are significant in revealing topical emphases drawn from the OT by the early Church and in illustrating the way in which these passages were employed. Apart from the ethical emphasis marked by the recurrence of the commandments (often in connection with Lev. 19:18),³ the subject matter chiefly includes justification by faith, the nature of the true Israel, and Christ as the Second Adam or representative man.

Hab. 2:4 is cited by Paul (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11) to show that righteousness is not achieved through obedience to the law but through faith; the author of Hebrews uses the same passage to describe the proper attitude of the Christian toward the trials of life. In each case the life of the true believer rests on faith, but the application of the passage varies.⁴

That Paul borrowed from Hebrews is out of the question. That the author of Hebrews borrowed from Paul is entirely unlikely because (a) he gives the words differently; (b) he cites much more of the passage, and (c) he evidently under-

above in Jas. 2:13-17 is also similar. For a discussion of Paul's Wisdom Christology cf. Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-176.

¹Mt. 11:25 (Lk. 10:21). ²See Appendix IV.

³Rom. 13:9; Gal. 5:14; Eph. 6:2f and parallels.

⁴Cf. Westcott, Hebrews, p. 337.

stands the words differently; he quotes the whole passage for the sake of its warning against *ὑποστολή*, and treats *πίστις* as the opposite of the weakness of character which leads to *ὑποστολή* It is much more likely that he drew upon a tradition which already recognized the passage from Habakkuk as a testimonium to the coming of Christ.¹

The same theme is present in the citation of Gen. 15:6 (Rom. 4:3; Jas. 2:23): "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." Paul uses the passage to work out his proposition of righteousness apart from works. James, faced with an anti-nomian attitude toward faith, quotes the verse to point out the character of Abraham's faith: It was in the 'work' of offering up Isaac that "the Scripture was fulfilled which says, 'Abraham believed God . . .'" Here it is not a case of one writer borrowing from the other; their applications of the verse are quite distinct. The mutual use of the particular Genesis passage is hardly adventitious and probably arises from its importance in the general apostolic tradition. However, in this case it is almost certainly Paul himself who makes the contribution to the common tradition; to refer one of Paul's fundamental propositions, which he analyses so carefully, to a mere adaption not only fails to account for the detailed consideration he gives the problem (cf. Rom. 4) but seriously underrates the originality of the apostle. James used the verse probably because of its importance to his readers, but it was very likely Paul who originally gave it that importance.

The nature of the true Israel is a second theme of

¹Dodd, According to the Scripture, p. 51. The applications of the passage in Paul and Hebrews are not contrary; *πίστις* can be set over against *ὑποστολή* in Hebrews and *ἔργον* in Paul because, in their respective contexts, *ὑποστολή* and *ἔργον* stand in the same category of unfaith. A common unity of thought underlies the particular interpretation.

ἔργον
X

importance. The relation of Paul's citations to the teaching of the Lord in this matter has already been considered. In the Epistles other instances occur. (1) On the day of Pentecost Peter quoted (Acts 2:17ff) a rather lengthy passage from the prophecy of Joel (2:28-32) and declared that the events then transpiring were its fulfillment. The last verse quoted is found again in Rom. 10:13, "Everyone who shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Paul's purpose is to show that in the Messianic Age both Jew and Gentile can come to God on equal terms. Peter gathers from the passage a description of the Messianic era and the events inaugurating it; the verse in question is evidently an invitation to those Jews who crucified Messiah to "call upon the name of the Lord." (2) Texts from the first two chapters of Hosea are referred to in Rom. 9:25f and 1 Pet. 2:10. Paul's is a combined quotation (Hos. 2:23; ^{2:1} 1:10); the other a definite allusion to Hos. 2:23. Both refer the 'Israel' prophecy to Gentile Christians,¹ yet "the independence of the two authors seems certain."² (3) The verse, "In Isaac shall your seed be called," occurs in Romans and Hebrews.³ Paul is concerned to show the restricted character of Abraham's seed, that is, the seed arising through the 'promise' and not through the 'flesh.' In Hebrews

¹Paul specifically does, and this seems to be the implication of *οὐκ ἴσταντες οὐδὲ λαός* in 1 Pet. 2:10.

²Dodd (According to the Scriptures, p. 75) gives good reasons for this conclusion: ". . . in Romans the key-words are *λαός* and *ἀγαπητοὶ* (after the LXX of 2:23), in 1 Peter the key-words are *λαός* and *ἐλεκτοὶ* (after the LXX of 1:6-8; 2:1)." Peter's reference appears to be ad hoc from Hos. 2:23 (The Hebrew has *יִשְׂרָאֵל* throughout); but as Dodd suggests, it may reflect, as Paul, the LXX variations in other verses.

³Gen. 21:12; Rom. 9:7; Heb. 11:18; cf. Gal. 3:16.

the promise element is applied differently: It was this pledge of God on which Abraham's faith rested when he was called upon to offer up Isaac.¹ The use of this verse, as of Gen. 15:6 mentioned above, most likely has its origin in Paul, who treats this OT section so thoroughly. However, after the initial concept entered the stream of apostolic tradition its field of application continually expanded.² The extent to which the sacrifice of Isaac entered into Pauline thought as this point is uncertain; but it is notable that the 'resurrection' faith ascribed to Abraham in Hebrews is the kind of faith Paul requires for salvation in Rom. 10:9f.³ (4) One other reference is of note: In 2 Kg. 7:14 (LXX) God promises David that his seed shall be established forever and continues, "I shall be to him a father and he shall be to me a son." The immediate recipient in view is Solomon, not merely Solomon the individual but Solomon the king in whom Israel is personified.⁴ Hebrews (1:5) applies this promise to Christ the 'seed' in whom Israel is eternally personified; and Paul (2 Cor. 6:18)

cf
also
Romans
4:20-
25.

¹It is probably here that James' (2:23) reference to the offering of Isaac, as the 'work' demonstrating or fulfilling his faith, fits into the framework of the early Church's exegesis.

²This type of expansion is quite evident in the patristic writings. Cf. Grafe, Das Urchristentum und das Alte Testament.

³For possible allusions to the sacrifice of Isaac in Rom. 3:25 (cf. 7[&]7⁷ in Gen. 22:8) and Rom. 8:32 (cf. Gen. 22:16 LXX) see H. J. Shoeps, "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology," JBL, LXV (December 1946), 385-392.

⁴On this solidarity concept in Hebrew thought see A. R. Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God (Cardiff: University Press, 1942); The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel (Cardiff: University Press, 1949).

cites ^t of Christians, the true remnant of Israel and the 'body' of Christ.¹

The Adam-Christ typology of 1 Cor. 15:22-28, 45-49 is yet another motif with correspondence to other NT exegesis.² The application of the titles, "last Adam" and "second man," to Christ is found only in 1 Cor. 15, but it is within this context (vs. 27; cf. Eph. 1:22) that the quotation occurs, "For he has put all things under his feet" (Ps. 8:7).³ The same verse appears in Heb. 2:8 as a part of a longer citation. The Psalm itself reflects upon the creation account and the place of man (אָדָם, vs. 5) in the created order; even "the words 'put under his feet' sound like a paraphrase of the אָדָם of Gen. 1:26, 28."⁴ Although "son of man" (vs. 5) may be taken in a generic sense, the first man as the ideal type or representative is clearly in mind. Hebrews after quoting the Psalm of 'man,' concludes:

But we do not yet see all things in subjection to him (i.e., man). But we see Jesus . . .

¹Paul's citation, one in a catena, departs considerably from the OT text; but this is doubtless its source. It is together with texts identifying Christians as *ἄδὸς θεοῦ* (and *υἱὸς θεοῦ*) and as the delivered remnant (Is. 52:11; Ezk. 20:34). Cf. Gal. 3:16. Christ's identification of Himself with His people must have been indelibly impressed upon Paul at his conversion; Cf. Acts 9:5; Mt. 25:40, 45.

²The *ἐν Χριστῷ* (cf. 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 2:20) and the 'body of Christ' (cf. Eph. 5:22-32, Col. 1:24) concepts in Paul are related both to the Adam-Christ typology and to the 'stone-temple' imagery. Which type is more basic is a moot point. Their interrelation probably points to their development as one comprehensive idea, although the Lord's use of the 'stone' passage perhaps favors its priority. But cf. infra, pp. 127, on Christ's use of 'son of man.'

³Cf. Mt. 21:16 where Christ quotes another verse of the Psalm.

⁴Delitzsch, Psalms, I, 198.

The transition is here made from Adam, the Psalmist's type, to Christ, the last Adam, in whom man's destiny is realized; and who "was made a little lower than the angels (Ps. 8:8) . . . that he might taste death for everyone" (Heb. 2:9). The essential unity of Hebrews with Paul's exegesis becomes even more apparent in the further development of the Adam-Christ typology in 1 Cor. 15.¹ The guarantee of man's resurrection, and through it the fulfilment of his destiny, is the fact that the Lord Christ does taste death and does become victor for every man:

Death is swallowed up in victory.
 O Death, where is thy victory?
 O Death, where is thy sting?
 --Thanks be to God who gives us the victory
 through our Lord Jesus Christ.²

Also pertinent is the citation in verse 45: "The first man Adam became a living soul; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit." Neither of these citations follow the OT text very closely, and the latter half of verse 45 is not from the OT at all. Burney supposes that it is derived from early Christian testimonia:

Prior to St. Paul's conversion the earliest circle of Christian believers at Jerusalem was drawn not merely from

¹The same typology, taken either from the Psalm or directly from Genesis, seems to be involved in Phil. 2:5ff, classified by Lohmeyer as a Christological hymn. Cf. Lohmeyer, Kyrios Jesus, pp. 25f. Cf. also Col. 1:18.

²1 Cor. 15:55, 57; Hos. 13:14; Is. 25:8. ". . . When Paul used the magnificent apostrophe, 'Death where is thy sting? . . .' he was not employing a casual literary reminiscence, but referring to a passage already recognized as a classical description of God's deliverance of his people out of utter destruction." Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 76. Cf. Heb. 2:14; Rev. 20:14; 1 Cor. 15:1-5. Dodd also (p. 77) takes "the third day" in 1 Cor. 15:4 to refer to one of the Hosea (6:3) testimonia; "for the resurrection of Christ is the resurrection of Israel of which the prophet spoke." (p. 103).

the peasant class, but embraced (according to Acts 6:7) 'a great company of priests' who scarcely would have been unversed in Rabbinic teaching but may be supposed to have applied much learning as they had acquired to the service of the new Faith. It is by no means improbable, therefore, that the passage as a whole may have been drawn from a collection of OT testimonia. . . If then this interpretation of 1 Cor. 15:45 as wholly as quotation be correct, the implication is that sometime before St. Paul wrote his epistle in A. D. 55-6 the antithesis between the first Adam and Christ as the second Adam had been worked out in Christian Rabbinic circles and was used in argument.¹

It is just possible that the Adam-Christ antithesis reaches back even further than Burney suspects. Delitzsch contends that Christ's use of the title 'son of man' has Ps. 8, as well as other Scriptures in mind;² if this is so, it is not at all improbable that this (as the 'stone-temple') typology finds its ultimate source in the Lord's own teaching.³

In all of the OT parallels between Paul and other NT writers⁴ the striking observation is the underlying unity in the

¹C. F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel (Oxford: Clarendon, 1922), pp. 46f; cf. Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," pp. 170f; supra, pp. 41, 73ff. Burney (pp. 43-47) finds allusions to the analogy in Luke's genealogy ("... Adam, who was the son of God," Lk. 3:38) and in rabbinic literature. Cf. Gn. R. XII, 6 (SMR, I, 92) on Gen. 2:24: Six things lost through Adam's fall are to be restored through Messiah. Midrash Haggadol (fourteenth century, quoted in Burney, p. 46) on Gen. 16:11: Messiah is called Yinnon (יִנּוֹן = propagate, produce life; Ps. 72:17) "because he is destined to quicken those who sleep in the dust." Cf. Sanh. 98b (SBT, p. 667). For objections to Burney cf. Davies, op. cit., pp. 43f. Davies thinks that Paul himself originated the Adam-Christ typology and that other references stem ultimately from him.

²Delitzsch, Psalms, I, 200.

³It is interesting that Paul's quotation of Gen. 2:24 (Eph. 5:31) is paralleled in Mt. 19:5. But the diverse application does not suggest any typological connection.

⁴One other near-parallel may be mentioned--Rom. 15:3 (Ps. 68(69):9b) and Jn. 2:17 (Ps. 68(69):9a). Both apply the Scripture to Christ. It is very unlikely that the writers would choose parts

midst of an exegetical particularity. The pattern fits very remarkably when all of the pieces are assembled; but 'piece by piece' the interpretation and application is too varied, for the most part, to support a theory of borrowing or direct dependence.¹ The most likely explanation is that these ideas, and these ideas associated with these particular OT texts, were--more or less--the common property of the apostolic Church.² The problem involved in this common use of OT texts in the NT has been the occasion for the hypothesis of the 'Testimony Book' and the various modifications made upon it.

The 'Testimony Book' Hypothesis

It may naturally be supposed that [the Jewish] race which laid stress on moral progress, . . . and which was carrying on an active propaganda, would have, among other books, manuals of morals, of devotion, and of controversy. It may also be supposed if we take into consideration the contemporary habit of making collections of excerpta and the special authority which the Jews attached to their sacred books, that some of these manuals would consist of extracts from the OT . . . The

of the same verse purely coincidentally; it may be supposed, therefore, that this Psalm was generally accepted and used messianically when these citations were made.

¹As noted above, the thought behind some of the parallels (particularly those in Hebrews) probably has Paul's mind as its source. But even here the diverse application of the texts suggests that the dependence is not directly upon Paul's Epistles. A more probable hypothesis is that in the apostle's earlier teaching particular texts were incorporated under some exegetical principle or topic in his 'curriculum' (e.g., the seed of Abraham, the true Israel); the text could then be variously adapted, within the general principle, according to the particular desire of the user.

²Of course, certain prophecies and themes were more important for some than for others, and some interpretations were original to a particular writer or group and were only gradually disseminated. The Pauline OT references find most frequent and significant correspondence with "Q" (material common to Matthew and Luke), the Fourth Gospel, Hebrews, and First Peter; James and the speeches in Acts also contain marked affinities.

existence of composite quotations in the NT, and in some of the early fathers suggests the hypothesis that we have in them relics of such manuals.¹

With this suggestion of Hatch there began in 1889 a theory which gained wide acceptance by the turn of the century and by 1920 was virtually unanimously approved. Behind the theory, in its NT aspect, lay the same reasoning which was used in advancing Böhl's Volksbibel hypothesis, and indeed, which is basic to any attempt to answer the problem of NT quotations:² (1) The NT contains quotations which vary from the LXX and MT but which agree with parallel NT and patristic citations. (2) The interdependence of the latter documents is improbable, either for historical reasons or because of the divergent manner in which the texts are cited and applied. (3) Consequently, the source should be viewed as a third document lying behind the parallels. This third document should not be viewed as a Volksbibel or a variant text or targum but as a 'Testimony Book'; for "following the contemporary habit, the early Christian propaganda would produce or adopt for its own purpose, short collections of extracts Messianic and otherwise, for the use of those who had to argue from the OT."³

¹E. Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford: Clarendon, 1889), p. 203. The idea was not novel, but Hatch's remarks were the catalyst for the ensuing research. Cf. Harnack, A History of Dogma, trans. N. Buchanan (London: Williams and Norgate, 1894), I, 175.

²The later theories of Kahle (supra, pp. //) and Stendahl (infra, pp. 187//) are other answers to the same problems.

³J. Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament (3rd ed.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1920), p. 24. Actually, Hatch and Vollmer have Jewish collections in mind; viewed as a Christian literary effort, the theory is developed by Burkitt and Harris.

Vollmer, although pointing out the purely hypothetical character of Hatch's suggestion, viewed it as the probable answer to some variant and composite citations in the NT (e.g., 1 Cor. 2: 9).¹ In Britain the idea was quite widely accepted,² and in 1906 Burkitt proposed that the Logia of Papias should be understood as a collection of OT proof-texts.³ It remained, however, for the versatile mind of Rendel Harris to bring the testimony hypothesis into its own. To show that a 'Testimony Book,' composed of OT texts used in Anti-Jewish polemic, was the earliest Christian document, he engaged in a thorough study of the data in NT and patristic writings.⁴

The earliest evidence for the use of testimonies is that of Melito (c. 165), which is referred to by Eusebius: At the request of one Onesimus Melito compiled six books of "Extracts (ἐκ λόγῶν) from the Law and the Prophets concerning the Saviour and concerning all our faith. . . ." ⁵ To Cy~~o~~pr~~o~~ (probably as a

¹Vollmer, op. cit., pp. 38-48. So, Lietzmann, An die Galater, p. 133. However, M.W. Jacobus ("The Citation Ephesians 5:14 as Effecting the Paulinity of the Epistle," Theologische Studien Festschrift for B. Weiss, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Reprecht, 1897, pp. 9-29) dismissed the idea as "purely speculative."

²Cf. Swete, op. cit., pp. 252f; Thackeray, Paul and Jewish Thought, pp. 184f; "The existence of such an anthology is by no means improbable, but it must be said that no very convincing proofs have yet been brought forward."

³F. C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and its Transmission (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1906), pp. 127ff; so, J. Woods, The Old Testament in the Church (London: SPCK, 1949), p. 7. Burkitt's suggestion was not novel, but it was significant in the development of the 'testimony' hypothesis.

⁴J. R. Harris, Testimonies (2 vols.; Cambridge: University Press, 1916, 1920).

⁵Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, IV, xxvi; trans. K. Lake (London: Heinemann, 1926), I, 391f.

revisor) and to Gregory of Nyssa (the authorship is doubtful) were ascribed similar collections.¹ These are taken to be not isolated efforts but instances of a general practice which dates back to the earliest days of Christianity. The dialogues used in post-apostolic apologetics with their frequent reference to the OT, show, according to this hypothesis, a popular adaption of such testimony collections: "It cannot be accidental that all the Greek and Latin Dialogues (except Justin's 'Trypho,' which is in a slightly different class) should put forward the same arguments in the same fashion, supported by the same proof texts."²

Harris argued for the use of testimonies in the NT itself on the basis of several peculiarities in NT quotation:³

1. Recurrent quotations in the NT often agree with each other and with patristic writings in contrast to any known OT text.⁴
2. Some of these are combined quotations suggesting a common source in which the combination already existed.⁵
3. The same OT passages tend to be used in supporting a particular argument, and these arguments often appear under a specific concept or key-word as, for example, 'stone.'

¹Harris, op. cit., I, 5f; B.P.W.S. Hunt, Primitive Gospel Sources (London: Clarke, 1951), pp. 226ff.

²Hunt, op. cit., p. 281. F. C. Conybeare (The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchaeus and of Timothy and Aquila, Oxford: Clarendon, 1898, pp. livff) attributes the similarities to a possible proto-type dialogue such as 'Jason and Papiscus.'

³Harris, op. cit., I, 8f; cf. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, pp. 24f.

⁴Sometimes the variants do appear in the texts of Aquila and Theodotion.

⁵This is given special force in the IF in Mt. 27:9 and Mk. 1:2. There combined citations from Zechariah-Jeremiah and Malachi-Isaiah are ascribed simply to Jeremiah and Isaiah; this would be unlikely if the NT writers were working directly from the OT books.

Harris' concern is to show the early date and anti-Judaic character of the 'Testimony Book.'¹ Its presence in the Pauline literature is evident in the anti-Jewish arguments in Romans and Galatians. Justin and Cyprian's Testimonia repeat some of these arguments. One prominent parallel is the quotation of Is. 54:1 in Gal. 4:27, Justin's First Apology 53, and Cyprian's Testimonia 1:20. Justin's argument is closely aligned with Cyprian, but it varies somewhat from Galatians:²

He is not quoting St. Paul directly. We must then either say that he is quoting St. Paul indirectly in which case the Testimony Book becomes a pendant to the Epistles, or else we must say that the anti-Judaic parts of Romans and Galatians agree with Justin Martyr in a common dependence upon a primitive collection of Testimonies, and it is evident that the latter is the true explanation. . . ."³

Harris finds much confirmation of this view from other parallel quotations in Paul, the patristic writers (especially Justin), and later 'Testimony' collections.⁴ Perhaps the most noteworthy examples are the combinations in Rom. 9:25f⁵ and Rom. 9:32f which recur in 1 Pet. 2:6-10. In the latter case the combination appears to be made under the key-word 'stone,' in its messianic application

¹Harris, op. cit., I, 2. Hunt (op. cit., p. viii) follows much the same argument but endeavors by it to establish the influence of testimonies in the composition of the Gospels.

²According to Justin the passage shows that Gentile Christians would be "more numerous and more true" than Jewish and Samaritan Christians. Paul's contrast is between the true Israel (Jew and Gentile Christians alike) and the unbelieving Jewish nation.

³Harris, op. cit., I, 24.

⁴Cf. Harris, op. cit., II, 12-42; "St. Paul's use of Testimonies in the Epistle to the Romans," The Expositor, Eighth Series, XVII (June 1919), pp. 401-414; "St. Paul and Aristophanes," ET 34 (January 1923), 151-156; "Josephus and His Testimony," Evergreen Essay No. 2 (Cambridge: Heffer, 1931), 18-21.

⁵Supra, pp. 122//. The combination also occurs in Cyprian's Testimonia, 1:19.

to Christ. Cyprian's Testimonia have a section of 'Christ as Stone' in which some of these OT passages (e.g., Is. 28:16; Ps. 118:22) are quoted; the same combination is found as well in some patristic writings (e.g., Barnabus VI).¹ Harris concluded that all these parallels found their proper explanation in a common dependence on the 'Testimony Book;' this document, therefore, was earlier than the NT canonical books and was probably to be identified (as Burkitt suggested) with Papias' Logia.

Harris' hypothesis was accepted as established by most writers and, with slight modifications, was applied to various problems of NT research.² However, there developed during this same period a broader interest in pre-canonical Christian writings which served to modify and eventually undermine the 'Testimony Book' theory. Writing in 1929, Michel granted the probability of a 'testimony' collection for missionary and polemic purposes in the sub-apostolic Church and possibly even in Paul's day; nevertheless, Harris' theory underrated Paul's originality and his importance for later writers, who may well have used Paul and varied their texts to suit their own purpose. Also, the possibility of a key-word (Stichwort)³ rather than 'testimonies' as the occasion for

¹Harris, Testimonies, I, 26-32. Among other examples given by Harris (ibid., II, 12-42) are Rom. 10:16 (Jn. 12:37f; Justin, Dial. 42) and Eph. 4:8 (Justin, Dial. 39). In the latter case Justin is similar to Ephesians but enumerates the gifts differently.

²Cf. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 24; Box, op. cit., p. 445. J. A. Findlay, "The First Gospel and the Book of Testimonies," Amicitiae Corolla, ed. H. G. Wood (London: University Press, 1933), pp. 57-71; D. Plooiij, "Studies in the Testimony Book," Verhandlungen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen (Amsterdam: Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1933). A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (London: Nicholson and Watson, 1940), p. 70.

³E.g., Rom. 9:33 ($\lambda\epsilon\theta\omicron\varsigma$); 15:10-12 ($\epsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\upsilon\eta$). Cf. supra,

text combinations in Paul had not been sufficiently considered.¹

Form criticism also played a part in detracting from the 'Testimony Book' hypothesis; for example, Papias' Logia and Paul's reference to "the third day" in 1 Cor. 15:3f were taken to refer not to testimony collections but to sayings of Jesus and to an early Passion narrative.² But the field of study probably most significant in indirectly modifying the Harris hypothesis was that of early Christian liturgics. The influence of the synagogue on the form of early Christian worship was probably considerable;³ however, some of the liturgy apparently reflects an anti-rabbinic attitude which Harris finds in his 'Testimony Book.' The importance of the Decalogue in the church service,⁴ which may have influenced its

pp. 61f . A difficulty for this theory is that the key-word is not always present. E.g., the absence of *εὐαγγ* in passages grouped under 'Gentiles' such as Rom. 9:25f, 29; Gal. 4:27 (Justin, First Apology 53).

¹Michel, op. cit., pp. 52ff, 88ff. Michel's line of reasoning is similar in some respects to that later followed by Dodd. N. J. Hommes (Het Testimoniaboek, Amsterdam: Uitgevers-Maatshappij, 1935, pp. 304-323, 365) argues that most of the things Harris and Ploofj attributed to a 'Testimony Book' are better explained by Stichwort combinations. He considers at length the quotations in Rom. 3:10-18; 11:8-10; 2 Cor. 6:16ff.

²J. V. Bartlett, "Papias' Exposition: Its Date and Contents," Amicitiae Corolla, pp. 15-44; Taylor, op. cit., p. 48; cf. T. W. Manson, "The Life of Jesus," BJRL 27-30 (1943-1947), Vol. 29, p. 399. Manson refers the Logia to Christian oracles--sayings analogous to the old prophetic writings, giving the commands and promises of God to the New Israel. These are largely sayings of Jesus and are to be equated not with Matthew but with 'Q.'

³W. O. E. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy (Oxford: Clarendon: 1925). Oesterley's estimate is revised downward by C. W. Dugmore (op. cit., pp. 75ff, 106, 108, 113) and O. S. Rankin ("The Extent of the Influence of the Synagogue Service upon Christian Worship," Journal of Jewish Studies, I (1948), 27-32; but they recognize its importance for the type and order of service. Cf. G. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London: Dacre, 1944), pp. 12, 39.

⁴Cf. Pliny, Letters, X, xevi, trans. W. Melmoth (London:

form of citation in the NT, evidently "had from the beginning an anti-synagogical tendency, stressing the validity of the Decalogue in contrast to the Ceremonial Law."¹ Cullmann also, in agreement with Harris, accepts the use of OT anthologies in the Church for polemic purposes, but he does not view this as their only or primary content. The anthologies were often liturgical or catechetical design and included apostolic, as well as OT, writings.² Rom. 9:32f and 1 Pet. 2:4-8 were regarded by Harris as basic points of evidence for Paul's use of the 'Testimony Book;' but Selwyn took the common document behind the passages not as testimonia but as an early Christian hymn or rhythmical prayer.³ In general, these writers concerned with liturgical development continued to recognize or assume the early date of the 'Testimony Book,'⁴ but the character of the 'testimonies' was viewed in much broader fashion

Heinemann, 1915), II, 403: ". . . they sang in alternate verses a hymn to Christ, as to a god, and bound themselves to a solemn oath, not to any wicked deeds, but never to commit any fraud, theft, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust. . . ." This apparently indicates a use of the Decalogue in some form during the worship service.

¹Rankin, op. cit., p. 31.

²O. Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions (London: Lutterworth, 1949); Early Christian Worship (London: SCM Press, 1953), p. 24: "It is probable, too, that already in the earliest period, not only Christian writings but also OT writings were read." The first witness is Justin, First Apology 67: ". . . the memoirs of the Apostles (gospels?) / or writings of the prophets were read aloud as long as time allowed.

³Selwyn, op. cit., pp. 268, 267 (On Eph. 5:14). Cf. Prat, op. cit., I, 417; supra, pp.

⁴Stendahl (op. cit., p. 217), however, rejects the theory outright: "The methods of the synagogue in dealing with the texts of the OT, both in liturgical reading and in teaching, account for most of the features Harris wanted to explain by his Book of Testimonies."

than the anti-Jewish polemic stressed by Harris.¹

T. W. Manson goes a step further in modification of the hypothesis. He takes the similarities in NT exegesis as indicative of a 'Testimony Book' but not necessarily one in written form:

We should think of the 'Testimony Book' not as something that was turned out in written form in the earliest days of the Church, but rather as a collection of proof-texts assembled in the course of preaching, and forming a part of the primitive kerygma . . . It would be natural that the texts that should be cited in support of any particular article of the kerygma should fall into groups in the collection of testimonies. But, again, it is not necessary that they should be written down. . . . In other words the early form of the 'Testimony Book' was determined by the form of the primitive teaching and the book itself was written on the 'fleshy tablets' of the preacher's heart.²

In the light of the developments considered above, Dodd's significant contribution in this field may be better appreciated. Dodd recognizes the importance of the elaborate investigations of Harris but concludes that the theory of a pre-canonical Christian 'Testimony Book' "outruns the evidence, which is not sufficient to prove so formidable a literary enterprise at so early a date."³ He makes the following specific objections:⁴

1. Instances where citations of two or more NT writers agree against the LXX are not numerous, "certainly not more

¹In Acts 26:23 are possible 'titles' of a fuller catalogue of testimony catena. Cf. Dodd, According to the Scripture, p. 16ff.

²T. W. Manson, "The Argument from Prophecy," JTS, XLVI (1945), p. 132. Some mention of Bonsirven's objections to Harris' theory should also be made. Agreeing with Michel's assessment, he argues that Paul's rabbinic memory obviates any recourse to Jewish or Christian florilegia if they existed (op. cit., pp. 292, 337). Cf. also Puukko, op. cit., pp. 53f.

³Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 26. Formerly Dodd was in general agreement with Harris' hypothesis. Cf. Dodd, Romans, pp. 32, 221.

⁴Ibid., pp. 26f.

numerous than cases where one agrees with the LXX and the other differs, or where both differ from the LXX and from one another."

2. Identical combinations of OT passages in parallel NT texts are few and perhaps special and exceptional; they are insufficient to establish a general theory.
3. The recurrence of a group of passages in which 'stone' stands as a symbol is striking in correspondence to a later known testimony grouping; but it is almost unique.
4. If there was a work of such importance that NT and patristic writers used it as a vade mecum, it is inexplicable that there should be no reference to it (except possibly Papias') and no extant derivative from it until Cyprian's edition in the third century.

Dodd thinks that the NT evidence points not to a testimony book as such but to a method of Bible study which found literary expression only sporadically and which only later resulted in the composition of 'testimony books.' This method involved the selection and use of blocks or sections of OT Scriptures. These sections were viewed as 'wholes,' and verses were quoted from them not merely for their own significance but as pointers to the total context; and it is the total context, not just the particular verse quoted, which forms the basis for argument in the NT.¹ The selections did not form a book but "something belonging to the body of instructions imparted, orally in the main, . . . to those whose duties in the Church led them to OT research; a sort of guide to the study of the Bible for Christian teachers."² The pertinent passages "were understood and interpreted upon intelligible and consistent principles" which viewed the gospel facts as the fulfilment of

¹Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 126; The Old Testament in the New, p. 7.

²Dodd, The Old Testament in the New, p. 9.

the Scriptures.¹ "The whole body of material--the passages of the OT scriptures with their application to the gospel facts--is common to all the main portions of the New Testament, and in particular it provided the starting point for the theological constructions of Paul, the author of Hebrews, and the Fourth Evangelist."²

Dodd develops his thesis first by considering the 'testimonies'--OT passages used repetitively in the NT--and then by classifying those sections of the OT which these passages embrace. Though recognizing the possibility of literary dependence between the NT writers, he thinks such a presumption overlooks the more probable hypothesis of a common oral tradition. Accordingly, he proceeds to treat such parallels as occur as reflecting a common tradition unless there is definite evidence to the contrary.³ The portions of Scripture which emerge as a source of testimonia for the NT writers are classified as follows:⁴

<u>Apocalyptic- Eschatological</u>	<u>New Israel</u>	<u>Servant of the Lord</u>	<u>Unclassified</u>
Joel 2-3; Zech. 9-14; Dan. 7.	Hosea; Is. 6: 1-9:7; 11:1-10; 28:16; 40:1- 11; Jer. 31: 10-34.	Is. 42:1-44:5; 59: 1-13; 50:4-11; 52: 13-53; 12; 61; Ps. 69, 22, 31, 38, 88, 34, 118, 41, 42-43, 80.	Ps. 8, 110, 2; Gen. 12:3; 22:18; Dt. 18:15; 18:19.
Mal. 3:1-6; Dan. 12.	Is. 29, Jer. 7; Hab. 1, 2.	Is. 58:6-10	Ps. 132, 16; 2 Sam. 7:13f; Is. 55:3; Amos 9:11f.

With the exception of the first category Dodd's 'text-plots' are

¹Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 126.

²Ibid., p. 127.

³Ibid., pp. 29f.

⁴Ibid., pp. 62-108. Gen. 15:6 is omitted as not directly bearing on an understanding of the kerygma (p. 107). The primary and secondary sources are listed in order.

well represented in the Pauline letters.¹ Their significance is not merely in being the source of a number of NT quotations or allusions; the impressive fact is that these NT references have a thematic unity and reveal that the writers went to common sources and interpreted them with a common understanding of their application to the facts of the gospel.

Dodd's hypothesis gives a more comprehensive picture of the use of Scripture in the early Church than Harris' theory was able to do. Dodd does not reject the possibility of written testimonies in the apostolic period. But they are not primary, but derivative from a particular method of Bible study; and in the early pre-canonical development they form only a small and fragmentary portion of the total 'testimony' exegesis.

As noted above Dodd views the process as growing out of an "original coherent and flexible method of biblical exegesis" whose beginnings lead back to the very nascence of the Christian Church:

This is a piece of genuinely creative thinking. Who was responsible for it? The early Church we are accustomed to say, and perhaps we can safely say no more. But creative thinking is rarely done by committees Among Christian thinkers of the first age known to us there are three of genuinely creative power: Paul, the author to the Hebrews, and the Fourth Evangelist. We are precluded from proposing any one of them for the honor of having originated the process, since even Paul, greatly as he contributed to its development, demonstrably did not originate it But the NT itself avers that it was Jesus Christ himself who first directed the minds of his followers to certain parts of the Scriptures as those in which they might find illumination

¹See Appendix I and IV. There are only a very few from the apocalyptic-eschatological section (e.g., Rom. 10:13; cf. 1 Cor. 6:2; 1 Thess. 4:13); but since the section itself is small, this may not be particularly significant. Dodd's list is not exhaustive; and if 'testimonies' be taken in a broader sense, some other passages which are important for Paul might be added (e.g., Gen. 2, 15ff; Lv. 18, 19).

upon the meaning of his mission and destiny. . . . To account for the beginning of this most original and fruitful process of rethinking the OT we found need to postulate a creative mind. The ¹gospels offer us one. Are we compelled to reject the offer?

The examination made earlier of material which Paul holds in common with other NT writers points in the very direction which Dodd has suggested.

λέγει Κύριος Quotations

There are nine NT quotations--four of them in Pauline letters--within which the phrase, "saith the Lord" (λέγει Κύριος) occurs;² the equivalent phrase, λέγει ὁ Θεός occurs once.³ Rom. 12:19 is a typical example:

For it is written: Vengeance is mine, I will repay saith the Lord.

The phenomenon ordinarily would be only of passing interest since any number of OT texts include this seal of authority. However, two factors appear which warrant a second look: (1) All of the citations vary, to one extent or another, both from the LXX and from the MT. Furthermore, the variations are not only in the addition or omission of words but in the rendering of the text as well. (2) On at least six occasions the phrase, λέγει Κύριος (as well as λέγει ὁ Θεός in Acts 2:17), is a NT addition to the text;⁴ the other five occurrences--all non-Pauline--have

¹Dodd, According to the Scriptures, pp. 109f.

²Acts 7:49; 15:16f; Rom. 12:19; 14:11; 1 Cor. 14:21; 2 Cor. 6:16ff; Heb. 8:8-12; 10:16f; 10:30. The phrase occurs twice in 2 Cor. 6:16ff and three times in Heb. 8:8-12. Its presence in Heb. 10:30 (= Rom. 12:19) is textually uncertain; Codex A and the Antiochian texts have it, B and C omit it.

³Acts 2:17.

⁴If the Heb. 10:30 be admitted the total is seven. In

the phrase or its equivalent in the original.¹

In the question of subject matter there is some affinity with testimonia already considered although only one λέγει κύριος passage is used more than once (Rom. 12:19; Heb. 10:30). The greater portion of the citations is related to the 'temple' typology in which the Christian community is viewed as God's new temple. This is the definite import of Stephen's words (Acts 7:49),² and it is the explicit purpose for the adduction of the catena in 2 Cor. 6:16. Amos 9:11f (Acts 15:16f) is cited by James to show that the purpose of God includes the Gentiles; the introductory portion of the quotation concerns rebuilding "the tabernacle of David." As noted above, these themes are a part of a pattern, and their presence here suggests, at least, that this context of Scripture was understood as a part of the 'new temple' testimonia.³

The New Covenant prophecy (Jer. 31:31ff) cited in Hebrews (8:8-12; 10:16) also has more than a surface connection with the other passages. The author of Hebrews sums up his argument by noting that Christ is the minister "of the true tabernacle (τῆς σκηνης τῆς ἀληθινῆς), which the Lord pitched, not man,⁴ and the mediator of a better covenant; then follows Jeremiah's prophecy concerning the New Covenant. It may be going too far to see in "the house of Israel" (i.e., the Christian 'remnant') an

Acts 7:49 the phrase may have been borrowed from the opening clause of the LXX and the MT.

¹Acts 15:16f; Heb. 8:8, 9, 10; 10:16f. The passages quoted in Hebrews all have φησὶ κύριος in the LXX.

²Cf. supra, pp. 116ff

³Cf. supra, pp. 116ff

⁴Heb. 8:2. It is an interpretive paraphrase of Num. 24:6 (LXX).

allusion to the "true tabernacle"¹ or to make a contrast between the law in the heart and the tablets (or scrolls) of the law in the temple. But the words, "I shall be to them a God and they shall be to me a people," is a distinct echo of a verse in Pauline 'new temple' quotation (2 Cor. 6:16ff); and the reference to the old covenant "ready to vanish away" (vs. 13) is probably an allusion to the old temple services.²

The other λέγει κύριος quotations concern (1) the principle of vengeance or judgment as the prerogative of God alone (Rom. 12:19; 14:11; Heb. 10:30) and (2) the judicial significance of 'tongues' (1 Cor. 14:21). The latter may be considered with the framework of anti-Jewish polemic to which Harris assigned the 'Testimony Book.'³ The citation (Acts 2:17ff), λέγει ὁ Θεός, is from a section of the OT listed by Dodd as primary testimony source, and from which Paul also draws a quotation (Rom. 10:13).

Taken as a whole, the λέγει κύριος quotations represent only a fraction of NT citations, and some of these only repeat the phrase from the OT text; and most of the passages inserting the phrase ad hoc are Pauline. Yet the usage appears to be more than an idiosyncrasy of any individual NT writer. The 'testimony' pattern into which most of the passages fall, the ever-present

¹Taken in terms of the Jewish concept of solidarity, there is a closer relation than is apparent at first. Cf. Paul's phrase, οἶκος Θεοῦ, supra, pp. 116ff.

²Cf. Westcott, op. cit., p. 226. Cf. Rev. 21:2f.

³The passage is difficult. Robertson and Plummer give perhaps the best explanation (op. cit., pp. 316f): As the Jews who scorned Isaiah's clear and simple message were judged in God's speaking to them by means of a foreign-tongued Assyrian horde, so now those Jews rejecting the simple message of the Gospel are, in effect, judged by the incomprehensible words of the Holy Spirit.

textual variations, and the significance of the phrase in the OT suggest that λέγει κύριος may have been characteristic in the proclamation of elements of the kerygma. Even if Heb. 10:30 be excepted the words of Stephen and the essentially identical λέγει ὁ Θεός of Peter remain independent witnesses to the practice. Its employment in Paul is too sporadic to construe the verses in Acts as Lukan interpolation of Pauline phraseology. Nor is the explanation satisfying that the NT writers are merely stressing the fact that God is speaking. The IF performs this function; and the λέγει κύριος is always an integral part of the citation, apparently already present in the text when it is introduced by the writer.

λέγει κύριος is the badge of prophetic pronouncement in the OT. Its presence in the NT probably has an equivalent significance and may give a clue for understanding the role which the NT exegete--or better, the NT prophet--considered himself to fill. The gift of prophecy was highly regarded in the apostolic age;¹ it was a specific gift or appointment of the Holy Spirit;² and it was not conferred upon all.³ Early Christians without doubt used the word in full light of its OT significance, and, indeed, some

¹Cf. Acts 2:17ff; 1 Cor. 14:1-5. Stress on the prophetic aspect is seen in the added phrase, *καὶ προφητεύουσιν*, in Acts 2:18.

²Cf. 1 Cor. 12:4, 10, 28.

³Cf. 1 Cor. 12:28. Swete declares that "only a relatively small number of believers were 'established to be prophets,' forming a charismatic order to which a recognized position was given in the Church. Such persons were said *ἔχειν προφητείαν* (1 Cor. 13:2) and known as *οἱ προφῆται* (Eph. 2:20; 3:5; Rev. 18:20; 22:6), being thus distinguished from those who occasionally 'prophesied' (Acts 19:6; 1 Cor. 11:4f; 14:31)." Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, p. 377.

of the functions most peculiar to OT prophets, such as predictive utterance, appear in their NT counterpart.¹

It is not unreasonable to expect that the NT 'prophet' would, at times, employ the prophetic epigraph, "thus saith the Lord." The equivalent phrase, "thus saith the Holy Spirit (τάδε λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἕγχοον) introduces the prophecy of Agabus in Acts 21:11.² The occurrences in Revelation are even more noteworthy. In Rev. 14:13 the phrase "saith the Spirit" appears in much the same fashion as λέγει κύριος in the passages mentioned above:

And I heard a voice from heaven saying, Write: Blessed are the Dead who die in the Lord henceforth. Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; for their deeds follow them.

In the beginning of John's prophecy³ the Lord Christ is quoted as follows:

I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord God (λέγει κύριος ὁ Θεός), the One who is, and was, and is to come, the Almighty (ὁ Πάντοκράτωρ).⁴

This quotation has no IF and λέγει κύριος may only be the writer's way of introduction. If so, it evidences a type of IF of which there are very few in the NT; even the other λέγει κύριος quotations have an IF of the ordinary type.

At first blush one is inclined to dismiss the whole matter

¹E.g., Acts 21:11. ²Cf. Heb. 3:7. ³Cf. Rev. 1:3.

⁴Rev. 1:8. The phraseology differs from the more usual IF, e.g., "these things saith he that. . ." Cf. Rev. 2:1; 3:1. It is perhaps worth noting that ὁ Πάντοκράτωρ occurs only twice in the NT outside Revelation; it is in the quotation in 2 Cor. 6:16ff.
λέγει κύριος

as the idiom of the NT writers as they quoted, and it may well be that some instances are only the writer's formula of quotation. Such a case could be made, for example, of the two citations in Revelation. This, however, does not explain why the pattern is not found more often; it certainly does not explain why Paul, whose IF are so consistently different, should have *λέγει κύριος* embedded in a few of his quotations which already contained an ordinary formula of introduction, and that he should do this without any warrant from the OT text. It is more probable that this form of the quotation was most familiar to him. He may, certainly, have originated the particular form himself; but it is extremely doubtful that he did so as he wrote his epistle. That he introduced a double IF into his quotations sporadically and apparently without any reason is one of the least likely explanations of the matter.

The foregoing argument may be summed up as follows:

1. *λέγει κύριος* is a characteristic phrase of prophetic pronouncement in the OT.
2. The early Christian community also includes those with the office or appointment of 'prophet,' and these 'prophets' sometimes use the same phrase, or its equivalent in citing their own revelation.
3. The phrase also is inserted within some quotations in the NT in such a manner as to preclude its being considered an IF or a part of the cited OT text.
4. These *λέγει κύριος* quotations are consistently divergent from extant OT texts and their OT source is often within a 'testimony' pattern evident elsewhere.

It is not an unreasonable conclusion that at least some of the Pauline *λέγει κύριος* texts were quoted by the apostle in a form already known and used in the early Church. The most natural origination for such paraphrasis of the OT would be early Chris-

tian prophets--including not only leaders such as Paul but also many minor figures.

The use of testimonies may well have arisen, as Dodd suggests, from the selection of whole sections of the OT and their oral application to the facts of the Gospel. But this does not mean that no written and specific 'proof-texts' were in use in the pre-canonical testimony tradition.¹ Whether there^w as an actual 'school of the prophets' one can only speculate. But Stendahl has shown at least that many OT quotations in the NT evidence a careful working out of interpretive principles, and the incorporation of these principles into the text of the quotations themselves.² There is an activity of the Holy Spirit in the early Church which may well explain the source of some of these interpretations. It is the exercise of prophecy, and it occurs both in ecstatic utterance (cf. 1 Cor. 12-14) and the disclosure of the import of revelations from the Holy Spirit (e.g., Acts 21:11). There is no reason why it should not include elaboration, interpretation and application of OT Scriptures.³ The fact that the prophetic λέγει κύριος

¹Dodd argues against the hypothesis of a pre-canonical 'Testimony Book,' but he recognizes the possibility of occasional testimonies in written form; cf. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 126. The presence of OT florilegia is reported among the recent Qumran discoveries; however, the writer has seen nothing published on them.

²Infra, pp. 187//. Stendahl's conclusions are concerned mainly with Matthew, but he finds similar evidence in the Fourth Gospel: "Thus the Johannine method is not what is usually meant by loose citations, or those more or less freely quoted from memory. It is rather the opposite since the form of John's quotations is certainly the fruit of scholarly treatment of written OT texts." (op. cit., p. 163).

³There is something similar to this in the reflection of OT prophets upon earlier Scriptures; cf. Ps. 2, 105; Is. 48, 21.

was already present in some OT texts being used as testimonia may well have facilitated an ad hoc employment elsewhere. This extension appears at least in some degree, to be related to testimonia of the same order or perhaps arising from the same group or 'school.'¹ There would be no hesitation in using these OT paraphrases--or any other matter spoken 'in the Spirit;' for they, as much as the OT itself, were the Words of God. This hypothesis is not without its problems, but it does seem satisfactorily to explain at least some of the phenomena found in NT quotation and to shed further light on the genesis and development of OT exegesis in the early Church.

Summary and Conclusion

It is evident from observations made in the above pages that Paul does not quote the OT in isolation; and his relation to other NT writings is not satisfactorily explained as merely a borrowing by one writer from another. Some sort of mutual connection with a third source appears most probable, Queries as to the nature of this connection gave rise to the 'testimony hypothesis.' There is at least one pre-canonical Christian document known--the Jerusalem Decree (Acts 15:23-29), and there can be no a priori objection to others. Harris supposed that one of these was a 'Testimony Book' upon which NT and patristic writers freely drew in quoting the OT. Harris depended too much in his theory on

The origin of some early Christian hymns--a few of which are incorporated into the NT (cf. Selwyn, op. cit., p. 267; supra, pp. 40,)--may also have been included within the exercise of the prophetic gift. Cf. 1 Cor. 14:15.

¹E.g., the presence of *ἄνευ κήρυκος* (*ἀνεὶ κήρυκος*) in Amos 9:11f (Acts 15:16f) and Jer. 31:31ff (Heb. 8:8ff) may have occasioned the ad hoc usage in other 'new temple' testimonia such as the catena in 2 Cor. 6:16ff.

the independence of patristic citations from their NT parallels; but once established, the 'Testimony Book' was seen lying behind parallels within the NT itself. Dodd's objections to Harris' hypothesis are, for the most part, well taken; and it is with his theory of an interpretive method applied to selected OT 'text-plots' that future investigations will begin. Dodd believes that the key to OT interpretation was given by Christ Himself to his apostles, and a considerable portion of Pauline exegesis appears to find its origin in just this source. Apropos to the question are the words of C. F. Evans: "When the Old Testament and rabbinic and hellenistic writings have been ransacked for parallels to, and possible sources of influence upon, the gospel tradition, it still remains at least possible, if not probable, that by far the greatest single determinative source with which we have to reckon is the creative originality of Jesus Himself. . . ." ¹

The λέγει κύριος quotations and a few other striking parallels indicate that some OT texts were already in stereotyped form when Paul used them. It therefore appears that some texts from the testimony 'text-plots' had, previous to Paul's letters, received specific interpretation and application by others in the early Church. There are grounds for supposing that this may have arisen and been carried on in informal fashion by those filling the role of prophet in the early Church. Much of this activity probably took place in the course of preaching and missionary endeavor, as Michel and Manson have suggested, though

¹C. F. Evans, "I will Go Before You Into Galilee," JTS, Second Series, V (April 1954), p. 3.

Stendahl's hypothesis of a 'school' for OT interpretation cannot be disregarded.

Dodd has made the point that the Lord is probably the One who pointed out pertinent sections of the OT and gave his apostles certain interpretive principles whereby these passages were to be understood. One further question is closely connected with this: What is the nature of the interpretive principles employed by the NT writers? Some consideration of this question as it applies to the Pauline hermeneutic will be given in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

PAULINE EXEGESIS

Introduction

In the previous chapters an attempt has been made to determine the nature and significance of Paul's OT quotations and to relate his usage to contemporary Jewish and Christian exegesis. The following pages consider some of the emphases in Pauline exegesis and the hermeneutical principles which govern his citation and application of the OT. Quotations may be classified according to text,¹ purpose,² or subject matter.³ In the present study a topical classification has been followed with some particular attention given to the use of typology. The concluding section discusses two fundamental principles which are determinative for Paul's OT hermeneutic.

Paul's exegesis fits into a pattern which, when properly understood, forms a cogent and systematic whole. Even the more difficult passages take their place in the pattern when they are considered from the apostle's point of view.⁴ Paul was a profound

¹Cf. Appendix I.

²E.g., proof, type, analogy, illustration, allegory.

³Bonsirven, (*op. cit.*, 294-324) classifies Paul's exegesis as express and implicit. Cf. Weissäcker, *op. cit.*, I, 132f.

⁴Quotations for illustration or language color, although present, are not so prevalent as usually supposed. 1 Cor. 15:32 repeats a proverb in Isaiah; 1 Cor. 10:26 also appears to be a convenient use of Scripture phraseology. Dodd (The Old Testament in the New, pp. 3f) allows for such allusion in the NT, as in any

thinker and the OT was one subject on which his thought was in orderly array. His was no grasping for texts or waving of a talisman; and conclusions to that effect probably arise from a misunderstanding of his meaning. Dodd evaluates Paul's elaborate exegesis in Rom. 9-11 as follows:

This is evidence of the thorough and extensive biblical research which lies behind Paul's exposition of the Gospel. It should be added that the argument, compressed and complex as it is, proceeds by strict sequence from step to step, and is, with one or two possible exceptions, completely cogent, granted the presuppositions common to Paul and to those whom he addressed. The qualification indeed is itself scarcely necessary; if one takes the pains to understand exactly what is implied in the various steps of the argument, there is very little which does not contribute to a strictly logical presentation of his case from first principles.¹

The discussion below does not pretend to be a commentary. It is an endeavor to form a synthesis of Pauline exegesis both from a topical and hermeneutical viewpoint. In a sense the whole NT is an exegesis of the Old; for it seeks throughout to explain the Christian movement as a fulfilment of the OT. So Luther wrote:

. . . All [the apostles'] preaching is based on the OT, and there is no word in the NT which does not look back to the Old wherein it was already declared. . . . The OT is thus the testament of Christ--a letter which he caused to be opened after his death and read and proclaimed in the light of the gospel. . . .²

It is "the light of the gospel" which determines Paul's approach to the OT. The demonstrable fact that Jesus is the promised

book, which serves no further purpose than to stimulate the fancy or give aesthetic enrichment; but he concludes that NT writers use such allusion "less than might appear at first sight."

¹Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 18.

²Luther, Sermon on Jn. 1:1-14; Weimar ed., X, 1, 181f, cited in W. Vischer, The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ, trans. A. B. Crabtree (London: Lutterworth, 1949), p. 7.

Messiah—a major theme of OT citation in the Gospels—is assumed.¹ The apostle is chiefly concerned with the next step—the significance of the Scriptures for the Messianic Age and Messianic Community.

Topical Emphases

Paul's devotion to Scripture was not that of a rabbi; he did not cite the Scriptures from a sense of duty or a love of theology or tradition, but because of their witness to Christ. For Paul, Christ was not only a factor giving added meaning to the OT but the only means whereby the OT could be rightly understood;² it was not merely that he saw Christ in the OT but that he viewed the whole scope of OT prophecy and history from the standpoint of the Messianic Age in which the OT stood open, fulfilled in Jesus Christ and in his new creation.

Paul, as the other NT writers, uses the OT selectively; he makes no attempt to exploit even the whole corpus of messianic prediction either as it refers to Christ or to the Messianic Age.³ Nevertheless, the subjects on which the apostle dwells read like "titles of a treatise on OT theology."⁴ Something of

¹Stendahl (op. cit., pp. 41f) notes also the many allusions to Elijah in the Gospels as contrasted with Paul (e.g., Mk. 1:2, 3, 14; Mt. 17:10ff; Lk. 1:17). Even more striking is the absence of messianic proof-texts, basically important for any Jewish Christian. Their presence is assumed in the form of early 'gospels' or of previous oral teaching.

²Cf. Woods, The Old Testament in the Church, pp. 6, 10.

³C. H. Dodd, History and the Gospel (London: Nisbet, 1938), p. 61.

⁴W. F. Lofthouse, "The Old Testament and Christianity," Record and Revelation; Lietzmann, An die Galater, p. 33; B. Weiss, op. cit., I, 277; T. Houghton, "Testimony of the Epistle to the Romans to the Old Testament," Evangelical Quarterly 7(October 1935), 424ff.

the scope of his OT references may be seen in the following index:

1. The Fall of Man and its effects --Rom. 5:12ff.
2. The Universality of Sin ---Rom. 3:10ff.
3. The Coming of Christ and the Gospel ---Rom. 1:2; Gal. 3:8, 14.
4. The Obedience and Sufferings of Christ ---Rom. 15:3
5. The Resurrection of Christ ---1 Cor. 15:1ff.
6. The Lordship and Dominion of Christ ---1 Cor. 15:25, 27.
7. The Sovereignty of God ---Rom. 9:15, 17, 20.
8. Divine Election ---Rom. 9:7, 10ff; 11:4f.
9. The Rejection of Israel and Calling of the Gentiles ---Rom. 9:25ff; 10:16ff.
10. The Universality of the Gospel ---Rom. 10:18.
11. The Forgiveness of Sin ---Rom. 4:6; 9:33; 10:11ff.
12. Justification by Faith ---Rom. 1:17; 4:1ff; 10:5ff.
13. Baptism and the Lord's Supper ---1 Cor. 10:1ff.
14. The Gifts of the Spirit ---Eph. 4:8
15. Christian Conduct ---Rom. 12:19; 13:9; 1 Cor. 9:9.
16. The Persecution of Christians ---Rom. 8:36.
17. The Final Salvation of the Jews ---Rom. 8:36.
18. The Parousia of Christ ---2 Thess. 1:8-10.
19. The Final Judgment ---Rom. 14:11.
20. The Final Overthrow of Death ---1 Cor. 15:54ff.

If any of the above topics are not the object of express OT prophecy, they are implicit in its history or typology as viewed from the standpoint of the Messianic Age. The extent to which these motifs may be traced to the Pentateuch is striking. Most of the framework of his theology rests upon the accounts of the creation, the life of Abraham, and the Exodus. Unlike the rabbis, however, it is a Pentateuch illumined and interpreted by the Prophets and Psalms, not by the tradition of the elders.

Faith and Works

The most important OT theme in Romans and Galatians is the basis of man's justification before God.¹ Paul argues that

¹Cf. Rom. 1:17; 4; 10:4ff; Gal. 3:6ff; 4:22ff. The two

righteousness comes through faith and not through the law; to those who trust God's promise righteousness is imputed, but to those who seek righteousness through law perfect obedience to the law is required. While the law was good in that it made manifest God's will, it could not by the works it enjoined enable men to fulfill its commands.¹

The locus classicus for this theme is Hab. 2:4 (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11): "The righteous shall live by faith." The verse poses several problems: What is the content of the word faith ($\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$)? Is the contrast between a 'faith-righteousness' and a 'law-righteousness' (i.e., the righteous-by-faith shall live) or is $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ the sole factor which secures 'righteousness?' The Hebrew אֱמוּנָה has primarily a passive idea of 'faithfulness' or 'trustworthiness,' while the Greek $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ stresses the active force of 'trust in.' Burney has observed that while אֱמוּנָה is frequently used to denote the quality of character produced by $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ אֱמוּנָה , the words 'to show steadfastness in' (אֱמוּנָה cf. Num. 14:11) are the regular Hebrew phrase denoting 'believe in' ($\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$). Thus, Burney concludes, "The statement that Hebrew has no term which can be regarded as the equivalent of $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$, and that therefore St. Paul's use of Hab. 2:4 cannot be justified, hardly represents the fact."² The meaning

principle sections, Rom. 4 and Gal. 3, may be classified as a Christian midrash or commentary on Abraham's faith. Cf. Windisch, Paulus und das Judentum, p. 52f.

¹Cf. W. Fairweather, The Background of the Epistles (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1935), p. 339.

²Burney, The Gospel in the Old Testament, pp. 129f. Cf. C. F. Keil, The Twelve Minor Prophets, trans. J. Martin (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1868), II, 74; Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 138;

of the two words overlap and vary only in stressing different aspects of the larger 'whole.' Paul's rendering is paraphrastic and interpretive but quite justifiable.¹ Epstein gives a particularly good definition of אֱמוּנָה which could well serve as a 'harmony' of Paul and James:

The Hebrew word Emunah has a two-fold connotation--theological and human. It signifies alike faith--trust in God, and faithfulness--honesty, integrity--in human relations. These two concepts . . . do not conflict with each other; on the contrary they complement and supplement each other . . . Faith . . . is of value only in so far as it is productive of faithful action; nor is there any faithful action that is not rooted in faith in God.²

Ἐκ πίστεως in Rom. 1:17 has usually been taken, in accordance with Habakkuk's meaning and Paul's grammar, as modifying ζήσεται and pointing out the condition by which the righteous live.³ Nygren, on the other hand, views Paul as establishing a 'faith-righteousness versus works-righteousness' contrast which the apostle pursues throughout the epistle:⁴ It is the righteous-by-faith who shall live. "It is not suggested,"

J. S. Stewart, op. cit., pp. 173-186; D. M. Baillie, Faith in God (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927), p. 34: "In apocalyptic literature the ideas of faith and fidelity merge into one." Contra: S. R. Driver, The Minor Prophets (Edinburgh: Jack, 1906), p. 76; A. B. Davidson, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah (Cambridge: University Press, 1896), p. 76.

¹Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 138. The Hebrew is so translated by Symmachus, Aquila, Theodotian, and other Greek versions.

²SBT, Seder Zera 'im., I, xv.

³Lightfoot, Notes, pp. 250f; Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., pp. 28ff.

⁴A. Nygren, Commentary on Romans (London: SCM, 1952), pp. 87ff. Cf. A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. W. Montgomery (London: Black, 1931), pp. 208ff. Nygren, in good Lutheran tradition, works out this contrast through the whole of Romans.

writes Nygren, "that Paul did not grasp the literal sense of the statement, but rather that he saw in it a deeper significance."¹ But not only the grammar is against Nygren;² for Paul there is no 'law-righteousness' or 'works righteousness.' The universality of sin, which Paul takes such pains to point out (Rom. 3:10ff), precludes the possibility of such; for the very principle from which 'law-righteousness' proceeds is that "he who does those things shall live by them."³ The law fails and its adherents are condemned, not because the righteousness it requires is any less acceptable, but because its adherents invariably "continue not in the things which are written" (Gal. 3:10).⁴ On the other hand, faith secures, and maintains, righteousness not because it is inherently superior to 'works' or law, but because it is the medium whereby a relationship is established with the One who is righteous.

Paul does not teach justification by faith in a vacuum. Faith does make one righteous both forensically⁵ and, increasingly,

¹Nygren, op. cit., p.88.

²Sanday and Headlam (op. cit., p. 28) point out that if Paul wished to stress the contrast, he could easily have written *ὁ δὲ ἔκ τινος δικαιοσύνης* and removed all ambiguity.

³Rom. 10:5; Gal. 3:11f. In Rom. 3:10ff Paul shows the Jews that the OT used this language of them (vs. 19); therefore, they are equally condemned with the Gentiles. Cf. Lightfoot, Notes, p. 269.

⁴Paul does view the law as inferior (1) in being mediated through angels (Gal. 3:19), (2) in enticing men to make a claim on God (Rom. 4:3) and (3) in its transient character (2 Cor. 3:13). Cf. C. A. A. Scott, op. cit., pp. 41ff.

⁵"Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness" (Rom. 4:3); "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin" (Rom. 4:8).

in actuality,¹ because faith issues in the ἐν Χριστῷ relationship. For in Christ the law stands fulfilled; its goal (τέλος) is attained;² and for all who have passed from ἐν Ἀδὰμ to ἐν Χριστῷ, Christ Himself is their "righteousness, and sanctification and redemption" (1 Cor. 1:30). While "the caption ἐν Χριστῷ may be placed above everything St. Paul says,"³ its centrality does not displace the importance of how one becomes ἐν Χριστῷ. In Pauline thought the two concepts are one inseparable whole:

One of the greatest mistakes of Albert Schweitzer has been to consider the doctrine of justification as a polemical by-product of Pauline thought, a theoretical auxiliary without practical significance. On the contrary, a proper understanding of St. Paul must proceed from his teaching about how man is justified by faith in God's act of justification.⁴

The place of the Habakkuk key-text in this motif may be better understood if approached from Paul's development of the theme in his earlier epistle to the Galatians.⁵ Gal. 3 is largely a midrash on the Abrahamic history, and of the seven quotations in the chapter all except the Habakkuk passage are

¹"[God sent His Son] that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk . . . after the Spirit" (Rom. 8:4). This is the force of the whole argument in Rom. 6-8; it is unthinkable that the unrighteous could be called righteous if the way and means of the creation and production of that righteousness were not in view and in operation. Cf. Rom. 8:29.

²Rom. 10:4. Sanday and Headlam (*op. cit.*, p. 284) and Dodd (*Romans*, p. 165) take τέλος as 'termination,' but the idea of fulfilment also seems to be present.

³A. Fridrichsen, "Jesus, St. Paul, and St. John," The Root of the Vine (London: Dacre, 1953), p. 41.

⁴Ibid., p. 44.

⁵Schweitzer (Mysticism of Paul, pp. 208f) has rightly called attention to this distinction.

from the Pentateuch.¹ It is virtually certain that the story of Abraham forms the foundation for the 'righteousness by faith' motif in Pauline thought and that the verse from the 'Prophets' is adduced as an interpretation and application of the principle laid down in Genesis.² The lead-line position given Hab. 2:4 in the argument in Romans may be occasioned by its already popular connection with Gen. 15:6,³ or its importance in Judaism as the summation of the law,⁴ or, more probably, the place which it likely had in the early Church as a 'pointer verse' to the whole faith-righteousness theme. The story of Abraham,⁵ however, is the bed-rock of Pauline thought on the question; and the faith therein expressed is determinative for the interpretation of 'faith' in Hab. 2:4. And this is an active faith; "for Abraham's faith, according to St. Paul, is faith in the miracle of the resurrection, which makes life out of death."⁶

The transfer of Habakkuk's application to the status of a general principle arises from a selective interpretation of that passage. This exegetical molding is present in the interpreta-

¹Gen. 15:6; 12:3; 18:18; Dt. 27:26; Lv. 18:5; Dt. 21:23; Gen. 22:18.

²Similarly in Gal. 4, Is. 54:1 apparently is cited as an elucidation of the Sarah-Hagar story.

³Cf. supra, pp. 70f.

⁴Cf. supra, pp. 70f.

⁵The character of Isaac as 'the son of promise' (Rom. 4; Gal. 4:22ff) and the election of Jacob (Rom. 9:13) are a part of the same general theme, faith versus works, law versus promise. On Rom. 9-11 is also integral to it cf. Nygren, op. cit., p. 35.

⁶O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, trans. J. K. S. Reid (London: SCM, 1950), p. 66. Cf. Rom. 4:17; 10:9f; Heb. 11:17ff; Jas. 2:21ff.

tion of 'faith' noted above, in the identification of the 'righteous,' and in the whole point of reference involved in the vision. Whether the 'righteous' (P'7S) means every righteous individual, a particular righteous personage, righteous Israel, or the righteous in Israel is left an open question by the grammar.¹ Paul, in accordance with the targum and the Qumran commentary, interprets it of the righteous in Israel.² For the apostle, as for the Qumran community, the identity of the 'righteous' is bound up with the prophetic doctrine of the remnant. The NT writers understand the remnant to be the Christian Community; and it is to it that the prophecy refers.

It is important to remember that for Paul there is no discontinuity between Israel and the Church; his whole position depends upon the Christian remnant being the 'heir of the Covenant.' The polemic against the Jewish nation for seeking righteousness apart from Christ "must not conceal the fact that, in his opinion, righteousness is rooted in the Covenant itself, the New Covenant, the reality of faith . . . For St. Paul, to be righteous is to abide with one's whole being in this Covenant, to be 'in Christ.'"³

The vision in Hab. 2 is given in answer to the prophetic complaint that God has allowed the wicked (Chaldeans) to triumph. The vision is not to be fulfilled immediately,⁴ and its fulfilment

¹Cf. Manson, The Argument from Prophecy, pp. 133f.

²Ibid., p. 133; supra, pp. 70f

³Fridrichsen, op. cit., pp. 50f; infra, pp.

⁴This is evidently the purpose for writing it plainly "upon tables" (Hab. 2:2). That it "will not delay" emphasizes not an

brings the final triumph of the righteous in which "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea" (Hab. 2:14). The 'wicked' in the vision are the Chaldeans, but the scope of the prophecy extends to a contrast of the wicked and righteous in general. In this wider context Paul finds the meaning of the vision. The Chaldean invasion is the occasion for the prophecy, but its fulfilment is in a wider and eschatological sphere. For the NT writers, the Messianic Age inaugurated by Jesus Christ's death and resurrection ushers in that fulfilment. This view of the prophecy understandably heightens the importance of Hab. 2:4 for the Christian Messianic Community.

Jew and Gentile

A second theme of primary importance in Pauline exegesis concerns the rejection of the Jews and 'calling' of the Gentiles. Both subjects find a place in the teaching of the pre-Pauline Church,¹ but Paul deals with the question more explicitly and extensively than do the other NT writers. The pertinent Pauline texts are found largely in Rom. 9-11, which Dodd terms a "striking example" of the way Paul 'opens up' and applies the Scriptures.² The discussion grows out the larger question of 'faith versus

immediacy but that it will occur exactly in its appointed time. Cf. 2 Sam. 20:5; Jud. 5:28; Driver, The Minor Prophets, p. 76. Davidson, Habakkuk, p. 75; G. W. Wade, Habakkuk (London: Methuen, 1929), p. 182.

¹Cf. supra, pp. 119 ff , ; infra, pp. 180 ff

²Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 18. There are a number of references elsewhere as, for example, Rom. 15:9-12, 21; Gal. 3:8; 1 Cor. 14:21.

works' considered above, and (as Nygren contends) should be understood not as an arbitrarily inserted pericope but as an integral part of the preceding argument.¹

The apostle's analysis in Rom. 9-11 is intricate and interlaced throughout the OT 'proofs;' but it follows an orderly sequence and gives a profound apologetic for a 'Christian' interpretation of the OT. Underlying the whole of the argument, and indeed the whole of Paul's OT exegesis, is the fundamental postulate that the 'true Israel,' the heir of the promises does not consist of physical descendents ipso facto but of 'children of the promise' sovereignly selected by God. This fact is clear (Rom. 9:6-13) in the selection of Isaac and rejection of Ishmael² and in the choice of Jacob instead of Esau,³ even though all were physical descendents of Abraham. Paul proceeds (vss. 14-21) to justify such arbitrary decisions of God, and in doing so he assumes certain conclusions argued earlier: All men stand under a death judgment in Adam's sin and in their confirmation of Adam's rebellion in their own sins.⁴ The favor of God even to the 'best' of men (Moses) is purely a matter of mercy, and his 'hardening' of wicked men (Pharaoh) is actually a molding and directing of their evil "in order to make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy."⁵ Thus also (vss. 22-26) does

¹Whether the section did in fact have a separate existence is, of course, another question.

²Gen. 21:12.

³Gen. 18:10.

⁴Rom. 3:10ff; 5:12ff; supra, pp.

⁵This section with its example of the potter and the clay is severely criticized by various commentators. Dodd (Romans, p.

the mercy given in calling Jews and Gentiles¹ in Christ apply only to a remnant of the Jewish nation; because they sought righteousness by works and found Christ; the way of faith, a rock of offence.²

Rom. 10 contrasts the two ways, righteousness through works and through faith. The former requires perfect obedience to the law; the latter, a simple calling "on the name of the Lord" in faith (vss. 6-11).³ But Israel, as predicted, did not believe

159) called it "the weakest point in the whole epistle. . . . Men is not a pot; he will ask 'why did you make me like this?' and he will not be bludgeoned into silence." Cf. A. M. Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel (London: SCM, 1954), p. 15. Such objections misconstrue Paul's argument; the moral question which Dodd labors is just not there. The character of the 'clay' is settled; it is in rebellion "ripe and ready for destruction" (καταρτισθέντα vs. 22, Moffatt), both personally and ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς. The question is not 'Why did you create me thus' but 'Why are you using me thus?' 'Why are you not showing me mercy?' God sovereignly makes the wrath of man to praise him (cf. Ps. 76:10; Is. 10:5); but it is for a merciful end, both in deferring judgment on the objects of wrath (vs. 22) and in using their sins to bring objects—also sinful—of his mercy to Himself (vs. 23).

¹Rom. 9:25f; Hos. 2:23; 1:10. The application of this prophecy to Gentiles (as well as Jews) rests on the conception of 'Israel' argued in the earlier verses of Rom. 9. It is not the 'spiritualizing' of a particular prophecy but the consistent application of a fundamental hermeneutical principle. Hosea has in view not physical Israel (Paul implies) but the regathered remnant of faith (cf. Rom. 9:27ff) irrespective of their lineage. Cf. F. Johnson, op. cit., pp. 350ff; infra, pp. 180ff

²Is. 10:22f; 1:9; 8:14; 28:16.

³Lv. 18:5; Dt. 30:12ff; Joel 2:32. Rom. 10:6-8 is usually taken as a rhetorical application of a proverbial text. Cf. F. Johnson, op. cit., pp. 183ff; Prat, op. cit., I, 21; Davies, op. cit., pp. 153f; supra, pp. 68f. Others regard it as a misinterpretation of the OT passage; cf. Dodd, Romans, pp. 165ff; J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 436. While it is rhetorical (note the IF), the citation has more than a casual relation to the OT text. Dt. 30:6 speaks of the 'circumcision of the heart' which Jer. 31:31 identifies with the New Covenant. Dt. 30:11-14 does not merely concern the 'location' of the law but an attitude toward it, in which they love the Lord God 'with all their heart' (Dt. 30:6, 10, 16). Paul sees implicit in this an attitude of faith, which

although they knew the message and had ample warning of their impending rejection (vss. 16ff).¹ However, Paul concludes (Rom. 11), the rejection of Israel is not complete or final. As in Elijah's day there is a believing remnant; the rest, in judgment on their unbelief, are blinded (vss. 3f, 8ff).² After the full number of Gentiles are converted, the mass of Israel will turn to Messiah and be regrafted into the olive tree,³ the Israel of God (vss. 26ff).⁴ This purpose of salvation for Gentiles and

alone can fulfill the law (cf. Rom. 8:4), and so applies the principle to his own day.

¹Is. 53:1; Ps. 18:5; Dt. 32:21; Is. 65:1.

²3 Kg. 19:14, 18; Is. 29:10; Dt. 29:4; Ps. 68:23f. The 'un-seeing eyes' motif (Is. 29:10) reflects, and probably arises from, the teaching of Christ. Christ uses (Mk. 4:11ff; cf. Jn. 12:37) in this regard the prophecy in Is. 6:9f, which Paul also cites in Acts 28:26ff. Cf. Rom. 10:16; Jn. 12:38. On this passage Dodd (Romans, p. 176) aptly remarks: "If we read the comments of a sober rabbi like Jochanan ben Zakki (cf. SBK, ad loc) or of a political realist like Josephus, not to speak of the parables of Jesus, we are led to the conclusion that Paul did not exaggerate when he judged that the history of the 8th and 7th centuries B.C. was repeating itself in the half-century preceding the fall of Jerusalem." Cf. 1 Thess. 2:16.

³As typifying Israel see Jer. 11:16; Men. 53b (SBT, p. 322). Cf. Hos. 14:7; A. Feldman, The Parables and Similies of the Rabbis (Cambridge: University Press, 1927), pp. 158-168. On the inclusion of the Gentiles in the 'olive tree' cf. Lv. R., I, 2 (SMR, VI, 3).

⁴Is. 59:20f; 27:9. The prophecy is applied not, as usual (e.g., Rom. 9:25f), to 'true Israel' but to the Jewish nation; cf. Dodd, Romans, p. 182. According to Delitzsch (Isaiah, II, 378), Is. 59 gives a picture judgment (vs. 18) resulting in a general turning to God and (vs. 19) the coming of Jehovah for Zion, the remnant, and for Jacob, previously unfaithful Jews who then repent. The LXX rendering "turn away from ungodliness from Jacob" reflects a variant text from the MT: "to those turning from transgression in Jacob;" Cf. Toy, op. cit., p. 158. Ἐκ Σιὼν, Paul's only important variation from the LXX (ἐνεκεν Σιὼν) may arise from his contrast of Zion, true Israel, and Jacob, the nation Israel, and the resultant conviction that the Church as οὐρα Χριστοῦ and ναὸς Θεοῦ is the locus (and perhaps the instrument)

Jews--both disobedient, both rejected--arises totally from God's mercy and draws from Paul's lips an exclamation of awe:

O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God.
How unsearchable his judgments and unscrutable his ways.¹

In conclusion, two points should be reiterated. First, the doctrines of salvation by faith and the inclusion of the Gentiles, so fully developed in Romans, as well as Paul's view of 'true Israel,' are found in one nucleus in Gal. 3. In the Galatians passage most, if not all, of the points later 'spelled out' in Romans either appear in abbreviated form or are assumed in the argument. The Abrahamic Covenant is of faith (vs. 6),² includes the Gentiles (vs. 8),³ and has Christ for its true 'seed' or heir (vss. 16, 29); neither physical descent nor works of law

from which the Redeemer goes forth. Cf. Ps. 13(14):7; 52:7 (53:6). But Cf. Ps. 77(78):68. Is. 27:9 is in a similar messianic context. Paul probably uses both as 'pointer' texts, and his citation reveals an exegetical molding by which his understanding of the prophecy is drawn out. Cf. infra, pp. 187ff

¹Rom. 11:33. The section concludes with a quotation from Is. 40:13; Job 41:3. R. P. C. Hanson ("St. Paul's Quotations of the Book of Job," Theology 53: 1950, 250-253) considers Paul's quotations from Job to reveal its true significance, not the patience of the 'innocent sufferer' but the transcendence of God. Job, in short, is "the Epistle to the Romans of the OT"---(p.253).

²Gen. 15:6.

³Gen. 12:3; 18:18. Repetitions of the promise are twice in the hithpael (Gen. 22:18; 26:4), which has a reflexive connotation ('bless themselves'). "But the Niphal 7727 (Gen. 12:3; 18:18; 28:14) has only the passive signification 'to be blessed,'" and Paul's rendering, as an interpretation, is proper even for the others (F. Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1864, I, 195). Driver (Genesis, London: Methuen, 1904, p. 145) regards the Niphal as ambiguous; E. Kautzsch (Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, trans. A. C. Cowley, Oxford: Clarendon, 1898, pp. 139-142), while defining the Niphal as primarily reflexive, grants that it may have a passive significance as well. This is probably another instance in which Paul's application, although not contrary to the grammar, depends upon a particular interpretation of it within the whole Pauline hermeneutic. Cf. F. Johnson, op. cit., 16ff; infra, pp. 187ff.

avail to secure participation in it (vss. 10ff). Second, Paul's theology stems primarily from the Pentateuch. The starting-point of his thought is the story of Abraham; the citations from the prophets appear to be interpreted in the light of the Genesis narrative, and vice versa, the Torah is understood in the light of its interpretation by the Prophets.¹

Miscellaneous

Eschatological quotations in Paul's letters are confined for the most part to 1 Cor. 15,² but the principles expressed there are reflected throughout the Pauline corpus.³ The quotations are applied more as typological interpretations than as 'proof texts' in the strict sense. Ps. 8 implies the Second Adam's lordship over death, "for he has put all things under his feet" (1 Cor. 15:27); and this involves the power to grant life to others (1 Cor. 15:45).⁴ Therefore, through Christ 'Israel' will be resurrected and the power of death vitiated.⁵

As to other topics, 1 Cor. 1-3 contains a number of

¹This pentateuchal emphasis may have been occasioned by the similar stress of the Judaisers (Burton, op. cit., p. 159) or, more probably, by Paul's own view of the OT: In the Pentateuch the basic pattern of God's plan appears; in the prophets one sees its development, interpretation, and predicted lines of fulfilment.

²1 Cor. 15:27, 45, 54f. Rom. 14:11 is one other definite eschatological quotation. Cf. 1 Cor. 2:9; 2 Thess. 1:8-10.

³E.g., the Adam-Christ typology provides the scaffolding for his doctrine of redemption and resurrection; cf. Black, Second Adam, p. 179; supra, pp.

⁴Supra, pp. 73ff, 125ff

⁵1 Cor. 15:54f (Is. 25:8; Hos. 13:14). That Hos. 13:14 probably (as the grammar indicates) contains a promise and not (if taken interrogatively) a threat cf. infra, pp. 185

citations from which the conclusion is drawn that 'Christ and His Cross' is the only true Wisdom:¹ Worldly wisdom is, in the long run, fruitless and vain, for it can never comprehend the plan of God either in the OT or in the cross; the Christian, however, possesses true wisdom in the Lord Christ. The Pauline paraenesis contains a number of citations giving moral injunctions or applying New Covenant principles contained in or inferred from OT passages. Four concern 'giving,'² and three the Decalogue and law of love;³ the remainder cover a variety of subjects: avenging oneself, judging one's brother, fornication, idolatry, eating of meat, and marital relations.⁴

The following classification gives a resume of major themes in Pauline quotation:

<u>Faith and Works</u>	<u>Jew and Gentile</u>	<u>Ethics</u>	<u>Wisdom</u>	<u>Eschatology</u>
Rom. 1:17; 4:3, 6f, 17f; 10:4ff; Gal. 3:6, 8-13, 16; 4:22ff.	Rom. 9:7, 9, 12f. 15, 17, 25-29, 33; 10:16, 18-21; 11:3f, 8ff, 26f; 15:9ff, 21; Gal. 3:8	Rom. 12:19; 13:8; 14:11; 15:3; 1 Cor. 6:16; 9:9; 10:7, 26; 2 Cor. 6:16ff; 8:15; 9:9; Gal. 5:14, 31; 6:2f	Rom. 11:24f; 1 Cor. 1:19, 31; 2:9, 16; 3:19f.	1 Cor. 15:27, 45, 54f.

¹1 Cor. 1:19, 31; 2:9, 16; 3:19f. Cf. Davies, op. cit., pp. 147-176.

²1 Cor. 9:9; 2 Cor. 8:15; 9:9; 1 Tim. 5:18.

³Rom. 13:8f; Gal. 5:14; Eph. 6:2f.

⁴Rom. 12:19; 14:11; 1 Cor. 6:16; 10:7, 27; Eph. 5:31. The 'temple' catena in 2 Cor. 6:16ff is used to enjoin 'separation' from the world; cf. further on the 'body of Christ,' Dodd, Gospel and Law, pp. 33ff. In the citation in Rom. 15:3f the example of Christ is adduced as an ethical norm.

Typology

As the above discussion shows, the stress of Pauline quotations is not upon predictive prophecy as it is usually understood¹ but upon the application of principles enunciated in the OT. These principles are often viewed as realized or fulfilled in a special way in the Messianic Age ushered in by Christ's resurrection.² In this context the significance of Pauline typology is readily apparent.

τύπος occurs 15 times in the NT. Primarily it signified the imprint made by a blow, and from this the several NT meanings arise--imprint,³ image,⁴ form,⁵ pattern or example.⁶

τύπος may be either the primary concept or the secondary image,⁷ but in typological exegesis the 'type' is usually applied to the OT 'shadow' and the 'antitype' to the NT fulfilment. The NT writers see in certain OT persons, or institutions, and events prefigurations of New Covenant truths.⁸ Thus Adam (Rom. 5:14),

¹I.e., the prediction of a particular event as, for example, that Messiah should be born in Bethlehem (Mt. 2:6).

²E.g., the inclusion of the Gentiles, the ἐκκλησία as God's temple, the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

³Jn. 20:25.

⁴Acts 7:43.

⁵E.g., Rom. 6:17.

⁶E.g., 1 Cor. 10:6; Heb. 8:5.

⁷E.g., Acts 7:43; Heb. 8:5; 9:24. Cf. A. B. Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1903), pp. 224ff.

⁸Bonsirven (op. cit., pp. 269, 301ff) gives four classifications: a model of conduct, an example or parallel (Abraham and Christ), a prefiguration of the future order, and allegorical exegesis; this typology is quite distinct from rabbinical exegesis (ibid., p. 324). However, there is a resemblance in Jewish liturgy in which every OT event was "regarded prophetic, and every prophecy, whether by fact or by word. . . , as a light to cast

Jonah (Mt. 12:40), and the paschal lamb (1 Cor. 5:7) are types of Christ; and the flood (1 Pet. 3:18ff) and Exodus (1 Cor. 10:1ff) are typical of Christian experiences. In Hebrews Christ is presented as fulfilling the office of Moses (ch. 3), Aaron (ch. 5), and Melchizedek (ch. 7):

The use which the author makes of Holy Scriptures is . . . not dialectic or rhetorical, but interpretive. The quotations are not brought forward in order to prove anything, but to indicate the correspondence which exists between the several stages in the fulfilment of the Divine purpose from age to age.¹

The 'type' used as an exegetical method has, then, a much more restricted meaning than τύπος would suggest—even in its NT usage.

NT typological exegesis is grounded firmly in the historical significance of the 'types.'² Even Pauline 'allegory' rests in a typological framework and is not allegory in the usual Jewish or Hellenistic sense.³ The distinction between allegory and typology was expressed in 1762 by J. Gehard:

Typus consistit in factorum collatione. Allegoria occupatur non tam in factis, quam in ipsis concionibus, e quibus

its sheen on the future, until the picture of the Messianic Age in the far background stood out. . . ." Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, I, 163; cf. Prophecy and History, pp. 163ff.

¹Westcott, Hebrews, p. 481.

²Cf. Dodd, "A Problem of Interpretation," p. 17: "The writers of the NT, then, by their attitude to the older Scriptures, authorize an historical understanding of them as an indispensable element in their interpretation and application to contemporary situations."

³Cf. supra, pp. 63ff; Bonsirven, op. cit., pp. 301f, 308. F. Buchsal ("Ἀλληγορέω," KTW, I, 260-264) classifies alike as allegorical exegesis 1 Cor. 5:6-8; 9:8-10; 10:1-11; Gal. 4:21ff, but he notes an essential difference from Jewish-Palestinian and Alexandrian-allegory: The Scripture is fulfilled in his time (1 Cor. 10:11) and its true meaning is recognized only by Christians (2 Cor. 3:14).

doctrinam utilem et reconditam depromit.¹

The historical character of this exegetical method evokes a further question: Are OT 'types' merely facts comparable to NT events, or is their typological character determined by Divine intent? Davidson maintained that a criterion of Divine intent was beside the point; it is not God's design but the "similarity identity, and predictiveness" which constitute the essential character--or 'typicalness'--of a type.² However, this definition does not fully meet the issue. For the NT writers a type has not merely the property of 'typicalness' or similarity; they view Israel's history as Heilsgeschichte,³ and the significance of an OT type lies in its particular locus in the Divine plan of redemption. When Paul speaks of the Exodus events happening *TUTTKWS* and written "for our admonition,"⁴ there can be no doubt that, in the apostle's mind, Divine intent is of the essence both in their occurrence and in their inscription.⁵

¹Quoted in L. Goppelt, Typos. Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1939), p. 8: "Typology consists in the comparison of facts. Allegory concerns itself not so much in facts as in their assembly, from which it draws out useful and hidden doctrine." Cf. F. Johnson, op. cit., p. 117; Westcott, Hebrews, p. 200: "Between type and antitype there is an historical and real correspondence in the main idea of each event or situation. . . . A type presupposes a purpose in history worked out from age to age. An allegory rests finally in the imagination."

²Davidson, Prophecy, pp. 235ff.

³On this concept of prophecy and fulfilment in the NT of O. Schmitz, "Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament," Wort und Geist, Festschrift für K. Heim (Berlin: Furche, 1934), pp. 49-74.

⁴1 Cor. 10:11; cf. Rom. 15:4; 1 Pet. 3:21.

⁵So M. S. Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics (New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1885), p. 337; Fairbairn, op. cit., p. 46; G. E. Wright, The God Who Acts (London: SCM, 1952), pp. 61ff.

The rationale of NT typological exegesis is not only "the continuity of God's purpose throughout the history of his covenant,"¹ but also his Lordship in molding and using history to reveal and illumine his purpose. God writes his parables in the sands of time.

Although the 'type' has its own historical value, its real significance typologically is revealed only in the 'anti-type' or fulfilment.² Things which were hidden or only partially revealed are now revealed to the Church--the Messianic Community--in whom the fulfilment is realized. "Die typologie," Goppelt concludes, "zeigt nicht nur das Wesen des Neuen gegenüber dem Alten, sondern auch, das³ gerade und nur auf diesem heilsgeschichtlichen Grunde steht."³

Yet a third factor is present in NT typology. Besides being historical and in accordance with the Divine plan the OT type often has a dispensational or economic relationship to the corresponding NT fact. For example, there is a pattern of correspondence between the Old and New Covenants--the shadow and the true⁴--so that the pattern outlines of the first may be imposed upon the second. NT typology does not, therefore, merely involve striking resemblances or analogies but points to a correspondence which inheres in the Divine economy of redemption.⁵ And

¹G. W. H. Lampe, "Typological Exegesis," Theology, XVI (June 1953), 202.

²Cf. ibid., pp. 207f. It is not without significance that the NT never seeks to identify 'types' of future fulfilments though it does use parable and apocalyptic imagery in this fashion.

³Goppelt, op. cit., p. 183: "Typology shows not only the character of the new vis-a-vis the old but also that it stands directly and solely on a 'salvation-history' foundation."

⁴Cf. Col. 2:17; Heb. 8:5; 10:1.

⁵W. J. Phythian-Adams (The Way of At-One-Ment, London:

this appears to be true not only in the Exodus Typology, in which the two covenants are so expressly contrasted,¹ but in the other OT 'types' as well.²

Although Paul is sometimes cited as the originator of typological exegesis,³ the presence of typological concepts in pre-Pauline strata of the NT precludes this.⁴ Undoubtedly, however, the apostle contributed a great deal to its development in the early Church. His typology is drawn chiefly from three OT periods: the Creation, the Age of the Patriarchs, and the Exodus.⁵ From the creation narratives Paul draws a typological relation between Adam and Christ in which the whole scope of cosmic redemption appears to be encompassed: *Ἐν Χριστῷ* a man enters a

SCM, 1944, p. 11) uses the term 'homology' to more clearly express this meaning: "By 'homology' we mean that there is between two things not a mere resemblance but a real and vital--in this case an economic--correspondence." Contra, Prat (*op. cit.*, I, 20f), who dismisses the whole covenant typology as accommodation or analogy.

¹It is most explicitly formulated in Heb. 8-10. Cf. 2 Cor. 3.

²*Infra*, pp. . The almost exclusive attention given Exodus typology is a deficiency in the recent revival of typological studies. Goppelt, surveying the whole NT, is an exception. H. Sahlin's *Zur Typologie des Johannesevangeliums*, Uppsala und Leipzig, 1950, has not been available to the writer.

³Cf. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 61. Harnack ("Paulinischen Briefen und Gemeinden," p. 138) regards the inadvertent 'typological' usage in 1 Cor. 9:10 as the starting point for the rise of the OT to *Erbaufungsbuch* for Gentile Christianity; cf. *supra*, pp. 34

⁴*Supra*, pp. 119ff

⁵This is generally true throughout the NT although there are notable exceptions, e.g., the Flood (1 Pet. 3:18ff), Jonah (Mt. 12:40; 1 Cor. 15:3?), Elijah (Mt. 11:14). Paul's interpretation of later OT events (e.g., the book of Hosea, the Exile) often fall within a typological framework; but when this is true, they usually point back to principles or events originating in one of the earlier periods (e.g., the Covenant, the faith-seed or remnant).

new resurrection creation (καὶ νῆ κτίσις) whose head and sovereign is the Lord Christ;¹ and from Rom. 8 it appears that the whole cosmic order is to be in this new redeemed creation.² These views are undoubtedly related to, and probably in part derivative from, Paul's understanding of the Adam-Christ typology. This typology finds express definition in Rom. 5 and 1 Cor. 15, where it is the rationale under which the Christian's redemption—both in justification and in final resurrection to immortality—is explained.³ An extension of the Adam-Christ parallel to Eve and the Church is apparently the motif in Eph. 5:31f and possibly is implicit in 2 Cor. 11:2f.⁴ As τύπος τοῦ κελδόντος Adam is typically related to Christ both in comparison and in contrast: Both head a new creation; but where Adam's failure brought sin and death to all ἐν Ἀδὰμ, Christ's victory brought righteousness and immortal life to all ἐν Χριστῷ.⁵ Also the historicity of Adam is quite as basic to Paul's thought here as the historicity of Christ, and, as Goppelt has noted, any theory which reduces the Adam typology to speculation over a mythological Urmensch misses the point of Paul's analysis:

Die Beziehung Adam-Christus ist für Paulus nicht Veranschaulichungsmittel oder spekulation sondern Erleuchtung und

¹2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; cf. Eph. 2:10, 15. See further Abbot (op. cit., p. 217) and J. B. Lightfoot (The Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon, London: MacMillan, 1875, pp. 212f, 222) on Col. 1:15-18. Cf. Rom. 1:4; Rev. 3:14.

²Rom. 8:19ff.

³Supra, pp. 734f

⁴Cf. Tasker, op. cit., p. 98; contra, Goppelt, op. cit., pp. 157f; Best, op. cit., p. 171. The Adam-Christ typology may underlie Phil. 2:5ff.

⁵Rom. 5:17; 1 Cor. 15:22.

Vergewisserung des Glaubens aus der Schrift, echte Typologie.¹

There are few typological parallels drawn from the patriarchal period. Such matters as the faith of Abraham stand in direct continuity with the New Covenant; they are not typology conceived of as a pattern of parallel and contrast, of shadow and true, of figure and fulfilment, of economic or dispensational correspondence.² There may be allusions in Rom. 3:25; 8:32 to the sacrifice of Isaac as typical of Christ's offering,³ but the only definitive typological parallel is the Sarah-Hagar 'allegory' in Gal. 4:22ff.⁴ This 'allegory of the two covenants'⁵ forms one picture with the covenant typology drawn from the Exodus and later narratives. Although denominated 'allegory,'⁶ the passage differs from the symbolical use of Scripture in Philo and Origen^e, both in its view of history and in its epistemology. Its basis is not *γνώσις* but *πίστις*, not the esoteric experience of a mystery religion but the "heilsgeschichtliche Glaubenswirklichkeit."⁷ Although following an allegorical form in part, its

¹Goppelt, op. cit., p. 162: "The Adam-Christ relationship is for Paul not merely a medium of illustration or speculation but the illumination and confirmation of faith from the Scripture, genuine typology."

²Goppelt (op. cit., pp. 164-167) treats the 'seed of Abraham' (Gal. 3:16, 29) as typology: As Abraham believed God would create life from his dead body (Rom. 4:18ff), so Christians believe God raised Christ from the dead (Rom. 4:24; 10:9f). But this is more a comparison of the faith-basis of the New Covenant in two situations than typological exegesis as defined above.

³Schoeps, op. cit., pp. 390ff; cf. supra, pp. 124

⁴Supra, pp. 63ff, . ⁵Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 192ff.

⁶Gal. 4:24: .

⁷Goppelt, op. cit., p. 163: "a redemptive-historical reality of faith."

subject matter places it within the framework of Pauline typology: Sarah and Hagar in their experiences foreshadow and manifest the principles seen in full-flower in the Messianic Community versus legalistic Judaism.¹

The two covenants also provide the structural framework upon which the Exodus typology is built. The Abrahamic covenant stands in continuity with the 'new covenant' (καινή διαθήκη); the παλαιά διαθήκη of Sinai stands in contrast.² The events of the Exodus, the 'redemption' under the 'old covenant,' provide a pattern of 'types' foreshadowing the redemption in Christ. As the old covenant was initiated in the Passover, so "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us," establishing a new covenant in his blood.³ As those redeemed by Moses were baptized εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν in the cloud and sea, so those redeemed in Christ's death and resurrection are baptized εἰς ἰησοῦν.⁴ The old covenant

¹Not only Isaac and Ishmael but Jacob and Esau (Rom. 9: 13) are treated in this fashion. Perhaps the apostle's application is merely illustrative, but it is more likely that he views the typological structure as proper to the history itself. Cf. Burton, op. cit., p. 256.

²2 Cor. 3. It may be, as Goppelt maintains (op. cit., p. 171), that the Abrahamic covenant is a positive 'type' of the later καινή διαθήκη. It is, then, a case of 'both-and;' for Paul insists throughout that the Christian Community is in direct continuity with Abraham and heir to his covenant promises. Goppelt's suggestion is congruous with Heb. 5:10 where Melchizedek provides a positive type and the Levitical priesthood a negative one (cf. ἀντίτυπον Heb. 9:24; 10:1). In the final analysis it is unwise to attempt to erect any integrated system of typology even within the Pauline writings; some elements were probably viewed as 'wholes' without reference to any larger scheme. Cf. infra, pp. 179f.

³1 Cor. 5:7; 11:25ff.

⁴1 Cor. 10:3; cf. Rom. 6:3; 1 Cor. 1:30; Gal. 3:27; Eph. 1:14; 4:30

as the new, had a food and drink in which Christ was (typically) present.¹ As the old covenant had a Law written in stone, so the new covenant had a Torah, an ἐπιστολή Χριστοῦ, written on men's hearts.² Under the old covenant there was a tabernacle--and later a temple--in which the 'Presence' or Shekinah of God dwelt and where sacrifices for sin were offered; in the new covenant Christ and his Church are the temple and Christ's cross the altar of sacrifice.³

Exodus 'typology' was not original with Paul or even the early Church. The concept arises in the OT prophets who "came to shape their anticipation of the great eschatological salvation through the Messiah according to the pattern of the historical Exodus under Moses."⁴ Sahlin probably overstates the case in describing Is. 35, 40ff as "essentially variations on the Exodus story,"⁵ but the importance of the Exodus events is fundamental

¹ 1 Cor. 10:4; cf. Jn. 6:31f. The meaning is not clear. Πνευματικόν probably means 'in its typical or prophetic significance' (cf. Rev. 11:8; Gal. 4:25); Robertson and Plummer (op. cit., p. 200) interpret it as "supernatural origin."

² 2 Cor. 3:3. Christ's teaching is also considered 'Torah' by Paul. Cf. Dodd, "ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ"; Davis, op. cit., pp. 147ff; supra, pp.

³ On 'temple typology' cf. supra, pp. . C. A. A. Scott (op. cit., pp. viiif) regards Paul's debt to the Levitical system "negligible" and refers ἐλαστήριον in Rom. 3:25 not to the tabernacle service but to the brazen serpent; Schoeps (op. cit., pp. 390ff) takes it to be a reference to Isaac's sacrifice. While this verse is uncertain, there is no reason to exclude the possibility of tabernacle sacrifice, especially in the light of the later typological development in Hebrews. Cf. Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 87.

⁴ H. Sahlin, "The New Exodus of Salvation According to St. Paul," The Root of the Vine, p. 81.

⁵ Ibid.

to all of these prophecies. In Ps. 67(68) also, the Psalmist sees a greater messianic deliverance typified in the Exodus from Egypt.¹ The hundred odd references to the Exodus in subsequent OT books evidence the central place it held in ancient Jewish thought.²

The same is true of the rabbis. Aside from the unique place of the Pesach in the Jewish religious calendar, this Pass-over feast served to impress the importance of the Exodus upon each individual Jew. The Pesach ritual required each participant to identify himself with the Exodus experience: "[This is what] the Lord did unto me when I came forth out of Egypt."³ The rabbis also drew a parallel between the 'first deliverer' (Moses) and the 'last deliverer' (the Messiah).⁴ The Messiah was, as Moses, to bring plagues upon the oppressors of Israel,⁵ bring forth water from the rock, and perform a miracle of manna.⁶ The final deliverance, as the deliverance from Egypt, would take place at

¹Cf. C. A. Briggs, Messianic Prophecy (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1886), pp. 428ff; Ps. 77(78); Ps. 104(105).

²Cf. H. Englander, "The Exodus in the Bible," Studies in Jewish Literature, Festschrift for K. Kohler (Berlin: Reimer, 1913), pp. 108-116.

³Ex. 13:8; Cf. Pes. 116b (SBT, pp. 595ff); W. Vischer, The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ, trans. A. B. Crabtree (London: Lutterworth, 1949), p. 173.

⁴The rabbis seem to approach very closely here to a typological exegesis in the NT sense of the term. If so, it is an exception to the dictum of Bonsirven; cf. supra, pp. 63f

⁵Pesikta 67b-68a; cf. SBK, I, 85ff (Mt. 2:15); Weber, op. cit., p. 366.

⁶Pesikta 49b, Weber, op. cit., p. 364; Nu. R. XI, 2 (SMR, V, 415f); Eccl. R. 1, 9 (SMR, VIII, 33) on Joel 3:18; Midrash on Ruth 2:14, Ps. 72:16, S. S. 2:9; cf. SBK, I, 86f (Mt. 2:15); II, 481 (Jn. 6:31).

the Passover.¹

The NT writers set forth the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazêrâth as the fulfilment of these expectations. The picture of Christ in Matthew is particularly suggestive of the rabbinical parallels between Moses and Messiah: As Moses, he is saved from Herod's slaughter, comes forth out of Egypt, calls out the 'twelve sons of Israel,' gives the law from the mount, performs ten miracles (as Moses, ten plagues), provides 'manna' from heaven.² However, the picture is not certain; at least as good a case can be made out that Matthew has in mind Christ as the 'embodiment' of Israel.³ No systematic formulation should be looked for in any case.⁴ In other NT contexts, John the Baptist's ministry as the fulfilment of Is. 40:3 (Mk. 1:2f) carries an implicit reference to the Exodus events; "he is the forerunner, who now inaugurates the new eschatological Exodus which is to be fulfilled by the Messiah."⁵ In the new Exodus, as the old, the redeemed "sing the song of Moses."⁶ The connection of Christ's death with the Passover is one of the cardinal points in the

¹Cf. Sahlin, New Exodus, p. 82.

²Mt. 2:13ff; 10:2ff (Cf. Mk. 3:14); 5-7; 8-10; 14:15ff. The pattern is sporadic and mixed; in Jn. 6 and 1 Cor. 10 it is Christ himself who is the manna. Sahlin (New Exodus, p. 82) suggests that a Pentateuchal format is implicit in the first Gospel, viz., Mt. 1-7, 8-10, 11-18, 19-25, 26-28.

³This is almost certainly the meaning in Mt. 2:15; cf. also '40 days in the wilderness' (Mt. 4:1ff). The Semitic concept of solidarity between the Messiah, and Israel, and Israel's leaders cautions against drawing any fine distinctions in this regard.

⁴Cf. infra, pp. 180

⁵Sahlin, New Exodus, p. 83.

⁶Rev. 15:3.

Passion narratives; Burney's words well express its significance:

It was not, we may believe, a mere coincidence that 1200 years later at precisely the same season, . . . that He, the true Passover Lamb, suffered and died for our salvation at the very moment when the Jews were making ready for their annual commemoration of the Passover feast. . . .¹

The Pauline references to the Exodus events are not mere illustrations or analogies, but, as the discussion above demonstrates, are part of a system of OT interpretation reaching to the heart of the Gospel. Paul specifically connects baptism and the Lord's Supper with the Exodus.² In 1 Cor. 10:1ff and Rom. 6:3 Christian baptism is explained in terms of the Exodus imagery. In the former passage the Red Sea crossing and envelopment in the Shekinah cloud³ are taken as typical of the Christian's experience. A parallel to Jewish proselyte baptism seems implicit in Rom. 6:3. In Judaism this baptism was essential to identify the proselyte with Israel; and this identification, as the Pesach ritual stresses, signified an identification with Israel's Exodus from Egypt, i.e., with the 'baptism' in the Red Sea and Shekinah cloud. So Christian baptism identifies one with the new exodus—Christ's death and resurrection (Rom. 6:3). Sahlin's remark is pertinent:

As through circumcision and proselyte baptism the Jewish proselyte is incorporated into the people of God and becomes

¹Burney, The Gospel in the Old Testament, p. 44.

²See Sahlin, New Exodus, pp. 84-94. Cf. also A. H. McFlele, New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's (Cambridge: University Press, 1923), p. 145: "Much of what St. Paul says about salvation and the Christian life he has before his mind the events of the Exodus." A Jn

³Cf. Ex. 40:34-38. The rabbis expatiate considerably on this incident; cf. SBK, III, 405.

a partaker of God's act of salvation as recorded in the Exodus narrative, and primarily in the crossing of the Red Sea, so the Christian proselyte receiving Christian baptism, becomes a partaker in Christ's act of salvation, His death and resurrection. As the Jewish proselyte becomes by baptism one with the Exodus generation, so the Christian through baptism becomes one with Christ in His death and resurrection.¹

Similarly, the Eucharist is compared with the manna and the water from the rock (1 Cor. 10:1ff); and in several passages there is an implicit reference to the Pesach feast with Christ as the true Paschal lamb.²

Some elements in Pauline typology are obscure, and it is sometimes difficult to determine whether a 'type' or merely an illustration is in mind. Some OT references which are probably no more than analogies or application of principles³ may conform to a typological frame of reference. NT typology did not involve merely a catalogue of 'types;' it penetrated into the spirit of NT exegesis in all its forms.

In the Pauline writing two basic typological patterns appear--Adamic or creation typology and Covenant typology. Each is related to a particular aspect of God's redemptive purpose in Christ,⁴ and, over all, they unite to form one interrelated whole. Thus, becoming a Christian is spoken of as a new birth (Exodus typology) and a new creation (Adamic typology); sometimes

¹Sahlin, New Exodus, p. 91.

²1 Cor. 5:7; 10:16ff; 11:2ff. According to J. Jeremias (Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu, Zurich: Zwingli, 1949, pp. 18ff) the Last Supper was a Pesach meal. If so, the Eucharist would probably be regarded as a continuation of the Jewish feast with Christ as the Passover lamb. Cf. Sahlin, New Exodus, p. 93.

³Cf. 1 Cor. 9:9ff; 2 Cor. 4:13; 8:15.

⁴These two ideas may be present in Rom. 1:3f where Christ is described as *σπέρματος Δαυὶδ* and *υἱοῦ Θεοῦ*.

(e.g., Rom. 6:3) both ideas are apparently joined in the figure of resurrection.

In a study and use of biblical typology two erroneous tendencies are ever present. Seeking to apply the 'truths' of typology one may "de-historicize it, even while playing lip service to the historical context in which it is found."¹ Further, the exegete is tempted to seek a logical extension of NT patterns and to mold them into a systematic and comprehensive hermeneutic. In this area particularly NT thought-forms are Semitic not Greek, and it is not without significance that Paul and other NT writers were content to leave some typological elements in ambiguous form and apply others only in very limited fashion. Farrer's theory of image revelation may be helpful for the study of this NT discipline as well as biblical symbolism:

Then each image will have its own conceptual conventions, proper to the figure it embodies: and a single overall conceptual analysis will be about as useful for the interpretation of the Apostle's writings as a bulldozer for the cultivation of a miniature landscape garden. The various images are not, of course, unconnected in the Apostle's mind; they attract one another and tend to fuse, but they have their own way of doing this, according to their own imagery laws,² and not according to the principles of a conceptual system.

New Covenant Exegesis

Pauline exegesis employs a great deal of methodology found in rabbinical and other literature. IF, Stichwort combinations, and possibly 'pointer' citations are examples of such common stock usage. Yet, in other respects his exegetical methods

¹ Wright, op. cit., p. 65.

² A. Farrer, The Glass of Vision (London: Dacre, 1948), p. 45. Farrer applies the theory to the whole of biblical revelation.

appear to arise out of presuppositions peculiar to a particular segment of Jewish thought, if not to the NT exclusively. Two principles are fundamental to Paul's understanding of the OT. First, he reads the Scripture from the viewpoint of the 'Endtime' in which OT history and prophecy has become realized and fulfilled in Christ. The OT is Heilsgeschichte, pregnant in anticipation of future fulfilment: The mystery of the Gospel, foretold in the OT is now made manifest in Christ.¹ That the OT pointed to the Messiah and the messianic era was a familiar concept in Judaism. With this in mind the first century exegete had a two-fold task, to 'search the Scriptures,' and to discern 'the signs of the times;' he learned from the Scriptures the nature of God's purpose, and from current events he sought indication of the fulfilment:²

When the Scripture rightly ^{interpreted} coincided with the event rightly understood, then you had the argument from prophecy. To rebut it in the early centuries it was necessary to challenge the correctness of the exegesis or the justness of the interpretation of the event, or both.³

Paul assumes the validity of this principle, and his Christological interpretation of the OT proceeds from it.⁴ As the OT itself notes, the 'last word' is not in it but in the New Covenant which fulfills and supercedes it. And with the inauguration of the New Covenant in Jesus Christ history enters "the times of the End."

¹Rom. 16:26. Cf. T. Hoppe, Die Idee der Heilsgeschichte bei Paulus (Göttersloh: Bertelsmann, 1926), pp. 140-169; Vollmer, Vom Lesen und Deuten Heiliger Schriften (Tübingen: Mohr, 1907), p. 25.

²Manson, The Argument from Prophecy, p. 29. ³Ibid., p. 130.

⁴Cf. C. Clemen, "Die Auffassung des Alten Testament bei Paulus," Theologischen Studien und Kritiken 75 (1902), 173-187.

What had been predicted in Holy Scripture to happen to Israel in the Eschaton has happened to and in Jesus. The foundation-stone of the New Creation has come into position.¹

A second principle of deep consequence for Pauline exegesis is the Jewish concept of 'corporate solidarity.' For example, Israel the patriarch, Israel the nation, the king of Israel, and Messiah stand in such relationship to each other that one may be viewed as the 'embodiment' of the other. The precise nature of the relationship is not entirely clear, but the fact of it exercises a pronounced influence in NT exegesis. It is particularly important for Paul's understanding of such matters as original sin, the seed of Abraham, 'Israel,' and the body of Christ.²

Two components in Paul's exegesis which are particularly revealing for his general hermeneutic are his concept of 'Israel' and his use of what Stendahl has called midrash pesher.³ The former clarifies many applications of the OT which would otherwise appear purely arbitrary; midrash pesher gives a clue for Paul's understanding of the nature of 'quotation' and, consequently, throws light upon some of his textual variations.

The True Israel

Paul, as the other NT writers, regards the Christian ecclesia as the faithful remnant of Israel, the true people of

¹ W. Manson, "Eschatology in the New Testament," SJT, Occasional Papers No. 2, 1-16; cf. Feitzmann, An die Galater, p. 34.

² Cf. supra, pp. 73ff, ; infra, pp. 186ff. E. Best's (op. cit., pp. 203-207) recent study has not sufficiently considered this aspect of the question.

³ Cf. Stendahl, op. cit., p.

God.¹ Christians are the true 'Jews' (Rom. 2:29),² Israel (Rom. 9:6), Israel after the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 10:18), the seed of Abraham (Gal. 3:29), the Israel of God (Gal. 6:16), the circumcision (Phil. 3:3), the peculiar people (Tit. 2:14).³ The unbelieving majority of Jews are, in contrast, characterized by terms usually reserved for the heathen or Gentiles; a striking example is *κύνες* in Phil. 3:2.⁴

The early Church did not view itself as merely a sect within the larger 'Israel' of Judaism, or as a new or different people of God.⁵ Gutbrot rightly observes that "an all diesen Stellen ist nirgends eine Erweiterung von *Ἰσραήλ* in der Richtung auf Bezeichnung des neuen Gottesvolkes zu bemerken. . . ." ⁶
Bezeichnung

¹Cf. Jas. 1:1; 1 Pet. 2:5, 9, 10; K. L. Schmidt, The Church, trans. J. R. Coates from KTW, IV, 53f. Strathmann is mistaken in taking the concept, found also in 1 Pet. 2:9, as originating with Paul; cf. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 43. supra, pp. .

²Cf. Rev. 2:9.

³Cf. Ex. 19:5. The term *ἐκκλησία* is itself of marked significance; cf. R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, trans. K. Grobel (London: SCM, 1952), p. 38: "In understanding themselves as Congregation or Church the disciples appropriate to themselves the title of the OT Congregation of God, the *קהל* - *ק"פ*" *Εκκλησία* (= *קהל* - *ק"פ*) is carefully distinguished from *συναγωγή* in Jewish literature.

⁴'Dogs' was a choice Jewish epithet for Gentiles. E. Lohmeyer (Der Brief an die Philipper, 9th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhöck, und Ruprecht, 1953, pp. 124-126) contends that Paul's attack here is directed solely against "judische Agitatoren" from the Jewish synagogue in Philippi. Even if, as is more probable, Judaizers are included, the figure is still revealing, i.e., not being true Christians they are not true Jews.

⁵Contra, Strathmann, op. cit., pp. 55f.

⁶W. Gutbrot, "Τουδαῖος, Ἰσραήλ, Ἑβραῖος im Neuen Testament," KTW, III, 390: ". . . in all these passages there is nowhere an enlargement of the concept 'Israel' with the aim of denoting a new people of God."

As the imagery of the olive tree in Rom. 11 shows, for Paul there is only one Israel into which the Gentiles are ingrafted; there is, therefore, no necessary contrast between Israel *κατὰ σάρκα* the true Israel.¹ Paul's exclamation, "I too am an Israelite" (Rom. 11:1) reveals how firmly he holds to the fact that the Christian ecclesia is the continuing body of OT Israel. As Flew expresses it:

The proud claim (of the early Church) to the exclusive possession of the original covenant is unmistakable. The Jews in those early years regarded Christianity as a Jewish sect, and modern writers have sometimes so described the early Church. But that was not the view of the original disciples. A sect is a party or school within Israel. But the disciples were Israel. They were the Church or People of God. They did not separate from Israel. They could not. It was the rebellious sons of Israel who forfeited their covenant by rejecting Christ.²

The true Israel, according to Paul, was constituted through a faith relationship and not merely on the basis of physical descent; and this criterion is operative in his view of OT Israel as well. This view of Israel has a greater effect on Pauline exegesis than is apparent at first blush. It is germane to the application of Hab. 2:4 (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11), the status of the Christian believer, and the whole rationale of the covenant promises.³ Among the more obvious instances in his quotations, Rom. 9:25 (Hos. 2:23; 1:10) includes the Gentiles

¹Ibid., pp. 390f. As Gutbrot notes, Rom. 11:26 does not say *πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαίου σωθήσεται*.

²R. N. Flew, Jesus and His Church (London: Epworth, 1943), p. 101. Cf. A. G. Hebert, The Throne of David (London: Faber, 1941), pp. 229-239; R. Smith, "The Relevance of the Old Testament for the Doctrine of the Church," SJT 5 (March 1952), 16ff; Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 48f: "[The Church's] own conviction was that it was the only synagogue entitled to claim that it embodied true Judaism, the true Israel."

³Supra, pp. 90ff, . The identification of Abraham's seed is especially pertinent.

in a prophecy originally referring to faithless Israelites; that is, the unfaithful in Israel are in the category of Gentiles, and God's adoption of these 'Gentiles' implies the in-bringing of other Gentiles into the true Israel--the Christian ecclesia. Another prophecy of Hosea (13:14; 1 Cor. 15:55) is similar: For their iniquities the nation Israel will suffer invasion and death, but God will redeem them from this death. Paul cites the passage as a description of the redemption of the true Israel in the resurrection.¹ Rom. 11:26 apparently assumes a distinction between 'Zion' and 'Jacob' or national Israel; from 'Zion,' the true dwelling of God, the Redeemer shall come forth to the Jewish people.² The persecution of Israel by the Gentiles, described in Ps. 43(44):22 is applied by Paul (Rom. 8:36) to the persecution of Christians by Jews. In Ps. 67(68) God is described as a conqueror who redeems captive Israel and shares with them the booty of his victory; Paul applies the Psalm (Eph. 4:8) to gifts Christ gives to the Church

¹From Calvin onward (cf. Keil, op. cit., I, 159) many commentators have viewed this verse, as its context, as a threat rather than a promise; consequently, Paul's citation should be understood as merely literary allusion (cf. Toy, op. cit., p. 181; Johnson, op. cit., p. 153; Hos. 13:14 RSV). But it may be interpreted, as the grammar suggests, in contrast with the general context of judgment (cf. Keil, op. cit., pp. 160ff), and there is evidence that the early Church so understood it. As the usage here and elsewhere in the NT (cf. Mt. 2:15; 1 Cor. 15:3 ?) indicates, Hosea in general and this passage in particular was "already recognized as a classical description of God's deliverance of his people out of utter destruction." Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 76. Cf. Mt. 16:18.

²Paul sets this view forth as a 'mystery,' "a truth given by special revelation rather than deduced by argument." Dodd, Romans, p. 182; cf. 2 Cor. 3:15f. Whether $\Sigma\delta\upsilon$ refers to the heavenly Jerusalem (Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 337) or the Church (God's temple) is uncertain. Cf. supra, pp. 167ff.

after His victory over the 'captivity' of death.¹

The concept of solidarity has a bearing on a number of Paul's OT interpretations:² Ps. 68(69), which probably refers to Israel's king, is applied in Rom. 15:3 to Christ the true head of Israel.³ The place of Solomon in the temple typology (2 Sam. 7:14; 2 Cor. 6:16ff) suggests a further interpretation along the same lines. An allusion to Hos. 6:2 may occur in 1 Cor. 15:3 ("the third day"); if so, it is another instance of solidarity in which Christ's resurrection is considered Israel's resurrection.⁴ The NT allusions to Ex. 19:5f afford a very striking example of convergence:⁵ Israel is appointed to be a nation of 'priest-kings.'⁶ Within this nation of priest-kings there is a royal line of David and priestly line of Levi; from these arises Christ, the messianic priest-king, in whom Israel is personified. The NT consequently views the Church, Christ's body, as the true Israel, the nation of priest-kings.

¹The Psalm may be a survey of the whole history of Israel; the Exodus typology is expressly in view in vss. 8-11. Cf. C. A. Briggs, The Book of Psalms (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907), I, 94. On the text of vs. 18 cf. supra, pp. 40ff.

²Cf. supra, pp.

³The title "of David" may or may not be genuine; perhaps it is a 'Servant' Psalm with a personification of Israel's remnant (vs. 17). Either possibility is more suitable to Paul's typological application than Brigg's (Psalms, II, 115) conjecture of Jeremiah.

⁴Dodd, According to the Scriptures, pp. 77, 103; J. Weiss (op. cit., pp. 94ff) takes the phrase as a current idiom for a short interval of time.

⁵Cf. Col. 1:12f; Tit. 2:14; 1 Pet. 2:9.

⁶The Hebrew construct (מִלְכֵי־קֳדָשׁ) is a "closer relation than the genitive case. It is nearer the compound noun. . . ." Briggs, Messianic Prophecy, pp. 101ff.

Midrash Peshet

Of the considerable number of Pauline quotations which vary from the LXX and/or the MT, some may be explained on the basis of a variant textual source. However, agreements with the Targum, Peshitta, and various Greek texts are sporadic; and in some of these texts, at least, a Christian influence is probable. In any case it is very doubtful that all of the apostle's textual aberrations can be accounted for in this manner.¹

Several variant readings which have a direct bearing on the NT application suggest either an ad hoc rendering or an interpretative selection from various known texts.² For example, the addition of $\pi\alpha\varsigma$ in Rom. 10:11 (Rom. 9:33 omits it) contributes directly to the argument; and there is little doubt that Paul is here inserting his own 'commentary' into the body of the text. In Rom. 12:19 the variation apparently follows the rendering of the Targum; making this selection, Paul (or an earlier Christian exegete) secures the desired interpretation:

NT: Vengeance is mine, I will repay.
 Heb: To me belongs vengeance and retribution.
 Targ: Vengeance is before me and I will repay.

Also, $\pi\varsigma\iota\zeta$ in Is. 25:8, which Paul (1 Cor. 15:54)--against the LXX and the Targum ($\text{[}^{\text{b}}\text{e}^{\text{y}}\text{e}^{\text{e}}\text{]}$)--renders $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \nu\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, usually is translated 'forever' or 'utterly.'³ The Aramaic $\pi\varsigma\iota$ can mean 'excel' or 'overcome,' and this connotation is probably not entirely absent from the Hebrew. The point of interest, however, is that Paul uses a selective interpretation; and this interpretation is essential for the application of the passage in 1 Cor. 15.

¹See supra, pp. 15f.

²See Appendix II.

³2 Sam. 2:26; Job. 36:7; Amos 1:11.

The same motive apparently is present in Rom. 11:26f. Where the MT reads "to those who turn from transgression in Jacob" Romans, with the LXX, has "and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." The LXX itself is here an interpretative rendering of the Hebrew, an interpretation which accords with the argument in Romans. Possibly Paul merely follows the text which lay before him, but more likely he retains the LXX reading because it gives the sense which he himself finds in the passage. There are a number of indications favoring this supposition. In the same verse Paul departs from the LXX in the phrase ἐκ Σιών, evidently with a hermeneutical purpose in view.¹ Furthermore, where the LXX text is followed elsewhere a distinctive interpretation of the Hebrew is involved in it; and upon this interpretation Paul's argument is built. For example, in Rom. 1:17 πίστις stresses a particular aspect of ἰσχυρία; in Gal. 3:8 the NT and LXX 'be blessed' would, on the basis of statistical probability, better represent the Hebrew if it were reflexive rather than passive.² These variations should not be viewed as capricious, or arbitrary, or merely incidental. Similar features found in other writings of the NT and of the Qumran sect indicate that this procedure has a more significant purpose: Paul utilizes ad hoc renderings and the deliberate selection and rejection of known readings to draw out and express the true meaning of the OT passage as he understands it.

In a recent dissertation, K. Stendahl compared the texts

¹See supra, pp. 163f . Cf. Rom. 12:19; 2 Cor. 6:16ff; 1 Cor. 15:54f.

²Cf. supra, pp. 164f .

of Matthew's 'formula' quotations with the MT, LXX, Targum, and other Greek and Syriac versions.¹ He found that, in contrast to other OT citations in the Gospels, the 'formula' quotations peculiar to Matthew follow no one textual tradition but represent a selective targumizing procedure in which the interpretation is woven into the text itself. The rendering is not the result of a free paraphrase or looseness but arises out of a scholarly, detailed study and interpretation of the texts themselves.² Furthermore, the Matthaean type of midrashic interpretation closely approaches the midrash pesher of the Qumran Sect.³ To prove this contention Stendahl engages in a detailed examination of some of the exegetical procedures employed in DSH.

In pesher quotation or midrash the interpretation or exposition is incorporated into the body of the text itself, thereby determining its textual form. Also, the method, as found in DSH and the NT, has an apocalyptic feature in which the prophetic passage is viewed as 'fulfilled' in the present time and is applied to contemporary events.⁴ As Matthew's formula quotations view the OT as fulfilled in Christ, similarly the Habakkuk 'Commentary' applies Hab. 1-2 to the Teacher of Righteousness and

¹ Stendahl, op. cit. Cf. NTS, I (November 1954), pp. 155ff.

² Ibid., pp. 195, 200f.

³ Ibid., p. 35. Pesher (פֶּשֶׁר) occurs as a technical term in DSH. Whether it should be rendered 'commentary,' 'interpretation,' or 'midrash' is uncertain; Stendahl classifies it as a midrash parallel to halacha and haggada. Cf. the discussion in B. J. Roberts, "Some Observations on the Damascus Documents and the Dead Sea Scrolls," BJRL 34 (1951-52) pp. 367ff.

⁴ Roberts ("Observations," pp. 367f) regards this factor as the chief link between DSS and the NT.

the events surrounding him. Stendahl, however, is concerned chiefly with the way in which pesher interpretation affects the text-form (as contrasted with the exposition proper) of DSH. He finds more than 50 variants from the MT, most of which form "such an intimate and organic part of the exposition of the text that they cannot possibly be dismissed as (scribal errors)."¹ Even though many of these readings appear to be created ad hoc, they nevertheless frequently coincide with one or more of the known versions; "such coincidences occur where adaptation to the dogma and situation of the sect would sufficiently explain the text of DSH."²

Stendahl classified DSH variants as to (1) alterations of number and suffic^x and (2) more substantial changes.³ Among the former, in Hab. 1:13 MT has the singular (6'27), DSH the plural (16'27); in Hab. 2:16 MT has 715h, DSH 775h; in Hab. 1:10 MT has a feminine DSH a masculine; MT a second person suffix, DSH a third person (Hab. 2:15); MT a suffix where DSH has none (Hab. 2:18). Other variations are of greater weight: MT in Hab. 1:9 has a locative heh with the idea 'eastward' or 'forward' (17b'7P), DSH takes the word as a noun (17'7P); in Hab. 2:5 MT has 717 ('wine'), DSH 777 ('riches'); Hab. 2:6 MT has 1757zh ('taunt'), DSH 757zh ('scoffers' or interpreters'). In several places a reading or interpretation is omitted from the DSH text only to be taken up in the exposition, e. g., "they shall come" in Hab. 1:8; this indicates the exegete's acquaintance with other readings or possible interpretations. Stendahl compares the divergent readings with other versions

¹Stendahl, op. cit., p. 185.

²Ibid., p. 189.

³Ibid., pp. 185-190.

with the following results:¹

	<u>DSH</u>	<u>MT</u>	<u>Targ.</u>	<u>LXX</u>	<u>Pesh.</u>	<u>Vulg.</u>
Hab. 1:9	ד'תפ	דב'תפ	DSH	MT	—	DSH Symm.=DSH
(1:17a not interrog.)		interrog.	MT	DSH	DSH	DSH) Frag.=DSH
1:17b	דבבב	דבבב	(MT)	MT	MT	MT
2:1	דבבב	דבבב	DSH	MT	MT	MT
2:5	דבב	דבב	MT	MT	DSH	MT
2:6	דבבב	דבבב	(DSH)	MT	(DSH)	MT
2:8	דבבב	דבבב	MT	MT	MT	MT Frag.=DSH
2:15	דבבב	דבבב	no suf.	no pron.	no suf.	DSH
2:16	דבבב	דבבב	MT	DSH	DSH	(DSH) Aq.=DSH

The data are then evaluated with this conclusion:

The peculiar way in which DSH coincides both with those readings differing from the MT and with the MT's own makes it inadequate to say that DSH's Hebrew text was the one which is supported by the said versions. We must rather presume that DSH was conscious of various possibilities, tried them out and allowed them to enrich its interpretation of the prophet's message, which in all its forms was fulfilled in and through the Teacher of Righteousness.²

Stendahl finds similar phenomena--variations in person and number, structural changes, and evident knowledge of divergent readings--in Matthew's quotations and regards this as arising from a scholarly interpretation of the texts by an early Christian 'school' of exegetes: They selected from various textual traditions, and at times created ad hoc, readings which best expressed the meaning of the text as they understood it.

There are a number of Pauline quotations which indicate that the peshet method was employed not only by the apostle but

¹Ibid., p. 189.

²Ibid., p. 190.

in the pre-Pauline period of the Church as well.¹ The apocalyptic outlook, in its messianic expression is implicit in the whole Pauline hermeneutic, and is particularly obvious in ²1 Cor. 6:2.

For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now is the accepted time, behold now is the day of salvation.²

The interpreted or pesher text-form is also present in Paul's quotations. The apostle follows the LXX where it diverges from the MT in a number of places. Some of these probably have an exegetical purpose in view (e.g., $\pi\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ in Rom. 1:17; $\omicron\epsilon\varsigma$ in Rom. 15:21);³ but since the LXX is his usual vade mecum, it is difficult in most of these texts to show 'a selective rendering of a chosen text.'

In some 20 citations in which the LXX and Hebrew agree and Paul's text varies, the evidence of pesher quotation is more certain.⁴ In almost all of these the variation seems to be a deliberate adaption to the NT context; in some cases the alteration has a definite bearing on the interpretation of the passage.

¹Stendahl recognizes that this type of interpretation is present in apocalyptic writings and occasionally in the rabbis (ibid., p. 195) and that it is found in other NT writings, especially the Fourth Gospel. But he concludes that there were fewer intentional changes based on the Hebrew, and "thus the elaborate stage of the pesher found in Matthew scarcely existed" (ibid., p. 202). Cf. Bonsirven, op. cit., pp. 77-83.

²The manner in which this citation is parenthetically inserted suggests that the whole verse--the OT text plus the interpretation--was taken as a quotation by Paul. Cf. 1 Cor. 15:45; 1 Tim. 5:18; 2 Tim. 2:19.

³On Rom. 1:17 cf. supra, pp. 154f ; the LXX "to whom" in Rom. 15:21 accords much more explicitly with Paul's application than the indefinite $\tau\omega\delta$ of the MT.

⁴Cf. Appendix I.

Changes in person and number are especially prevalent.¹ The deviations in the catena in 2 Cor. 6:16ff are evidently designed for a messianic-age interpretation of the prophecies. God's command to Israel regarding Babylon ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$) is now applied to the relation of Christians with unbelievers ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\upsilon$); the promise given to Israel 'personified' in Solomon ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega \dots \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$) is fulfilled in true Israel, the members of Christ's body ($\upsilon\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma \dots \upsilon\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$). Similarly, $\sigma\omicron\phi\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ in 1 Cor. 3:20 and $\delta \pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma \lambda\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ אֱלֹהֵי אֱבֶרֶת in 1 Cor. 15:45a show an elaboration or interpretation of the OT text to fit it to the NT context.

In a few instances the variations point to a selection from among various known readings. The present state of the whole textual problem cautions against any dogmatizing in this regard,² and there appears to be no instance of a rejected reading being alluded to in the apostle's exposition. Nevertheless, the choice of a particular text for interpretive reasons appears probable in several Pauline quotations. Rom. 12:19 modifies the Hebrew with the Targum; the Targum also may be the source of the rendering, 'confess,' which is important for the sense of the citation in Rom. 14:11.³ Eph. 4:8 substitutes the third person for the second and rejects the MT and LXX rendering, 'take' or

¹E.g., Rom. 3:18 ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ to $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\upsilon$); 10:19 ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ to $\upsilon\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$); 1 Cor. 15:27 ($\upsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\zeta\alpha\varsigma$ to $\upsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\zeta\epsilon\upsilon$).

²E.g., Paul's citation from Job (Rom. 11:35; 1 Cor. 3:19) may follow the Hebrew simply because it is the most familiar text. The Vulgate in Job 41:3 also follows the Hebrew (and Romans). Cf. supra, pp. 74

³So Toy, op. cit. The pacl פִּיִּיִּיִּי , used in the Targum, may have the meaning 'vouch' or 'confirm.'

'receive' in favor of the translation 'give' found in the Targum and Peshitta. Whether this represents an interpretation of $\Pi\rho\xi$ ('take,' 'fetch') or a variant Hebrew textual tradition (e.g., $\rho\xi\pi$, 'apportion,' 'distribute') is uncertain, but the former is more probable.

1 Cor. 15:45f is perhaps the most notable instance of peshet quotation in the Pauline literature:

Death is swallowed up in victory.
Where, O Death, is your victory?
Where, O Death, is your sting?

The interrogative of the LXX is followed (the MT וְלֹא is uncertain), and for the MT וְלֹא ('forever') $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \nu\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ ('in victory') is substituted. The rendering $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \nu\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, which follows a number of Greek texts,¹ may originate in the Hebrew (or Aramaic) root itself. (וָיָסַד , leader, success). The Peshitta conflation, 'to victory forever,' witnesses to two known versions of the passage;² but whether the Peshitta, Aquila and like readings reflect a textual tradition known to and used by Paul, or whether they represent a textual tradition derived from the Pauline usage is a moot point. The variant $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \nu\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ is interwoven into Paul's exposition and indicates that the merged quotation was probably known to him in this form. But the idea of death being "swallowed up in victory" is so intimately connected with the 'victory' of Christ's resurrection that, if a conjecture must be made, the probability is that this interpre-

¹Cf. supra, pp. 9
(וְלֹא).

. The Targum has 'forever'

²Cf. Toy, op. cit., p. 180.

tation of the Hebrew is one created (or recovered) in the early Church. As Manson has well remarked, the doctrinal and liturgical traditions of the first century were very influential in shaping the textual traditions themselves.¹

Taken as a whole, the Pauline citations reflect in substantial measure a pesher-type molding of the text which in some cases is determinative for the NT application of the passage. While this at times involves a choosing and rejecting between texts and/or targums known to the apostle, more often the interpretive paraphrase appears to be created ad hoc by Paul or by the early Church before him. This type of pesher arises from the NT's attitude toward and understanding of the concept of 'quotation' itself as Manson has noted:

We are long accustomed to distinguish carefully between the text which--in more senses than one--is sacred, and the commentary upon it and exposition of it. We tend to think of the text as objective fact and interpretation as subjective opinion. It may be doubted whether the early Jewish and Christian translators and expositors of Scripture made any such sharp distinction. For them the meaning of the text was of primary importance; and they seem to have had greater confidence than we moderns in their ability to find it. Once found it became a clear duty to express it; and accurate reproduction of the traditional wording of the Divine oracles took second place to publication of what was held to be their essential meaning and immediate application. Odd as it may seem to us, the freedom with which they handled the Biblical text is a direct result of the supreme importance which they attached to it.²

In selecting a particular version or in creating an ad

¹Manson, "The Cairo Geniza: A Review," p. 184. Other quotations such as 1 Cor. 2:9; 14:21; 15:45 also appear to involve interpretations which have a distinctively Christian origin.

²Manson, "The Argument from Prophecy," p. 135. Some of Manson's conclusions on the particular text in question (Heb. 10:37f; cf. Rom. 1:17) may be open to qualification, but the fundamental principle which he here delineates is clearly present in Pauline and NT exegesis.

hoc rendering Paul views his citation as thereby more accurately expressing the true meaning of the Scripture. For Paul, as for the rabbis, the 'letter' was sacred; but unlike the rabbis, Paul valued the 'letter' not for itself alone but for the meaning which it conveyed. His idea of a quotation was not a worshipping of the letter or 'parroting' of the text; neither was it an eisegesis which arbitrarily imposed a foreign meaning onto the text. It was rather, in his eyes, a quotation-exposition, a midrash pesher, which drew from the text the meaning originally implanted there by the Spirit and expressed that meaning in the most appropriate words and phrases known to him.

The pesher method is not used extensively in Paul's quotations; but where it does occur, it often appears to go behind the Greek to reflect an interpretation of the Hebrew ur-text. Further, some of the most significant instances appear to point back to a pre-Pauline usage in the early Church. The presence of the method in *λέγει κύριος* quotations (e.g., Rom. 12:19; 1 Cor. 14:21),¹ the temple typology catena (cf. 2 Cor. 6:16ff),² and such citations as 1 Cor. 15:45³ are cases in point. Stendahl's valuable dissertation, by its comparison of pesher quotation in Matthew and DSH, has clearly shown that NT writers and the Christian exegetes behind them, in their use of this method, are not indulging in a novelty. Converted priests and rabbis, especially those adhering to apocalyptic parties or sects, might be expected to be well acquainted with it. Having now the light of the gospel and the gifts of the Spirit, it is no

¹Cf. supra, pp. 140ff

²Cf. supra, pp. 116ff

³Cf. supra, pp. 171f

surprise that they apply a midrash pesher method to the OT with conviction, confidence, and thoroughness. Stendahl envisions this exposition in its NT form as the product of early Christian 'schools of the prophets.' He suggests that the development may form an "unbroken line from the School of Jesus via 'the teaching of the apostles,' the 'ways' of Paul, the basic teaching of Mark and other *ὑπηρέτας τοῦ λόγου*, and the more mature School of John to the rather elaborate School of Matthew with its ingenious interpretation of the OT as the crown of its scholarship."¹ While the predilection of different writers for particular IP, subject matter, and text-forms do indicate different 'schools' of exegesis in the early Church; nevertheless, the developmental progression posited by Stendahl for the use of midrash pesher is open to some question. Since the method is not a Christian development, there is no reason why it could not have been employed even by individual exegetes (e.g., converted rabbis) from the earliest time. If midrash pesher is understood as an interpretive molding of the text within an apocalyptic framework, ad hoc or with reference to appropriate textual or targumic traditions, then there is some evidence for its use on a rather advanced scale even in the pre-Pauline strata of the NT.

Pauline Exegesis: An Added Factor

Pauline exegesis might be termed 'grammatical-historical plus.' The apostle does not ignore the historical significance of the text; neither does he play fast and loose with the grammar if care is taken to understand the precise purpose and meaning of

¹Stendahl, op. cit., p. 34.

his citation. The grammar and the historical meaning are assumed; and Pauline exegesis, in its essential character, begins where grammatical-historical exegesis ends. The latter discipline could say 'these' possibilities lie within the grammar, and 'this' is the probable historical significance. But Paul would probably begin by saying, 'The OT Scripture has a wider meaning than its immediate historical application;¹ even OT history is God-molded history whose significance does not lie merely in the event but in the meaning of the event for its later fulfilment. Furthermore, grammatical exegesis can only circumscribe the possibilities as to what a text says; to determine the meaning of a text one must not only select the proper grammatical possibility but also fit it into a proper interpretation of OT history as a whole.' This is precisely what Paul proceeds to do, integrating his exposition into the quotations themselves; and in doing so he is convinced that he thereby expresses the true meaning of the text. While his results do not always tally with the statistical probabilities of the grammar, they do lie within its possible meanings or reasonable inferences therefrom. The failure to recognize this 'added factor' is a notable weakness in nineteenth century criticism of the Pauline quotations. If Paul's pre-suppositions as to the nature of the OT and of its history are accepted, little fault can be found with his handling of the individual texts.

Conclusion

The problem posed by Pauline quotations lies in the

¹Cf. Rom. 15:4; 1 Cor. 10:11.

variations of the Pauline text and the application given the passage by the apostle. As to textual variations, about half the citations follow the LXX, and a considerable number accord partially or fully with other texts or versions. Nevertheless, a textual investigation leaves several phenomena unaccounted for and is, in general, inconclusive. The essential problem appears to be more one of interpretation than of a purely textual nature.

In many cases the Pauline rendering is intimately connected with his application of the text. These applications make use of common stock interpretations, oral and targumic traditions, and rabbinic methodology. They are not, however, the product of rabbinic artifice; and in their essential character they are not rabbinic at all. In large measure they find their origin in the hermeneutical methods and topical emphases of the early Church.

Midrash peshar as a hermeneutical method is present not only in the Gospels of Matthew and John but in the Pauline writings as well. In this method the exposition of the text determined the textual form of the quotation itself. This was variously accomplished by (1) merging pertinent verses into one strongly expressive 'proof-text,' (2) adapting the grammar to the NT context and application, (3) choosing appropriate renderings from known texts or targums, and (4) creating ad hoc interpretations. All of these devices were designed to best express the true meaning of the text as the NT writers understood it.

In conclusion, the significance of the OT for Paul's theology can hardly be overestimated. His experience on the

Damascus road radically altered his understanding of the Book, but it in no way lessened its importance for the apostle to the Gentiles. Rather, his knowledge of Christ opened to him a New Way in which he found the true meaning of the Scriptures. The words of C. H. Dodd apply with special force to the use of the OT in the Pauline epistles:

I have here only hinted at the significance for Christian theology of a right understanding of the treatment of the Old Testament in the New. I believe it represents an intellectual achievement of remarkable originality, displaying penetration into the meaning that lies beneath the surface of the biblical text, and a power of synthesis which gathers apparently disparate elements into a manysided whole, not unsuitable to convey some idea of the manifold wisdom of God.¹

¹Dodd, The Old Testament in the New, p. 21.

APPENDIX I

QUOTATIONS IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES

NT	OT	Classif.*
Rom. 1:17	Hab. 2:4	5 ^x
2:24	Is. 52:5	5
3:4	Ps. 50(51):6	4 ^x
3:10-12	Ps. 13(14):1-3	4
3:13a	Ps. 5:10	1
3:13b	Ps. 139(140):4	1
3:14	Ps. 9:28(10:7)	5
3:15-17	Is. 59:7-8	5
3:18	Ps. 35(36):2	4 ^x
4:3 (9, 22)	Gen. 15:6	2
4:7-8	Ps. 31(32):1-2	2
4:17	Gen. 17:5	1
4:18	Gen. 15:5	1
7:7	Ex. 20:17 (Dt. 5:21)	1
8:36	Ps. 43(44):23	1
9:7	Gen. 21:12	1
9:9	Gen. 18:10, 14	5
9:12	Gen. 25:23	1
9:13	Mal. 1:2-3	4 ^{xx}
9:15	Ex. 33:19	1

NT	OT	Classif.*
Rom. 9:17	Ex. 9:16	5
9:25	Hos. 2:23(25)	4
9:26	Hos. 1:10(2:1)	5
9:27-28	Is. 10:22-23	5
9:29	Is. 1:9	2
9:33	Is. 8:14 / 28:16	5
10:5	Lv. 18:5	4 ^x
10:6-8	Dt. 30:12-14	5
10:11	Is. 28:16	5
10:13	Joel 2:32 (3:5)	1
10:15	Is. 52:7	5
10:16	Is. 53:1	2
10:18	Ps. 18(19):5	2
10:19	Dt. 32:21	4 ^x
10:20	Is. 65:1	5 ^x xx
10:21	Is. 65:2	2 ^{xx}
11:3	3(1)Kg. 19:14	4
11:4	19:18	5
11:8	Is. 29:10 / Dt. 29:4(3)	4
11:9-10	Ps. 68(69):23-24	5
11:26-27	Is. 59:20 / 27:9	5 ^x
11:34	Is. 40:13	5 ^x
11:35	Job 41:3	3
12:19	Dt. 32:35	5
12:20	Pv. 25:21-22	2
13:9	Dt. 5:17-21 (Ex. 20:13-17) / Lv. 19:18	1

NT	OT	Classif.*
Rom. 14:11	Is. 45:23 (✓ 49:18)	5
15:3	Ps. 68(69):10	1
15:9	Ps. 17(18):50 (cf. 2 Kg. 22:50)	4 ^x
15:10	Dt. 32:43	2
15:11	Ps. 116(117):1	4 ^x
15:12	Is. 11:10	5 ^x
15:21	Is. 52:15	2 ^{xx}
1 Cor. 1:19	Is. 29:14	5 ^x
1:31	Jer. 9:22-23	4
2:9	(Is. 64:4 / 65:17) ?	5
2:16	Is. 40:13	5
3:19	Job 5:12-13	3
3:20	Ps. 93(94):11	4 ^x
6:16	Gen. 2:24	2
9:9	Dt. 25:4	5 ^x
10:7	Ex. 32:6	1
10:26	Ps. 23(24):1	1
14:21	Is. 28:11-12	5
15:27	Ps. 8:7	4 ^x
15:32	Is. 22:13	2
15:45	Gen. 2:7	4
15:54	Is. 25:8	5
15:55	Hos. 13:14	5
2 Cor. 4:13	Ps. 115(116):10	1
6:2	Is. 49:8	1
6:16	Lv. 26:11-12 (Ezk. 27:37)	4

NT	OT	Classif.*
2 Cor. 6:17	Is. 52:11-12	4
6:18	2 Kg. (2 Sam.) 7:14	4
8:15	Ex. 16:18	3
9:9	Ps. 111(112):9	1
10:17	Jer. 9:24	4
13:1	Dt. 19:15	5 ^x
Gal. 3:6	Gen. 15:6(12:3; 18:18)	2
3:8	Gen. 12:3 (✓ 18:18)	4
3:10	Dt. 27:26	5
3:11	Hab. 2:4	5 ^x
3:12	Lv. 18:5	4 ^x
3:13	Dt. 21:23	5
3:16	Gen. 22:18 (cf. 12:7; 13:15; 17:7)	1
4:27	Is. 54:1	2
4:30	Gen. 21:10	4 ^x
5:14	Lv. 19:18	1
Eph. 4:8	Ps. 67(68):19	4 ^x
5:14	?	
5:31	Gen. 2:24	5
6:2-3	Dt. 5:16 (Ex. 20:12)	5
1 Tim. 5:18	Dt. 25:4 (✓ (Mt. 10:10?))	2
2 Tim. 2:19	Nu. 16:5 (✓ (Is. 26:13?))	3 ^x

*Classification:¹

1 - in agreement with the LXX and the Hebrew.

¹Turpie (Old Testament in New Testament) gives a more detailed classification. Although containing a few readings later rejected, his work remains a valuable tool.

- 2 - in agreement with the LXX against the Hebrew.
 - 3 - in agreement with the Hebrew against the LXX.
 - 4¹ - at variance with the LXX and the Hebrew where they agree.
 - 5² - at variance with the LXX and the Hebrew where they vary.
- x - There is only a slight variation from the LXX.
- xx - There is a difference in word order.

¹The differences in Rom. 11:8 and 2 Cor. 6:17 affect clauses; the remaining texts vary in the addition, omission or rendering of words.

²Rom. 3:15-17; 9:33; 10:6-8; 14:11; 1 Cor. 2:9 vary as to clauses; the remaining texts vary as to words.

APPENDIX I (con't.)

OT ALLUSIONS AND PARALLELS IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES

Allusion	Source or Parallel	Allusion	Source or Parallel
Rom. 1:20-32	(Wis. 13:1ff)?	Rom. 11:11	Dt. 32:21
1:23	Ps. 105(106):20	11:32	(Wis. 11:23)?
2:6	Ps. 61(62):13	12:16-17	Pv. 3:7 / 3:4(LXX)
2:9	(Is. 8:22)?	14:13	Lv. 19:14 (Dt. 27:18)
2:11	2 Chron. 19:17	1 Cor. 1:20	Is. 19:11-12 / 33:18
3:4a	Ps. 115(116):11	5:7	Ex. 12:21
3:20	Ps. 142(143):2	5:13	Dt. 22:24; (24:7)
4:11	Gen. 17:10-11	6:2	Dan. 7:22; Wis. 3:8 (?)
4:25	Is. 53:12, 45	6:12-13	(Ecc. 37:27, 28)?
5:5	Ps. 21(22):6	6:17	Dt. 22:24
* 5:12	Gen. 2:17; 3:19	10:5	Nu. 4:16
7:2-3	Dt. 2:1-4	10:6	Nu. 11:4, 34
7:11	Gen. 3:13	10:20	Dt. 32:17
8:3	(Is. 53:10)?	10:21	Mal. 1:7, 12
8:33	Is. 50:8-9	10:22	Dt. 32:21
8:34	Ps. 109(110):1; Is. 53:12	11:3	Gen. 3:16
9:18	Ex. 4:21; 7:3	11:7	Gen. 1:27
9:20	Is. 29:16; 45:9	11:25	Ex. 24:8; Zech. 9:11
9:21	(Wis. 11:22-23)?	13:5	Zech. 8:17(LXX)
11:1-2	Ps. 93(94):14 94(95):4 1 Sam. 12:22		

Allusion	Source or Parallel	Allusion	Source or Parallel
1 Cor. 14:25	Is. 45:14	Eph. 5:2	Ps. 39(40):7; Ezk. 20:41
* 14:34	Gen. 3:16	5:18	Pv. 23:31 (LXX)
15:25	Ps. 109(110):1	5:25ff	(Is. 61:10)?
2 Cor. 3:3	Ex. 31:18; Ezer. 11:19	* 6:14a	Is. 11:5
* 3:7-18	Ex. 34:29-35, etc.	* 6:14b	Is. 59:17
5:10	Ecc. 12:14	6:17	Is. 49:2
5:17	Is. 43:18-19	Phil. 1:19	Job 13:16 (LXX)
6:9	Ps. 117(118):17-18	2:7f	Is. 53:12
6:11	Ps. 118(119):32	2:9	Is. 52:13
7:6	Is. 49:13	2:10-11	Is. 45:23, 49:3
8:21	Pv. 3:4 (LXX)	2:15	Dt. 32:5 (LXX)
9:7	Pv. 22:8 (LXX)	2:16	Is. 49:4; 65:23 (LXX)
9:10	Is. 55:10 / Hos. 10:12	4:3	Ps. 68(69):29
11:2	(Is. 61:10)?	4:18	Ezk. 20:41
11:3	Gen. 3:4, 13	Col. 2:3	Is. 45:3
Gal. 1:15-16	Is. 49:1 / Jer. 1:5	2:22	Is. 29:13
2:16	Ps. 142(143):2	3:1	Ps. 109(110):1
* 4:22ff	Gen. 16:15, ff.	3:10	Gen. 1:27
6:16	Ps. 124(125):5	1 Thess. 2:4	Jer. 11:20
Eph. 1:20	Ps. 109(110):1	2:16	Gen. 15:16; Ps. 79(80):6 (2 Macc. 6:14)
1:22	Ps. 8:7	4:5	Jer. 10:25
2:13-17	Is. 57:19; 52:7	4:6	Ps. 93(94):2; Dt. 32:35
2:20	Is. 28:16	4:8	Ezk. 36:27; 37: 14
* 4:25	Zech. 8:16		
* 4:26	Ps. 4:5		

Allusion	Source or Parallel	Allusion	Source or Parallel
1 Thess. 4:13	(Wis. 3:18)?		
4:17	Dan. 7:13		
5:8	Is. 59:17		
5:22	Job 1:1, 8; 2:3		
2 Thess. 1:8	Is. 66:15		
1:9-10	Is. 2:10, 11, 19, 21		
1:10	Zech. 14:5 / Ps. 67:36		
1:12	Is. 66:15		
2:4	Dan. 11:36; Ezk. 28:2		
2:8	Is. 11:4		
2:13	Dt. 33:12		
1 Tim. 2:6	Is. 53:11-12		
2:12-14	Gen. 3:16		
2:13	Gen. 2:7		
2:14	Gen. 3:6		
* 5:19	Dt. 19:15		
6:1	Is. 52:5		
6:15	Dt. 10:17; Dan. 2:47		
2 Tim. 4:14	Ps. 61:13; Pv. 24:12		
Tit. 2:5	Is. 52:5		
2:14	Is. 53:12; Ps. 129(130):8		

* - The allusion is manifestly intentional

APPENDIX II

TEXT	IF	NT
<p><u>Rom. 1:17</u> For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, The just shall live by faith.</p>	<p>καθώς γέγραπται</p>	<p><u>Rom. 1:17</u> ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται</p>
<p><u>Rom. 2:24</u> For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written.</p>	<p>καθώς γέγραπται</p>	<p><u>Rom. 2:24</u> τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν</p>
<p><u>Rom. 3:4</u> God forbid; yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.</p>	<p>καθάπερ γέγραπται</p>	<p><u>Rom. 3:4</u> ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε</p>
<p><u>Rom. 3:10-12</u> As it is written, there is none righteous, no, not one; There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.</p>	<p>καθώς γέγραπται ὅτι</p>	<p><u>Rom. 3:10-12</u> οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν· πάντες ἐξέκλιναν ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἐνός.</p>

Hab. 2:4

ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου
ζήσεται

Gal. 3:11

ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται

Heb. 10:38

ὁ δὲ δίκαιος μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται

Is. 52:5

δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντός τὸ ὄνομά μου
βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

Psa. 50:6

ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς
λογοῖς σου καὶ νικῆσῃς
ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε

Psa. 13:1 (Ecc. 7:21)

οὐκ ἔστιν κοιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ
ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός
τοῦ ἰδεῖν εἰ ἔστιν συνίων ἢ
ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν· πάντες
ἔξεκλίναν
ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν, οὐκ ἔστιν κοιῶν
χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός.

TEXT

IF

NT

Rom. 3:13a

Their throat is
an open sepulchre;
with their tongues
they have used
deceit;. . .

Rom. 3:13b

. . . the poison
of asps is under
their lips:

Rom. 3:14

Whose mouth is
full of cursing
and bitterness:

Rom. 3:15-17

Their feet are
swift to shed
blood: Destruction
and misery
are in their
ways: And the way
of peace have they
not known.

Rom. 3:18

There is no fear
of God before
their eyes.

Rom. 4:3

For what saith
the Scripture? Ab-
raham believed God,
and it was counted
unto him for right-
eousness.

Rom. 4:7-8

Blessed are they
whose iniquities
are forgiven, and
whose sins are
covered. Blessed is
the man to whom the
Lord will not im-
pute sin.

Rom. 3:13a

τάφως ἀνεωγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν
ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιοῦσαν

Rom. 3:13b

ὁδὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τῶν χειλέων αὐτῶν

Rom. 3:14

ὣν τὸ στόμα ἀράς
καὶ πικρίας γεμεῖ

Rom. 3:15-17

ὁδοὶ αὐτῶν
ὡς ὄξει οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν
ἐκχέαι αἷμα,

σύντριμμα καὶ
ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν
καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν

Rom. 3:18

οὐκ ἔστιν φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι
τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν

Rom. 4:3

(τί γάρ) ἡ
γραφή λέγει

ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ τῷ θεῷ,
καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην

Rom. 4:7-8

καθάπερ καὶ
Δαυὶδ λέγει

μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι,
καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι;
μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὗ οὐ μὴ λογίσθῃται
κύριος ἁμαρτίαν.

TEXT	IF	NT
<u>Rom. 4:17</u> (As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations.)	καθὼς γέγραπται	<u>Rom. 4:17</u> ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε.
<u>Rom. 4:18</u> So shall thy seed be.	κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον	<u>Rom. 4:18</u> οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου
<u>Rom. 7:7</u> Thou shalt not covet.	ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν	<u>Rom. 7:7</u> οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις
<u>Rom. 8:36</u> As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.	καθὼς γέγραπται	<u>Rom. 8:36</u> ὅτι ἕνεκεν σοῦ θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρόβατα σφαγῆς
<u>Rom. 9:7</u> . . . but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called.	ἀλλὰ	<u>Rom. 9:7</u> ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα
<u>Rom. 9:9</u> At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son.	(special)	<u>Rom. 9:9</u> κατα τον καιρον τουτου ἐλεύσομαι καὶ ἔσται τῆ Σάρρα υἱός.
<u>Rom. 9:12</u> . . . The elder shall serve the younger.	ἐβρέθη αὐτῆ	<u>Rom. 9:12</u> ὅτι ὁ μεῖζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι
<u>Rom. 9:13</u> As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.	καθὼς γέγραπται	<u>Rom. 9:13</u> τον Ἰακώβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ησαυ ἐμίσησα
<u>Rom. 9:15</u> For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.	τῷ Μωυσει γὰρ λέγει	<u>Rom. 9:15</u> ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτειρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτείρω

Gen. 17:5

ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἔθνῶν
τέθεικάσε.

Gen. 15:5

οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου

Ex. 20:17(Dt. 5:21)

οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις

Ps. 43:23

ὅτι ἕνεκα σοῦ θανατούμεθα ὅλην
τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς
κρόβατα σφαγῆς.

Gen. 21:12

(ὅτι) ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι
σπέρμα

Gen. 18:10

ἐπαναστρέφω ἤξω πρὸς σέ κατα
τον καιρον τουτου
εἰς ὥρας, καὶ ἔξει υἱὸν Σάρρα
ἡ γυνὴ σου.

Gen. 25:23

καὶ ὁ μεῖζων δουλεύσει τῷ
ἐλάσσονι

Mal. 1:2-3

καὶ ἠγάπησα τὸν Ἰακώβ
τὸν δὲ Ησαῦ ἐμίσησα

Ex. 33:19

καὶ ἐλεήσω ὃν ἄν ἐλεῶ,
καὶ οἴκτειρήσω ὃν ἄν
οἴκτειρω

(Cf. Heb. 11:12)Rom. 13:9(cf. Mt.19:18ff)

... οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις

Heb. 11:18

(ὅτι) ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα

TEXT	IF	NT
<p><u>Rom. 9:17</u> For the scrip- ture saith unto Pharoah, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that thy name might be de- clared throughout all the earth.</p>	<p>λέγει ... ἡ γραφή</p>	<p><u>Rom. 9:17</u> εἰς αὐτό τοῦτο ἐξήγειράσε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελη τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐν πάση τῇ γῆ</p>
<p><u>Rom. 9:25-26</u> As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my peo- ple; which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the child- ren of the living God.</p>	<p>ἐν τῷ Ὠσηέ λέγει</p>	<p><u>Rom. 9:25-26</u> καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαὸν μου λαὸν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην</p> <p>καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐβρέθη αὐτοῖς οὐ λαός μου ὄψεσθε, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζώντος</p>
<p><u>Rom. 9:27-28</u> Esaias also cried concerning Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved: For he will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness: because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth.</p>	<p>Ἡσαΐας κράζει</p>	<p><u>Rom. 9:27-28</u> ἐάν ᾗ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης τὸ ὑπόλειμμα σωθήσεται.</p> <p>λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων</p> <p>ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς</p>
<p><u>Rom. 9:29</u> And as Esaias said before, Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had been as Sodoma,</p>	<p>καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας</p>	<p><u>Rom. 9:29</u> εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῶν σπέρμα, ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν ὁμοιωθήμεν</p>

Ex. 9:16

καὶ ἕνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθησθε
 ἵνα ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν ἰσχύν
 μου,
 καὶ ὅπως διαγγεῖται τὸ ὄνομα μου
 ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῆ

Hos. 2:23

καὶ ἀγαπήσω τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην,
 καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ οὐ λαῷ μου λαός μου
 εἰ σὺ

(cf. 1 Pet. 2:10)Hos. 1:10

καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐβρέθη
 αὐτοῖς
 οὐ λαός μου υμεῖς
 κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ
 ζώντος

Is. 10:22-23

καὶ εἰάν γένηται ὁ λαός
 Ἰσραὴλ
 ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης
 τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν
 σωθήσεται.
 λόγον συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων
 ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ὅτι λόγον
 συντετημημένον
 ποιήσει κύριος ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ
 ὅλη

Is. 1:9

καὶ εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαώθ
 ἐγκατέλειπεν
 ἡμῖν σπέρμα ὡς Σόδομα ἂν
 ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὡς Γόμορρα
 ἂν ὁμοιωθῆμεν

TEXT

IF

NT

Rom. 9:29 con't.
and been made like
unto Gomorrha.

Rom. 9:33

As it is written,
Behold I lay in
Sion a stumbling-
stone and rock of
offence: and whoso-
ever believeth on
him shall not be
ashamed.

Rom. 10:5

That the man which
doeth those things
shall live by them.

Rom. 10:6-8

But the righteous-
ness which is of
faith speaketh on
this wise, Say not
in thine heart
Who shall ascend
into heaven? (that
is, to bring Christ
down from above:)
Or, Who shall des-
cend into the deep?
(that is, to bring
up Christ again
from the dead.) But
what saith it? The
Word is nigh unto
thee, even in thy
mouth, and in thy
heart: . . .

Rom. 10:11

For the scripture
saith, Whosoever
believeth on him
shall not be
ashamed.

καθὼς
γέγραπται

Μωϋσῆς
γράφει

ἢ οὐκ
πίστεως
δικαιοσύνη
οὕτως λέγει
(ἀλλὰ τί
λέγει;)

ἡ γράφη
λέγει

Rom. 9:33

Ἴδου τίθημι ἐν Σιών
λίθον προσκόμματος
καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου

καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ
καταισχυνηθήσεται

Rom. 10:5

ὁ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ

Rom. 10:6-8

τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν
οὐρανόν; . . .
... τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν
ἄβυσσον; . . .
... ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥημᾶ ἐστίν,
ἐν τῷ στόματί σου, καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ
σου; . . .

Rom. 10:11

πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ
καταισχυνηθήσεται

Is. 8:14

καὶ οὐκ ὡς
λίθου προσκομματι συναντήσεσθε,
οὐ δὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι

Is. 28:16

ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια
Σειῶν λίθον
πολυτελεῖ ἐκλεκτὸν ἀπογωνιαῖον
ἔντιμον εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς,
καὶ ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῆ

Lv. 18:5

ἃ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν
αὐτοῖς

Dt. 30:12-14

τίς ἀναβήσεται ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν
οὐρανὸν
... τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν
πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης,
... ἐστὶν σου ἐγγύς τὸ ῥῆμα
σφόδρα
ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ
καρδίᾳ σου,

Is. 28:16

καὶ ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῆ

1 Pet. 2:6 (cf. Mt. 21:42)

ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών
(1 Pet. 2:6- λίθος προσκόμματος
καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου;) λίθον
ἐκλεκτὸν ἀπογωνιαῖον ἔντιμον
καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ
Rom. 10:11

καταισχυθῆ

πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ
καταισχυθῆσεται

Gal. 3:12 (cf. Lk. 10:28)

ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς

Rom. 9:33

καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ
καταισχυθῆσεται

1 Pet. 2:6

καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ
καταισχυθῆ

TEXT

IF

NT

Rom. 10:13

For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

γάρ

Rom. 10:13

πᾶς (γάρ) ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται

Rom. 10:15

. . . as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!

καθάπερ
γέγραπταιRom. 10:15

ὡς ᾠραῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων τὰ ἀγαθὰ

Rom. 10:16

. . . For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?

('Ἡσαΐας
λέγει)Rom. 10:16

κύριε, τίς ἐπίτευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν;

Rom. 10:18

Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.

μενοῦν γὰρ

Rom. 10:18

εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξηθῆεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν

Rom. 10:19

But I say, Did not Israel know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you.

Μωσῆος
λέγειRom. 10:19

ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐκ' οὐκ ἔθνει, ἀσυνέτω παροργισῶ ὑμᾶς.

Rom. 10:20

But Esaias is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me.

'Ἡσαΐας
λέγειRom. 10:20

εὗρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν

Joel 2:32

καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται
τὸ ὄνομα
κυρίου σωθήσεται

Is. 52:7

ὡς ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων,
ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοῆν
εἰρήνης,
ὡς εὐαγγελιζόμενος αγαθα,
ὅτι ἀκουστήν ποιήσω τὴν
σωτηρίαν σου

Is. 53:1

κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ
ἡμῶν;

Ps. 18:5

εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξεῆλθεν ὁ
φθόγγος
αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς
οἰκουμένης
τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν

Dt. 32:21

κἀγὼ παραζηλώσω αὐτούς ἐπ'
οὐκ ἔθνει
ἐπ' ἔθνει ἀσυνέτω παροργισθῶ
αὐτούς

Is. 65:1

ἐμφανῆς ἐγενήθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ
ἐπερωτῶσιν,
εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ
ζητοῦσιν ...

Acts 2:21

... καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἐάν ἐπικαλέσηται
τὸ ὄνομα
κυρίου σωθήσεται.

Jn. 12:38

κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; ...

TEXT

IF

NT

Rom. 10:21

But to Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

(πρὸς δὲ τὸν
Ἰσραὴλ)
λέγει

Rom. 10:21

ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν
ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου
πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθῶντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα

Rom. 11:3

Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life.

(ἐν ἡλικίᾳ)..
λέγει ἡ
γράφῃ..

Rom. 11:3

κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν,
τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν
καὶ γὰρ ὑπελείφθην
μόνος καὶ ζητοῦσιν τὴν ψυχὴν μου.

Rom. 11:4

But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.

(τί) λέγει..
ὁ
χρηματισμὸς;

Rom. 11:4

κατέλιπον ἑμαυτῷ ἑπτακισχιλίους
ἀνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν
γόνυ τῆ βαάλ

Rom. 11:8

(According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day.

καθάπερ
γέγραπται

Rom. 11:8

ἔδωκεν αὐταῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα
κατανύξεως,

ὁφθαλμοὺς
τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν,
ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας

Is. 65:2

ἔξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου ὄλην
τὴν ἡμέρον
πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθῶντα καὶ
ἀντιλέγοντα

3 Kg. 19:14

καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου καθεῖλαν,
καὶ τοὺς προφήτας σου
ἀπέκτειναν
ἐν βομφαῖα καὶ ὑπολέλιμμαι ἐγὼ
μονώτατος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν
μου
λαβέν αὐτήν

3 Kg. 19:18

καὶ καταλείψεις ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπτὰ
χιλιάδας
ἀνδρῶν, πάντα γόνατα ἃ οὐκ
ᾤκλασαν
γόνυ τῷ βάλῳ

Is. 29:10

(ὅτι πεποτικεν υμας κυριος
πνευματι κατανουξεωσ
καὶ καμμύσει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς
αυτων.)

Dt. 29:4

(καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς
ὑμῖν καρδίαν εἰδέναι καὶ
ὀφθαλμοὺς
βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα ἀκοῦειν
ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης)

(cf. Mt. 13:14f; Jn.
12:40; Acts 28:26f)

Rom. 11:9-10

And David saith
Let their table be
made a snare, and
a trap, and a
stumblingblock,
and a recompence
unto them: Let
their eyes be dark-
ened, that they may
not see, and bow
down their back
alway.

Δαυίδ λέγει

Rom. 11:26-27

And so all Israel
shall be saved:
as it is written,
There shall come
out of Sion the
Deliverer, and
shall turn away
ungodliness from
Jacob: For this is
my covenant unto
them, when I shall
take away their
sins.

καθώς
γέγραπταιRom. 11:34-35

For who hath known
the mind of the
Lord? or who hath
been his counsellor?
Or who hath first
given to him, and
it shall be recom-
pensed unto him a-
gain?

(γάρ)

Rom. 12:19

. . .for it is
written, Vengeance
is mine; I will
repay, saith the
Lord.

γεγραπται
γάρ
(λέγει
κύριος)Rom. 11:9-10

γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα
καὶ εἰς θηραν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον
καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς,
οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν,
καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντός σύγκαμψον.
σκοτισθήτωσαν

Rom. 11:26-27

ἔξει ἐκ Σιῶν ὀρυόμενος,
ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ.
καὶ αὕτη
αὐτοῖς ἡ καρ' ἑμοῦ διαθήκη,

ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν

Rom. 11:34-35

τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; ἢ τίς
σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;

ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδο-
θήσεται
αὐτῷ

Rom. 12:19

ἔμοι ἐκδίκησις ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω
λέγει κύριος.

Ps. 68:23-24

γεγηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον
αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα
καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν καὶ εἰς
σκάνδαλον.

σκοτισθήτωσαν
οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν
καὶ
τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντός
σύνκαμψον.

Is. 59:20-21

καὶ ἤξει ἕνεκεν Σιών ὁ ρυόμενος
καὶ
ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ.
καὶ αὕτη
αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἑμοῦ διαθήκη,
εἶπεν κύριος.

Is. 27:9

... ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι αὐτοῦ τὴν
ἁμαρτίαν

Is. 40:13

τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; καὶ
τίς αὐτοῦ
σύμβουλος ἐγένετο ὃς συμβίβη
αὐτόν;

Job 41:3

ἢ τίς
ἀντιστήσεται μοι καὶ
ὑπομενεῖ

Dt. 32:35 (cf. Ps.
93(94):1f)

ἐν ἡμέρα ἐκδικήσεως
ἀνταποδώσω
ὅταν σφαλῇ ὁ ποῦς
αὐτῶν

1 Cor. 2:16

τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου;
ὃς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν;

Heb. 10:30

ἔμοι ἐδίκησις ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω
(λεγει κύριος)

TEXT

IF

NT

Rom. 12:20

Therefore if thine enemy hunger feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

(ἀλλὰ)

Rom. 12:20
ἐάν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψάμειζε αὐτόν·

ἐάν διψᾷ ποτίζε αὐτόν· τοῦτω γὰρ ποιῶν ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

Rom. 13:9

For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

τὸ γὰρ

Rom. 13:9
οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις.....

ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

Rom. 14:11

For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.

γεγραπται γὰρ
(λέγει κύριος)Rom. 14:11

ὡς ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος, ὅτι ἔμοι κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ

Rom. 15:3

. . .but, as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me.

καθὼς
γέγραπταιRom. 15:3

οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδίζόντων σέ ἐπέπεσον ἐπ' ἐμέ

Pv. 25:21-22

ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψώμιζε
αὐτόν
ἐὰν διψᾷ ποτίζε αὐτόν. τοῦτω γὰρ
ποιῶν ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις
ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

Dt. 5:17-21

οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ
κλέψεις.
οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις ... οὐκ
ἐπιθυμήσεις...

Ex. 20:13-17

οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ
φονεύσεις.
οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις ... οὐκ
ἐπιθυμήσεις

Lv. 19:18

ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς
σεαυτόν

Is. 45:23

κατ' ἑμαυτοῦ ὁμνῶ,.....
ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ
ὁμείττει πᾶσα γλῶσσα τὸν θεόν.

Ps. 68:10

οἱ ὄνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὄνειδιζόντων σε
ἐπέπεσον ἐπ' ἐμέ

Mt. 19:18 (cf. Mt. 5:21, 27)

οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ
κλέψεις,
οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις,...

Mk. 10:19

μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ
κλέψης,
μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης,...

Lk. 18:20

μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ κλέψης,
μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης,...

Gal. 5:14; Mt. 19:19; Mk. 12:31

ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν

Mk. 12:31 (cf. Lk. 10:27)

(cf. Jn. 2:17)

TEXT

IF

NT

Rom. 15:9-12

. . . it is written, For this cause, I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name. And again he saith, Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people. And again, Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and laud him all ye people. And again, Esaias saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust.

καθὼς
γέγραπται(καὶ πάλιν
λέγει)(καὶ
πάλιν)(καὶ πάλιν
Ἡσαΐας
λέγει)Rom. 15:21

But as it is written, To whom he was not spoken of they shall see; and they that have not heard shall understand.

καθὼς
γέγραπται1 Cor. 1:19

For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent.

γέγραπται
γάρ1 Cor. 1:31

That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

καθὼς
γέγραπται1 Cor. 2:9

But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have

καθὼς
γέγραπταιRom. 15:9-12

διὰ τοῦτο ἔξομολογήσομαι σοὶ ἐν
ἔθνεσιν
καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ.

εὐφρανθήτε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ

αἰνεῖτε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὸν κύριον,
καὶ ἐπαινεσάτωσαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ
λαοί.ἔσται ἡ ρίζα
τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ὁ ανιστάμενος ἄρχειν
ἔθνων, ἐκ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἔλπιουσιν.Rom. 15:21

ὄψονται οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν, συνησουςιν.

1 Cor. 1:19

ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν, καὶ τὴν
σύνησιν τῶν συνετῶν ἀθετήσω

1 Cor. 1:31ὁ καυχώμενος
ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω1 Cor. 2:9

ἃ ὀφθαλμοὶ οὐκ εἶδον καὶ οὐκ οὐκ
ἤκουσεν

Ps. 17:50

διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαι σοι ἐν
 εθνεσιν, κύριε,
 καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλλῶ.

Ps. 32:43

εὐφράνθητη ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ
 αὐτοῦ.

Ps. 116:1

αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη
 αἰνεσάτωσαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ
 λαοί.

Is. 11:10

καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἡ
 ῥίζα
 τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος
 ἄρχειν
 ἔθνων, ἐκ' αὐτῶ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.

Is. 52:15

ὅτι οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ
 αὐτοῦ ὄψονται·
 καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν συνήσουσιν.

Is. 29:14

ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν, καὶ
 τὴν
 σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν κρύψω.

Jer. 9:24

ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχασθῶ ὁ
 καυχώμενος,
 συνβεῖν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγὼ
 εἰμι κύριος...

Is. 64:4

ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν
 οὐδέ
 οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον
 θεὸν πλην σου καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου

(cf. Heb. 1:6)

(cf. Mt. 2:23)

(cf. Mt. 15:8f; Rom. 11:8)

2 Cor. 10:17

ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος
 ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω

TEXT	IF	NT
<p>entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.</p>		<p>καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ὅσα ἠτοίμασιν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν</p>
<p><u>1 Cor. 2:16</u> For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him?</p>	(γαρ)	<p><u>1 Cor. 2:16</u> τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; ὅς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν;</p>
<p><u>1 Cor. 3:19-20</u> For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness. And again, the Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.</p>	<p>γέγραπται γάρ (καὶ πάλιν)</p>	<p><u>1 Cor. 3:19-20</u> ὁ δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν. κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς τῶν σοφῶν ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι</p>
<p><u>1 Cor. 6:16</u> . . . for two, saith he, shall be one flesh.</p>	(γαρ φησιν)	<p><u>1 Cor. 6:16</u> ἔσονται γάρ, φησίν, οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν</p>
<p><u>1 Cor. 9:9</u> For it is written in the law of Moses, that thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn.</p>	<p>ἐν γὰρ τῷ Μωυσέως νόμῳ γέγραπται</p>	<p><u>1 Cor. 9:9</u> οὐ κημώσεις βοῦν ἀλοῶντα</p>
<p><u>1 Cor. 10:7</u> . . . as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.</p>	<p>ὡσπερ γέγραπται</p>	<p><u>1 Cor. 10:7</u> ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πεῖν, καὶ ἀνέστησαν καίζειν</p>
<p><u>1 Cor. 10:26</u> For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.</p>	(γαρ)	<p><u>1 Cor. 10:26</u> τοῦ κυρίου γὰρ ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ κλῆρωμα αὐτῆς</p>

LXX

NT PARALLELS

Is. 65:16

(ἐπι λήσονται γὰρ τὴν θλίψεν τὴν
καὶ οὐκ ἀναβήσεται αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν
καρδίαν;)
πρώτην

ἃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν
ἔλεον

Is. 40:13

τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; καὶ τίς
σύμβουλος ἐγένετο ὃς συμβίβη
αὐτόν;
αὐτοῦ

Job 5:13

ὁ καταλαμβάνων σοφούς ἐν τῇ
φρονήσει

Ps. 93:11

κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογίσμοις
ἀνθρώπων ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι
τῶν

Gen. 2:24

καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα
μίαν

Dt. 25:4

οὐ φιμώσεις βοῦν ἀλοῶντα

Ex. 32:6

ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν
καὶ ἀνέστησαν καίχου

Ps. 23:1

τοῦ κυρίου ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ
πλήρωμα αὐτῆς

Rom. 11:34

τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; ἢ τίς
σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;

Mt. 19:5; Mk. 10:7-8; Eph. 5:31

καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα
μίαν

1 Tim. 5:18

βοῦν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις....

TEXT	IF	NT
<p><u>1 Cor. 14:21</u> In the law it is written, With men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people; and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord.</p>	<p>ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται</p> <p>(λέγει κύριος)</p>	<p><u>1 Cor. 14:21</u> ὅτι ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χειλεσὶν ἑτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰς ἀκουσονταί μου, λέγει κύριος</p>
<p><u>1 Cor. 15:27</u> For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is.</p>	<p>(γὰρ)</p>	<p><u>1 Cor. 15:27</u> πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.</p>
<p><u>1 Cor. 15:32</u> . . . let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die.</p>		<p><u>1 Cor. 15:32</u> φάγομεν καὶ πίνομεν, αὐριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν</p>
<p><u>1 Cor. 15:45</u> And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.</p>	<p>οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται</p>	<p><u>1 Cor. 15:45</u> ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἄδαμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν· (ὁ ἔσχατος Ἄδαμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν.)</p>
<p><u>1 Cor. 15:54-55</u> . . . then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?</p>	<p>τότε γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος</p>	<p><u>1 Cor. 15:54-55</u> κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκος.</p> <p>κοῦ σου θάνατε τὸ νίκος; κοῦ σου θάνατε τὸ κέντρον;</p>
<p><u>2 Cor. 4:13</u> . . . according as it is written, I believed, and therefore have I spoken.</p>	<p>κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον</p>	<p><u>2 Cor. 4:13</u> ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα</p>

Is. 28:11-12

διὰ φανλισμὸν χειλέων,
 διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας, ὅτι
 λαλήσουσιν τῷ λαῷ
 τούτῳ... καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν
 ἀκούειν

Ps. 8:7

πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν
 αὐτοῦ

Heb. 2:8 (cf. Eph. 1:22)

.... πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν
 ποδῶν αὐτοῦ

Is. 22:13

φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ
 ἀποθνήσκομεν

Gen. 2:7

ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος
 εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν.

Is. 25:8

κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος
 ἰσχύσας

Hos. 13:14

ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου, θάνατε;
 ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου, ἄδη;

Ps. 115:10

ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα

TEXT

IF

NT

2 Cor. 6:2

(For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee:

λέγει γάρ

2 Cor. 6:2

καιρω δεκτω ἐπήκουσά σου και ἐν ἡμέρα σωτηρίας ἀβοήθησά σοι .

2 Cor. 6:16-18

. . . as God hath said, I will dwell in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you. And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.

καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεός

2 Cor. 6:16-18

ὅτι ἐνοικῆσω ἐν αὐτοῖς και ἐμπερικατήσω και ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεός και αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μου λαός

(ὁμο)
(λέγει κύριος)

διὸ ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν και ἀφορσθητε, λέγει κυριος, και ἀκαθαρτων μὴ ἄπτεσθε κάγω εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς.

(λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ)

και ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα, και ὑμεῖς ἔσθεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱούς και θυγατέρας, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ.

2 Cor. 8:15

As it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had no lack.

καθὼς γέγραπται

2 Cor. 8:15

ὁ τὸ πολὺ οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν, και ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐκ ἠλατόνησεν

2 Cor. 9:9

(As it is written, He hath dispersed abroad; he hath given to the poor: his righteousness remaineth for ever.

καθὼς γέγραπται

2 Cor. 9:9

ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκεν τοῖς πένησιν, ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

2 Cor. 10:17

But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

(δε)

2 Cor. 10:17

ὁ δὲ καυκώμενος ἐν κυρίου καυκάσθω

Is. 49:8

καιρω δεκτω ἐπηκουσα σου και εν
 ημερα
 σωτηριας εβοηθησα σοι.

Lv. 26:11-12

και θησω την διαθηκην μου
 εν υμιν... και εν περιπατησω εν υμιν
 και εσομαι υμιν θεος, και υμεις εσθεσθε
 μου λαος

Ezk. 37:27

(και εσται η κατασκηνωσις μου
 εν αυτοις
 και εσομαι αυτοις θεος, και αυτοι
 μου εσονται λαος)

Is. 52:11-12

εξελθατε εκειθεν και
 ακαθαρτου
 μη αψησθε, εξελθατε εκ μεσου αυτης...
 προκορευσεται γαρ κρητορος υμων κυριος... Heb. 1:5b

εγω εσομαι αυτω εις πατερα,
 και αυτος
 εσται μοι εις υιον
 (v.8 - ταδε λεγει κυριος
 παντοκρατωρ)

εγω εσομαι αυτω εις πατερα,
 και αυτος
 εσται μοι εις υιον

Ex. 16:18

ουκ επλεονασεν ο το πολυ
 και ο το ελαττον ουκ ηλατόνησεν

Ps. 111:9

εσκόρπισεν, εδωκεν τοις πηνησιν,
 η δικαιοσυνη αυτου μενει εις τον
 αιωνα

Jer. 9:24

αλλ' η εν τούτω καυχασθω ο
 καυχώμενος,
 συνειν και γινώσκειν οτι εγω
 ειμι κυριος...

1 Cor. 1:31

ο καυχωμενος εν κυριω καυχασθω

TEXT	IF	NT
<p><u>2 Cor. 13:1</u> . . . In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.</p>		<p><u>2 Cor. 13:1</u> ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ τριῶν στήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα</p>
<p><u>Gal. 3:6</u> Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.</p>	καθὼς	<p><u>Gal. 3:6</u> Ἄβραάμ ἐπίστευσεν καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην τῷ θεῷ</p>
<p><u>Gal. 3:8</u> And the scriptures, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.</p>	<p>προϋδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γραφή . . . προεπηγγελλισατο τῷ Ἀβραάμ</p>	<p><u>Gal. 3:8</u> ὅτι ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.</p>
<p><u>Gal. 3:10</u> . . .for it is written, Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.</p>	γέγραπται γὰρ	<p><u>Gal. 3:10</u> ὅτι ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ἐμμένει τῷ βιβλίῳ πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά</p>
<p><u>Gal. 3:11</u> . . .for, The just shall live by faith.</p>	(οτι)	<p><u>Gal. 3:11</u> ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται</p>
<p><u>Gal. 3:12</u> . . .but, The man that doeth them shall live in them.</p>	(αλλα)	<p><u>Gal. 3:12</u> ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς</p>
<p><u>Gal. 3:13</u> . . .for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:</p>	ὅτι γέγραπται	<p><u>Gal. 3:13</u> ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρενόμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου</p>

Dt. 19:15

ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ
ἐπὶ
στόματος τριῶν μαρτύρων στήσεται
πάν ῥημα

Gen. 15:6

καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραμ τῷ θεῷ
καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς
δικαιοσύνην.

Gen. 12:3

καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ
πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς

Gen. 18:18

καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ
πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς

Dt. 27:26

ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὃς
οὐκ
ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς

λόγοις τοῦ νόμου τούτου
ποιῆσαι αὐτοῦς

Hab. 2:4

ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου
ζήσεται

Lv. 18:5

ὃ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται
ἐν αὐτοῖς

Dt. 21:23

ὅτι κεκαταραμένος ὑπὸ θεοῦ
πᾶς κρεμᾶμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου

Mt. 18:16 (cf. Jn. 8:17)

ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων ἢ

τριῶν

σταθῆ
πάν ῥημαJas. 2:23

ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραμ τῷ θεῷ
καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην

Rom. 4:3

ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραμ τῷ θεῷ
καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην

Rom. 1:17

ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται

Heb. 10:38

ὁ δὲ δίκαιος μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται

Rom. 10:5 (cf. Lk. 10:28)

ὁ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν
αὐτῇ

(Acts 5:30)

κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου

TEXT

IF

NT

Gal. 3:16

He saith not, "and to seeds," as of many; but as of one. "And to thy seed."

οὐ λέγει ...
ἀλλ'...

καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου

Gal. 4:27

For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not; for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband.

γέγρακται
γάρ

Gal. 4:27
εὐφράνθητι στεῖρα ἢ οὐ τέκτουσα,
καὶ βοήσον ἢ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα, ὅτι πολλὰ
τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μαλλον
ἢ τῆς ἐχοῦσης τὸν ἄνδρα

Gal. 4:30

Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son:

ἀλλὰ τί
λέγει ἡ
γραφὴ

Gal. 4:30
ἔκβαλε τὴν καιδέσκη καὶ τὸν υἱὸν
αὐτῆς

Gal. 5:14

For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

... νομος...
πεκλήρωται
ἐν τῷ

Gal. 5:14
ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν

Eph. 4:8

Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.

οὖν λέγει

Eph. 4:8
ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἠχμαλώτευσεν
αἰχμαλώσιαν,
ἔδωκεν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

Eph. 5:14

Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.

οὖν λέγει

Eph. 5:14
ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν
νεκρῶν,
καὶ ἐπιφάσει σοὶ ὁ χριστός

Gen. 22:18 (cf. 12:7; 13:15;
17:7f)

και ενευλογηθησονται
εν τῷ σπερματί σου
πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς

Is. 54:1

εὐφράνθητι στεῖρα ἢ οὐ τέκτουσα,
ῥῆξον
καὶ βόησον ἢ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα, ὅτι
πολλὰ
τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μέλλον
ἢ τῆς ἐχοῦσης τὸν ἄνδρα

Gen. 21:10

έκβαλε τὴν παιδοσκοπὴν ταύτην καὶ
τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς

Lv. 19:18

καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς
σεαυτὸν

Ps. 67:19

ἀναβάς εἰς ὕψος ἠχμαλώτευσας
αἰχμαλωσίαν
ἔλαβες δοματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ.

(Is. 60:1, 19, 20, ?) cf. Jn.
5:25; Rom. 13:11)

Acts 3:25 (cf. Lk. 1:55)

και ἐντῷ σπερματι σου
ἐνευλογηθησονται πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ
τῆς γῆς

Mt. 19:19; Mt. 22:39; Mk. 12:
31; Rom. 13:9 (cf. Lk. 10:27)

ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς
σεαυτὸν

Mt. 5:43

ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου

TEXT

IF

NT

Eph. 5:31

For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.

Eph. 6:2-3

Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.

1 Tim. 5:18

For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn, And, The Labourer is worthy of his reward.

2 Tim. 2:19

. . . The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from iniquity.

Eph. 5:31

ἀντὶ τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα
καὶ τὴν μητέρα
καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν

Eph. 6:2-3

τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα,
(ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν
ἐπαγγελίᾳ,)

ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἔση μακροχρόνιος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

1 Tim. 5:18

βοῦν ἀλοῶντα οὐ φιμώσεις

λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή
(καὶ)

καὶ ἄξιός ἐστι ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ

2 Tim. 2:19

(ἔγνω κύριος τοὺς ὄντος αὐτοῦ

(καὶ)

καὶ ἀποστητω ἀπὸ ἀδικίας πᾶς ὁ ὀνομάζων τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου)

Gen. 2:24

ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος
 τὸν πατέρα
 αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ
 καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν
 γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ·
 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα
 μίαν

1 Cor. 6:16; Mt. 19:5; Mk. 10:7-8

ἔσονται ... οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα
 μίαν

Dt. 5:16

τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν
 μητέρα σου

τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα

(ὁν τρόπον ἐνέτειλατο κύριος ὁ
 θεός σου,) ^{ἵνα}
 ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἵνα
 μακροχρόνιοι
Ex. 20:12 ἦτε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

Mt. 15:4
Mk. 7:10 (cf. Lk. 18:20)

τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα
 σου

τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν
 μητέρα,
 ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἵνα
 μακροχρόνιος
Dt. 25:4 γένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

οὐ φεμώσεις βοῦν ἀλοῶντα

1 Cor. 9:9

οὐ κημώσεις βοῦν ἀλοῶντα

(cf. Lv. 19:13; Dt. 25:14-15)

Lk. 10:7

ἄξιός γάρ ἐστις ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ
 αὐτοῦ

Mt. 10:10

ἄξιός γάρ ἐστις ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς
 αὐτοῦ

Nu. 16:5

καὶ ἔγνω ὁ θεός τοῦς ὄντος αὐτοῦ

APPENDIX III

COMBINED QUOTATIONS IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES

1. Merged Quotations

NT	OT	Section of Jewish Canon
Rom. 3:10-18	Ps. 13(14):1-3; 5:10; 139:4; 9:28 (10:7); Is. 59:7-8; Ps. 35 (36):2	Kethubim / Nebiim
9:25-26	Hos. 2:23(25); 1:10 (2:1)	Nebiim
9:33	Is. 8:14; 28:16	Nebiim
11:8	Is. 29:10; Dt. 29:4	Nebiim / Torah
11:26-27	Is. 59:20; 27:9	Nebiim
11:34-35	Is. 41:13; Job 41:3	Nebiim / Kethubim
1 Cor. 15:45	Gen. 2:7; (?)	Torah / ?
15:54-55	Is. 25:8; Hos. 13:14	Nebiim
2 Cor. 6:16-18	Lv. 26:11-12 (Ezk. 37:27) Is. 52:11-12; 2 Kg. 7:14	Torah / Nebiim
1 Tim. 5:18	Dt. 25:4; Mt. 10:10 Lk. 10:7)	Torah / <u>verbum Chris- ti</u>

2. Chain Quotations or Haraz

NT	OT	Section of Jewish Canon
Rom. 9:12-13	Gen. 25:23 / Mal. 1:2-3	Torah / Nebiim
9:25-29	Hos. 2:23(25); 1: 10(2:1) / Is. 10: 22-23 / Is. 1:9	Nebiim
10:5-8	Lv. 18:5 / Dt. 30: 12-14	Torah
(10:11-13	Is. 28:16 / Joel 2:32	Nebiim)
10:19-21	Dt. 32:21 / Is. 65: 1 / Is. 65:2	Torah / Nebiim
11:8-10	Is. 29:10; Dt. 29: 4(3) / Ps. 68(69): 23-24	Torah-Nebiim / Kethu- bim
15:9-12	Ps. 17(18):50 / Dt. 32:43 / Ps. 116(117): 1 / Is. 11:10	Kethubim / Torah / Kethubim / Nebiim

APPENDIX IV

PARALLEL QUOTATIONS

Paul	OT	NT	Comment
Rom. 1:17 (Gal. 3:11)	Hab. 2:4	Heb. 10:34	vary from the LXX and from each other
4:3 (Gal. 3:6)	Gen. 15:6	Jas. 2:26	virtually verbatim with the LXX
9:7	Gen. 21:12	Heb. 11:18	verbatim with the LXX
9:33	Is. 8:14; 28:16	1 Pet. 2:6-8	combined quotation; variations
10:13	Joel 2:32	Acts 2:21	virtually verbatim with the LXX
10:16	Is. 53:1	Jn. 12:38	verbatim with the LXX
12:19	Dt. 32:35	Heb. 10:30	vary from the LXX but agree with each other; a λέγει κύριος quotation
13:9 (Gal. 5:14)	Dt. 5:17ff Lv. 19:18	Mt. 19:18f Mk. 10:19; 12:31; Lk. 18:20	variations in order; Paul agrees with the LXX and is nearest Luke
1 Cor. 6:16 (Eph. 5:31)	Gen. 2:24	Mt. 19:5; Mk. 10:7-8	virtually verbatim with the LXX
15:27	Ps. 8:7	Heb. 2:8	Paul varies, Hebrews agrees with the LXX
2 Cor. 6:18	2 Kg. 7:14	Heb. 1:5b	Paul varies, Hebrews agrees with the LXX
13:1	Dt. 19:15	Mt. 18:16	Paul agrees, Matthew varies from the LXX
Gal. 3:16	Gen. 22:18, etc.	Acts 3:25	Paul probably had several Genesis passages in mind.
Eph. 6:2-3	Dt. 5:16	Mt. 15:4; Mk. 7:10	slight variations

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, T. K. The Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897.
- Abrahams, I. "Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis." Cambridge Biblical Essays. London: MacMillan, 1909.
- Aicher, G. Das Alte Testament in der Mishna. Freiburg: Herdersche, 1906.
- Alexander, J. A. Prophecies of Isaiah. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: Eliot, 1865.
- Alting, J. Operum Tome II. Amstelaedami: Borstius, 1685.
- Argyle, A. W. "Parallels between the Pauline Epistles and Q." ET, 60 (1948-49), 318-320.
- Bacher, W. "Bible Exegesis--Jewish." SJE. Vol. III, 1902.
- _____. "The Origin of the Word Hagada." JQR, IV (1892), 406-409.
- _____. Die Agada der Tannaiten. Vol. II. Strassbourg: Trübner, 1890.
- Baillie, D. M. Faith in God. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1926.
- Barr, A. "The Factor of Testimony in the Gospel." ET, XLIX (1937-38), 401.
- Bartlett, J. V. "Papias' Exposition: Its Date and Contents," Amicitiae Corolla. Edited by H. W. Wood. London: University Press, 1933.
- Best, E. One Body in Christ. London: SPCK, 1955.
- Black, M. "The Problem of the Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel." Journal of the Manchester University Egyptian and Oriental Society, 23 (1942), 4.
- _____. "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam." SJT, 7 (1954), 170ff.
- _____. "The Messiah in the Testament of Levi XVIII." ET, 60 (1948-49), 321, 322.

- _____ . An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.
- Böhl, E. Die Alttestamentlichen Citate im Neuen Testament. Wien: Braumüller, 1878.
- _____ . Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel. Wien: Braumüller, 1878.
- Bonsirven, J. Exégèse Rabbinique et Exégèse Paulinienne. Paris: Beauchesne, 1939.
- Box, G. H. "The Value and Significance of the Old Testament in Relation to the New." The People and the Book. Edited by A. S. Peake. Oxford; Clarendon, 1925.
- Bradley, D. G. "The Topos as a Form in the Pauline Paraenesis." JBL, LXXII (1953), 238-246.
- Briggs, C. A. Messianic Prophecy. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1886.
- _____ . The Book of Psalms. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907.
- Bromiley, G. W. "The Authority of Scripture." The New Bible Commentary. Edited by F. Davidson. 2nd. ed. London: Intervarsity Fellowship, 1954.
- Brownlee, W. H. "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls." BA, XIV (1951), 54ff.
- Büchsel, F. "Ἀλληγορέω ." KTW, I, 260-264.
- Buhl, F. Canon and Text of the Old Testament. Translated by J. MacPherson. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1892.
- Bultmann, R. Die Geschichte der synoptische Tradition. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1931.
- _____ . Theology of the New Testament. Translated by K. Grobel. Vol. I. London: SCM, 1952.
- Barkitt, F. C. The Gospel History and its Transmission. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1906.
- Burney, C. F. The Gospel in the Old Testament. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1921.
- _____ . The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel. Oxford: Clarendon, 1922.
- Burrows, M. "The Meaning of 'SR 'MR in DSH." VT, II (1952), 255-260.

- Burton, E. DeW. The Epistle to the Galatians. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1921.
- Cappelli, L. "Quaestio de Locis Parallelis Veteris et Novi Testamenti." Critica Sacra. Paris: Cramoisy, 1650.
- Carpzov, J. G. A Defence of the Hebrew Bible. Translated by M. Marcus. London: Lintot, 1729.
- Carrington, P. The Primitive Christian Catechism. Cambridge: University Press, 1940.
- Chajes, Z. H. The Students Guide through the Talmud. Translated by J. Shachter. London: East and West Library, 1952.
- Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- Charles, R. L'Ancien Testament dans le Nouveau, 1937.
- Clemen, A. Der Gebrauch des Altes Testaments in den neutestamentlichen Schriften. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1895.
- Cole, A. The New Temple. London: Tyndale, 1950.
- Conybeare, F. C. The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchaeus and of Timothy and Aquila. Oxford: Clarendon, 1898.
- Cross, F. C. "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls." BA XVII (1954), 2-21.
- Cullmann, O. Early Christian Worship. London: SCM, 1953.
- _____ . Christ and Time. London: SCM, 1951.
- _____ . The Earliest Christian Confessions. London: Lutterworth, 1949.
- _____ . Baptism in the New Testament. Translated by J. K. S. Reid. London: SCM, 1950.
- Danby, H. The Mishnah. Oxford: Clarendon, 1933.
- Davidson, A. B. Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah. Cambridge: University Press, 1896.
- _____ . Old Testament Prophecy. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1903.
- Davies, W. D. St. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. Cambridge: University Press, 1948.
- Deissmann, A. Light from the Ancient East. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1927.

- _____ . St. Paul. Translated by W. E. Wilson. 2nd ed. Revised. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926.
- Delitzsch, F. Brief an die Römer. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1870.
- _____ . The Psalms. 3 Vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1888.
- _____ . Isaiah. 2 Vols. Translated by S. R. Driver. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1890.
- _____ . The Pentateuch. 3 Vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1864.
- Denio, F. B. "Quotations." HDCG. Vol. II (1907).
- Dibelius, M. Die Pastoralbriefe. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1931.
- _____ . An die Colosser, Epheser, Philemon. Tübingen: Mohr, 1927.
- Dittmar, W. Vetus Testamentum in Novo. Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1903.
- Dix, G. The Shape of the Liturgy. London: Dacre, 1944.
- v. Dobschütz, E. "Zum paulinischen Schriftbeweis." ZNTW, 24 (1925), 306f.
- Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures. London: Nisbet, 1952.
- _____ . The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- _____ . Gospel and Law. Cambridge: University Press, 1951.
- _____ . "ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ." Studia Paulina. Festschrift for J. de Zwaan. Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.
- _____ . The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.
- _____ . "A Problem of Interpretation." Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, II (1951), 7-18.
- _____ . The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.
- _____ . History and the Gospel. London: Nisbet, 1938.
- Doere, J. W. "Some Notes with reference to ΤΑ ΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ in Rom. 3:2." Studia Paulina. Festschrift for J. de Zwaan. Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.

- Döpke, J. C. C. Hermeneutik der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller. Leipzig: Vogel, 1829.
- Driver, S. R. "Notes on Three Passages in St. Paul's Epistles." The Expositor, Third Series, IX (1889), 15-23.
- _____ . The Minor Prophets. Edinburgh: Jack, 1906.
- _____ . Genesis. London: Methuen, 1904.
- Drusii, J. "Notae in Parallela Sacra." Tractatum Biblicorum, Volumen Prius, sive Criticorum Sacrorum Tomus VIII. Londini: Flesher, 1660.
- Dugmore, C. W. The Influence of the Synagogue on the Divine Office. London: Milford, 1944.
- Dupont, J. "L'utilization apologétique de l'Ancien Testament dans le discours les Actes." Ephemer Theol. Lovan. 29 (1953)
- Dupont-Sommer, A. The Dead Sea Scrolls. Translated by E. M. Rowley. Oxford: Blackwell, 1952.
- Easton, B. S. The Pastoral Epistles. London: SCM, 1948.
- Edersheim, A. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. London: Longmans, Green, 1889.
- _____ . Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah. London: Longmans, Green, 1885.
- Eichhorn, J. G. Einleitung in die apocryphischen Schriften des Alte Testaments. Leipzig: Weidmannschen, 1795.
- Ellis, E. E. "The Biblical Concept of the Solidarity of the Human Race as Seen in Blessing and Punishment." Unpublished B. D. Thesis, Wheaton College Graduate School, 1953.
- Englander, H. "The Exodus in the Bible." Studies in Jewish Literature. Festschrift for K. Kohler. Berlin: Reimer, 1913.
- Epstein, I. The Babylonian Talmud. London: Socino, 1939.
- Etheridge, J. W. The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan . . . with Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum. London: Longmans, Green, 1865.
- Eusebius. Ecclesiastical History. Vol. IV. Translated by K. Lake. London: Heinemann, 1926.

- Evans, C. F. "I Will go Before You into Galilee." JTS, Second Series, V (1954), 3ff.
- Fairweather, W. The Background of the Epistles. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1935.
- Falconer, R. The Pastoral Epistles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1937.
- Farrer, A. The Glass of Vision. London: Dacre, 1948.
- Farrar, F. W. "Rabbinic Exegesis." The Expositor, Second Series, 5 (1877), 362-378.
- _____. The Life and Work of St. Paul. 2 Vols. London: Cassel, Fetter, Galkin, 1879.
- Feine, P. and Behn, J. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1950.
- Feldman, A. The Parables and Similies of the Rabbis. Cambridge: University Press, 1927.
- Findlay, J. A. "The First Gospel and the Book of Testimonies." Amicitiae Corolla. Edited by H. G. Wood. London: University Press, 1933.
- Flew, R. N. Jesus and his Church. London: Epworth, 1938.
- Focke, F. Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos. Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1913.
- Freedman, H. The Midrash. London: Socino, 1939.
- Friedlander, G. Perke de Rabbi Eliezer. London: Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1916.
- Goppelt, L. Typos. Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments in Neuen. Gutersloh: Bertelsmann, 1939.
- Gordon, A. R. "Quotations," HDAC. Vol. II (1918).
- Gottstein, M. H. "Anti-Essene Traits in the Dead Sea Scrolls." VF, VI (1954), 141-147.
- Gough, H. The New Testament Quotations. London: Walton and Moberly, 1855.
- Grafe, E. Das Ur-Christentum und das Alte Testament. Tübingen: Mohr, 1907.
- _____. "Das Verhältnis der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis." Theologische Abhandlung für C. von Weizsäcker, Freiburg: Mohr, 1892.

- Green, W. H. An Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon. London: Murray, 1899.
- Gressmann, H. "Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Ursprungs der hellenistischen Erlösungsreligion." ZPK, XL (1922), 172-191; XLI (1923), 154-180.
- Guignebert, C. The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1939.
- Gunkel, H. Wirkungen des Heiligen Geistes. Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1899.
- Gutbrot, W. "Ἰουδαϊσμός, Ἰσραήλ, Ἑβραϊσμός im Neuen Testament." KTW, III, 376-394.
- Haering, T. "Das Alte Testament im Neuen." ZNTW, XVII (1916), 213-227.
- Hänel, J. Der Schriftbegriff Jesu. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1919.
- Hanson, R. P. C. "St. Paul's Quotations of the Book of Job." Theology 53 (1950), 250-253.
- Harnack, A. v. "Das Alte Testament in den Paulinischen Briefen und in den Paulinischen Gemeinden." Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1928.
- _____ . The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. Vol. I. Translated by J. Moffatt. 2nd ed. Revised. London: Williams and Norgate, 1908.
- _____ . A History of Dogma. Vol. I. Translated by N. Buchanan. London: Williams and Norgate, 1894.
- Harris, J. R. Testimonies. 2 Vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1916 and 1920.
- _____ . "St. Paul's Use of Testimonies in the Epistle to the Romans." The Expositor, Eighth Series, XVII (1919), 401-414.
- _____ . "St. Paul and Aristophanes." ET, 34 (1923), 151-156.
- _____ . "Josephus and his Testimony." Evergreen Essay No. 2. Cambridge: Heffer, 1931.
- Harrison, P. N. The Problem of the Pastorals. Oxford: University Press, 1922.
- Hartmann, A. T. Die Enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen. Hamburg: Perthes, 1831.

- Hatch, E. Essays in Biblical Greek. Oxford: Clarendon, 1889.
- Hebert, A. G. The Throne of David. London: Faber, 1941.
- Hengstenburg, E. W. Commentary on the Psalms. 3 Vols. Translated by P. Fairbairn and J. Thomson. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1846.
- Herford, R. T. Christianity in the Talmud and Midrash. London: Williams and Norgate, 1903.
- Hommes, N. J. Het Testimoniaboek. Amsterdam: Uitgevers-Maatshappij, 1935.
- Hoppe, T. Die Idee der Heilsgeschichte bei Paulus. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1926.
- Hoskyns, E. C. "Jesus the Messiah." Mysterium Christi. Edited by G. K. A. Bell and A. Deissmann. London: Longman, Green, 1930.
- Houghton, T. "Testimony of the Epistle to the Romans to the Old Testament." Evangelical Quarterly, 7 (1935), 424f.
- Huhn, E. Die Messianischen Weissungen. Tübingen: Mohr, 1900.
- Hunt, B.P.W.S. Primitive Gospel Sources. London: Clarke, 1951.
- Hunter, A.M. The Work and Words of Jesus. London: SCM, 1950.
- _____. Paul and his Predecessors. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1940.
- _____. Interpreting Paul's Gospel. London: SCM, 1954.
- Jacobus, M. W. "The Citation Eph. 5:14 as Effecting the Paulinity of the Epistle." Theologische Studien. Festschrift for B. Weiss. Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1897.
- James, J. D. The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. London: Longman, Green, 1906.
- James, M. R. The Biblical Antiquities of Philo. London: SPCK, 1917.
- Jeremias, J. Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus. 6th ed.; Revised. Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1953.
- Johnson, A. R. The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God. Cardiff: University Press, 1942.
- _____. The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel. Cardiff: University Press, 1949.

- F. Johnson. The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old. London: Baptist Tract Society, 1906.
- Johnson, G. The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. Cambridge: University Press, 1943.
- Johnson, S. "Biblical Quotations in Matthew." HTR, XXXVI (1943) 135-153.
- Josephus. Works 9 Vols. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. London: Heinemann, 1926- .
- Jowett, B. The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians and Romans; Commentary. London: Murray, 1894.
- Kahle, P. E. The Cairo Geniza. London: British Academy, 1947.
 . The Karites and the Manuscripts. VT; III (1953), 834f.
- Kähler, M. Jesus und das Alte Testament. Güttersloh: Bertelsmann, 1938.
- Katz, P. Philo's Bible. Cambridge: University Press, 1950.
- Kautzsch, A. F. De Veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo Apostelo Allegatis. Lipsiae: Metzger und Wittig, 1869.
- Kautzsch, E. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Translated by A. C. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon, 1898.
- Keil, C. F. The Twelve Minor Prophets. Translated by J. Martin. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1868.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. St. Paul and the Mystery Religions. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913.
 . Sources of New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895.
 . Philo's Contribution to Religion. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919.
 . St. Paul's Conception of Last Things. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.
- Kittel, G. Theologische Wörterbuch. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933-.
- Kittel, R. Biblia Hebraica. Stuttgart: Bibelanstalt, 1937.
- Klausner, J. From Jesus to Paul. Translated by W. E. Stein-spring. New York: MacMillan, 1943.
- Knight, G. A. F. From Moses to Paul. London: Lutterworth, 1949.

- Knox, W. L. St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem. Cambridge: University Press, 1925.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "Typological Exegesis." Theology, XVI (1953), 202ff.
- Lauterbach, J. Z. Mekilta. 3 Vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1935.
- Leipoldt, J. Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1907.
- Leonard, W. The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. London: Burns, Oates, Washburn, 1939.
- Levertoff, P. P. Midrash Sifre on Numbers. London: SPCK, 1926.
- Lewis, C. S. The Literary Impact of the Authorized Version. London: Athlone, 1950.
- Lietzmann, H. An die Galater. Tübingen: Mohr, 1923.
- Lightfoot, J. B. The Epistle to the Galatians. London: MacMillan, 1864.
- _____. Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul. London: MacMillan, 1895.
- _____. The Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon. London: MacMillan, 1875.
- Lock, W. The Pastoral Epistles. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1924.
- Lofthouse, W. F. "The Old Testament and Christianity." Record and Revelation. Edited by H. W. Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1938.
- Lohmeyer, E. Kyrios Jesus. Heidelberg: Winters, 1928.
- _____. Grundlagen der Paulinischen Theologie. Tübingen: Mohr, 1928.
- _____. Der Brief an die Philipper. 9th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1952.
- Luther, M. Epistle to the Galatians. London: Clarke, 1953.
- MacGregor, G. H. C. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought." New Testament Studies, I (1954), 17-28.
- Manson, T. W. "The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus." BJRL, 34 (1952), 312-332.

- _____. "The Cairo Geniza: (A Review)." Dominican Studies,
II (1949), 183-192.
- _____. "The Life of Jesus." BJRL 29 (1945-46), 392-428.
- _____. The Teaching of Jesus. 2nd ed. Cambridge: University
Press, 1951.
- _____. "The Argument from Prophecy." JTS, XLVI (1945), 129-
136.
- Manson, W. "Eschatology in the New Testament." JTS, Occasional
Papers No. 2, 1-16.
- McNiele, A. H. New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's.
Cambridge: University Press, 1923.
- Metzger, B. "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in
the New Testament and the Mishnah." JBL, LXX (1951),
293-307.
- Meyer, H. A. W. The Epistles to the Ephesians and Philemon.
Translated by M. F. Evans. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark,
1880.
- Michaelis, W. "Pastoralbriefe und Wortstatistik." ZNTW XXVIII
(1929), 67-76.
- Michel, O. Paulus und seine Bibel. Güttersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929.
- Mielziner, M. Introduction to the Talmud. 3rd ed. New York:
Block, 1925.
- Moffatt, J. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Lon-
don: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- _____. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.
3rd. ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1920.
- Monnet, H. Les Citations de L'Ancien Testament dans les Epitres
de St. Paul. 1874.
- Montefiore, C. G. Rabbinical Literature and Gospel Teachings.
London: MacMillan, 1930.
- Montefiore, C. G. and Lowe, H. A Rabbinic Anthology. London:
MacMillan, 1938.
- Moore, G. F. Judaism. 3 Vols. Cambridge: Harvard University
Press, 1927.
- Moule, C. F. D. "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the
New Testament." JTS, Second Series, I (1950), 29-41.

- Moulton, H. K. "Scripture Quotations in the Pastoral Epistles." ET, 49 (1937-38), 94.
- Moulton, J. H. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1919.
- Moulton, J. H. and Milligan, G. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914-1929.
- Murtonen, A. "The Figure of Metatron." VT, III (1953), 409-411.
- Nägeli, T. Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus. Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1905.
- Nestle, E. Novum Testamentum Graece. Stuttgart: Bibelanstalt, 1949.
- Nock, A. D. "The Style and Thought of Paul." Contemporary Thinking about Paul: An Anthology. Edited by T. S. Kepler. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1950.
- North, C. R. The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. Oxford: University Press, 1948.
- Nygren, A. Commentary on Romans. London: SCM, 1952.
- Oepke, A. Jesus und das Alte Testament. Leipzig: Deichert, 1938.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period. London: SPCK, 1941.
- _____. An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha. London: SPCK, 1935.
- _____. "The Exegesis of the Old Testament." Record and Revelation. Edited by H. W. Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1938.
- _____. The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy. Oxford: Clarendon, 1925.
- Owen, H. The Modes of Quotation used by Evangelical Writers. London: Nichols, 1789.
- Peake, A. S. "Quintessence of Paulinism." BJRL, IV (1917), 9f.
- Phillips, G. E. The Transmission of the Faith. London: Lutterworth, 1946.
- Philo. Works. 11 Vols. Translated by F. H. Colson and R. Marcus. London: Heinemann, 1926- .
- Phipps, W. E. "The Attitude of the Apostle Paul toward Scripture." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, 1954.

- Phythian-Adams, W. J. The Way of At-One-Ment. London: SCM, 1944.
- Plooij, D. "Studies in the Testimony Book." Verhandlungen der Koninklijke Akademie. Amsterdam: Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1933.
- Porter, F. C. "The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of Paul." JBL, XLI (1922), 183-204.
- Prat, F. The Theology of St. Paul. 2 Vols. Translated by J. L. Stoddard. London: Burns, Oates, Washburne, 1945.
- Puukko, A. F. "Paulus und das Judentum." Studia Orientalis, II (1928), 1-37.
- Ralphs, A. "Ueber Theodotian-Lesarten im Neuen Testament und Aquila-Lesarten bei Justin." ZNTW, XX (1921) 182ff.
- _____. Septuaginta. Stuttgart: Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Randolph, T. The Prophecies and other Texts Cited in the New Testament. Oxford: Fletcher, 1782.
- Rankin, O. S. "The Extent of the Influence of the Synagogue Service upon Christian Worship." Journal of Jewish Studies, I (1948), 27-32.
- Reitzenstein, R. Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen. Leipzig: Trübner, 1927.
- Reuss, E. Canon of the Holy Scriptures. Translated by D. Hunter. Edinburgh: Ginnell, 1834.
- Roberts, B. J. The Old Testament Texts and Versions. Cardiff: University Press, 1951.
- _____. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Old Testament Scriptures. Manchester: Ryland's Library, 1953.
- _____. "The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls: A Survey." The Congregational Quarterly, XXXII (1954), 114-124.
- Robertson, A. and Plummer, A. First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1911.
- Roeps, G. De Veteris Testamenti locorum in apostolorum libris Allegatione. 1827.
- Roller, O. Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Rowley, H. H. The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Blackwell, 1952.
- Ryle, H. E. Philo and Holy Scripture. London: MacMillan, 1895.

- The Canon of the Old Testament. London: MacMillan, 1892.
- Sahlin, H. Zur Typologie des Johannesevangeliums. Uppsala and Leipzig, 1950.
- "The New Exodus of Salvation According to St. Paul." The Root of the Vine. Edited by A. Fridrichsen. London: Dacre, 1953.
- Sanday, W. and Headlam, A. C. The Epistle to the Romans. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895.
- Schechter, S. Studies in Judaism. London: A. and C. Black, 1896.
- Sherlock, T. The Use and Intent of Prophecy. London: Pemberton, 1726.
- Schlatter, A. Das Alte Testament in der johanneischen Apokalypse. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1912.
- Schmidt, K. L. The Church. Translated by J. R. Coates from KPW, IV, 53ff.
- Schmitz, O. "Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament." Wort und Geist. Festschrift for K. Heim. Berlin: Furche, 1934.
- Schröter, E. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. 5 Vols. Translated by S. Taylor and P. Christie. 2nd ed. Revised. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901.
- Schweitzer, A. Paul and his Interpreters. London: A. and C. Black, 1948.
- The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. London: A. and C. Black, 1931.
- Scott, C. A. A. Christianity According to St. Paul. Cambridge: University Press, 1939.
- Scott, E. F. The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
- Scott, J. Principles of New Testament Quotation. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1877.
- Selwyn, E. G. The First Epistle of Peter. London: MacMillan, 1952.
- Simpson, E. K. The Pastoral Epistles. London: Tyndale, 1954.

- Smith, R. "The Relevance of the Old Testament for the Doctrine of the Church." SJT, 5 (1952), 16ff.
- Smith, W. M. This Atomic Age and the Word of God. Boston: Wilde, 1948.
- Smits, C. "Oud-Testamentische Citaten in het Nieuwe Testament I, Synoptische Evangelien." Collect. Francis. Neerlandica 8:1 (1952).
- Snaith, N. H. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. London: Epworth, 1944.
- Sperber, A. "New Testament and Septuagint." JBL, LIX (1940), 193-289.
- _____. "The New Testament and the Septuagint." Tarbiz, VI (1934), 1-29.
- Spicq, P. C. Les Epitres Pastorales. Paris: Gabalda, 1947.
- Staerk, W. "Die alttestamentlichen Citate bei den Schriftstellern des Neuen Testament." ZNTW 35 (1892), 464-485; 36 (1893), 70-98.
- _____. "Der Schrift und Kanon-Begriff der jüdischen Bibel." Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie, VI (1928), 101-119.
- Stendahl, K. The School of Matthew. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wicksells, 1954.
- Stenning, J. F. The Targum of Isaiah. Oxford: Clarendon, 1949.
- Stevens, G. B. The Pauline Theology. London: Dickenson, 1892.
- Stewart, J. S. A Man in Christ. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- Stewart, R. A. The Earlier Rabbinic Tradition. London: IVF, 1949.
- Strack, H. L. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1931.
- Strack, H. L. and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash. München: Beck, 1926.
- Surenhusio, G. ΠΙΠΗΤ 725 sive Biblos kataλλayns in quo secundum veterum theologorum Hebraeorum. Amstelredami: Boom, 1713.
- Sweet, L. M. "Quotations." International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Edited by J. Orr. Vol. IV (1949).

- Swete, H. B. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. London: MacMillan, 1909.
- _____ . The Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1895.
- _____ . An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1900.
- Tasker, R. V. G. The Old Testament in the New Testament. 2nd ed. Revised. London: SCM, 1954.
- Taylor, C. The Gospel in the Law. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, 1869.
- Taylor, V. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. London: Macmillan, 1949.
- Tennant, F. R. The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin. Cambridge: University Press, 1903.
- Terry, M. S. Biblical Hermeneutics. New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1885.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, London: MacMillan, 1900.
- _____ . Josephus the Man and the Historian. New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1929.
- Tholuck, F. A. G. The Old Testament in the New. Translated by C. A. Aiken in Bibliotheca Sacra XI (1854), 568-616.
- Toy, C. H. Quotations in the New Testament. New York: Scribners, 1884.
- Turpie, D. M. The Old Testament in the New. London: Williams and Norgate, 1868.
- _____ . The New Testament View of the Old. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1872.
- Unnik, W. C. v. Tarsus of Jerusalem, De Stadt van Paulus' Jeugd. Amsterdam: Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1952.
- Vernard, L. "Citations de l'Ancien Testament dans le Nouveau Testament." Dictionnaire de la Bible. Edited by L. Pirot. Supp. II (1934).
- Vis, A. Messianic Psalm Quotations in the New Testament. Amsterdam: Hertzberger, 1939.
- Vischer, W. The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ. Translated by A. B. Crabtree. London: Lutterworth, 1949.

- Vollmer, H. Die Alttestamentlichen Citate bei Paulus. Freiburg: Mohr, 1895.
- _____ . Vom Lesen und Deuten Heiliger Schriften. Tübingen: Mohr, 1907.
- Wade, G. W. Habakkuk. London: Methuen, 1929.
- Warfield, B. B. Revelation and Inspiration. New York: Oxford University Press, 1927.
- _____ . "The Divine Messiah in the Old Testament." Princeton Theological Review, XIV (1916), 377ff.
- Weber, F. Jüdische Theologie. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1897.
- Weiss, B. Biblical Theology of the New Testament. Vol. I. Translated by D. Eaton. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882.
- Weiss, J. Der Erste Korintherbrief. Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1925.
- _____ . The History of Primitive Christianity. Translated by F. C. Grant, London: MacMillan, 1937.
- Weizsäcker, C. v. The Apostolic Age. Translated by J. Millar. 2nd ed. London: Williams and Norgate, 1894.
- Wenham, J. W. Our Lord's View of the Old Testament. London: Tyndale, 1953.
- Westcott, B. F. An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. London: MacMillan, 1860.
- _____ . The Epistle to the Hebrews. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan, 1920.
- Whiston, W. An Essay towards Restoring the True Text of the Old Testament. London: Senex, 1722.
- Williams, N. P. The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin. London: Longmans, Green, 1927.
- Windfuhr, D. "Der Apostel Paulus als Haggadist." ZATW (1926), 327-330.
- Windisch, H. Paulus und das Judentum. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1935.
- _____ . Die Frömmigkeit Philos. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909.
- Wood, F. H. "Quotation." HDB, Vol. IV (1901).
- Woods, J. The Old Testament in the Church. London: SECK, 1949.

- Woods, L. The Objection to the Inspiration of the Evangelists and Apostles from their manner of quoting texts from the Old Testament. Andover: Flagg and Gould, 1824.
- Wright, G. E. The God Who Acts. London: SCM, 1952.
- Zahn, T. Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by M. W. Jacobus. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1953.
- Zuntz, G. The Text of the Epistles. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Zunz, L. Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden. Frankfurt: Kauffmann, 1892.

Addenda

- Barthelemy, D. "Redecouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de las Septante." Revue Biblique, 60 (1953), 18-29.
- Bonhoffer, A. Epiktet und das Neue Testament. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1911.
- Bultmann, R. Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe. Göttingen: Vandenhöck und Ruprecht, 1910.