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WE cannot remind ourselves too often that the Bible of the Apostolic Church was the Old Testament; and that it was to the Old Testament that the first Christians turned for guidance on all matters of faith and conduct. I have discussed elsewhere the way in which Jewish thought had sought to codify and systematize the commandments and promises of God to his people in the Law and the Apocalypses, and the way in which the early expositors and defenders of Christianity turned to this body of teaching to find the historical and theological context of their own distinctive proclamation. There are more ways than one of doing this. It is possible to link up isolated texts in the Old Testament with events in the story of Jesus or the early Church, as when St. Matthew makes Psalm lxviii. 2 a prediction of the parabolic teaching of Christ, or St. Peter, according to Acts ii. 17-21, finds in Joel ii. 28-32 a prophecy of the events of Pentecost. In some cases the connection between the supposed prediction and its fulfilment is of the flimsiest character; and when we get into the field of allegorical interpretation and typology, it often seems as if the only limits to what can be done are set by the resource and fertility of invention of the expositor.

However, the fact that many of the allegorical and typological interpretations of Old Testament texts seem to be far-fetched and even fantastic should not blind us to the fact that there is a legitimate appeal to the earlier revelation. The matter can be put in this way that the whole corpus of the Hebrew scriptures, with its additional apparatus of apocalypse and legal tradition is

1 A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 14th of November, 1951.

2 See my article 'Some Reflections on Apocalyptic' in Aux Sources de la Tradition Chretienne (1950), 139-45; and 'The Argument from Prophecy', in J.T. S., 46 (1945), 129-36.
regarded as the revelation of the divine purpose. Rightly understood, it illuminates history; and history rightly understood, refers back to it. Since the revelation is from God, who knows the end from the beginning, and in whom there is no variableness, we may expect that on all vital points a genuine continuity and consistency will be discernible throughout the process of revelation and the course of history, that what is fulfilled in the life of Christ is foreordained by God from the foundation of the world. In Judaism and Christianity alike this principle that the end must be foreshadowed in the beginning is an active force. In the Jewish apocalypses the course of history down to its consummation is made known to the patriarchs and prophets. In the Rabbinical tradition the knowledge and even the actual observance of Rabbinic niceties is carried back to the earliest times. Thus the book of Esther is given to Moses on Sinai; and the late rules governing the ‘Erub are known to and kept by Abraham. Conversely, greater antiquity carries with it greater authority. On the question of marriage and divorce Jesus appeals from the rules given in Deuteronomy to the principles laid down at the creation of the world; and St. Paul goes behind the Law given on Sinai to the promise made to Abraham.

Since correct interpretation of the divine revelation in Scripture is no less important than the right discerning of the signs of the times, proper rules of interpretation have to be laid down; and we find that this was done by the Rabbis, the earliest set of hermeneutical principles being attributed to Hillel about the end of the first century B.C.

My purpose in this paper is to examine the way in which appeal is made to the Old Testament in the teaching of Jesus. Among the questions to be discussed are the following. What parts of the Old Testament are quoted? What form of the text is employed in the citations? What principles of interpretation are applied to the texts?

1 Gen. R., 49; b. Yoma 28b.
In examining the quotations we shall look first at those offered by Mark; next at those in Matthew and Luke, which may reasonably be assigned to the document Q; and then at those in passages peculiar to Matthew and Luke. These last I shall call M and L passages without attempting to prejudge the question whether the symbols M and L stand for single documents, collections of sources, oral traditions, or what not. As a working basis for the selection of quotations I take those passages which are printed in uncial type in the edition of Westcott and Hort. There are no doubt many allusions to the Old Testament and echoes of its wording which are not marked by special type in Westcott and Hort; but on the whole they do mark about all that has any right to be called direct quotation. If they err at all, it is on the side of admitting too much rather than too little.

We begin with Mark.

In Mark there are thirty-eight quotations or reminiscences of the Old Testament among the words of Jesus. Of these twelve may be assigned to the Law, nineteen to the Prophets and twelve to the Hagiographa—or forty-three in all. The discrepancy is due to the fact that in some cases there are two possible sources for the quotation or reminiscence.

It is sometimes maintained that the Old Testament quotations in Mark agree with the LXX. So far as quotations in the words of Jesus are concerned, the statement is incorrect. There are, of course, cases where the Masoretic text, the Targum, the LXX, and the text of Mark all say exactly the same thing; but these are not the cases from which we can learn anything. For our purposes the interesting and instructive cases are those in which the Masoretic text, the LXX, and the Targum do not agree, and the quotation in Mark takes sides. These form a considerable group. Another group, only slightly less interesting, contains the Markan quotations which go their own way independently of Masoretic text, Targum, and LXX. I do not intend to spend any time on the cases where Mark agrees with all the leading authorities for the Old Testament text, but to concentrate on the cases where he disagrees with some or all of them. There are twenty such cases. In ten of them Mark definitely takes sides in a disagreement of the Masoretic text, Targum, and LXX; in eight
he goes his own way. Five (Mk. vii. 6 f.; x. 7; xii. 29 f.; xiii. 22; xv. 34) present special textual problems for enquiry.

(a) Mark sides with one of the witnesses to the O.T. text:—

iv. 12 (Is. vi. 10) 1 καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς = Tg. ἠθετοὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς against M.T. καὶ ἠθετοὶ and LXX καὶ ἠθετοὶ αὐτοῖς.

iv. 29 (Joel iii. 13; LXX iv. 13) παρεστήκεν ὁ θερσιμός. παρεστήκεν = LXX and Tg. παρεστήκεν against M.T. παρεστήκεν.

vii. 7 (Is. xxix. 13) Mk. has μάτην with LXX against M.T. and Tg.

vii. 10 (Ex. xxi. 17; LXX 16) τελευτάτω = M.T. and Tgg. against LXX τελευτήσει.

x. 8 (Gen. ii. 24) Mk. has οὗ δύο with LXX and Tg. Jon. (ῥημάτος) against M.T. and Tgg. Onk.²

x. 19 (Ex. xx. 13-16; Deut. v. 17-20). In the order of the commandments Mk. agrees with M.T. and Tgg. against LXX. It may be added that Mk. uses μή with the subjunctive against LXX οὐ with the indicative.

xiii. 8 (Is. xix. 2) βασιλεία εἰπὶ βασιλείαν with M.T. and Tg. against LXX νομὸς εἰπὶ νομὸν.

xiii. 22 (Deut. xiii. 2) ψευδοπροφήτας. Mk. is explicit that the prophets are false. In this Mk. has the support of Tg. Jon. against M.T., LXX, and Tg. Onk.

xiv. 62 (Dan. vii. 13) μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν = M.T. and Theodotion against LXX (ἐπὶ τ. νεφ.).

xv. 34 (Ps. xxii (xxi) 1) M.T. and Tg. against LXX, which has πρόσεχες μοι after the second mention of the name of God.

Analysis of these data reveals that Mark agrees with M.T. five times, with the Targum eight times, and with the LXX three times. Only once (Is. vii. 7) does Mark agree with LXX against the other witnesses to the O.T. text. In the two cases where the targums of Onkelos and ps. Jonathan take opposite sides Mark agrees with ps. Jonathan; and in one of the two (Gen. ii. 24) it is arguable that Mark preserves the true text of the O.T. The important point is that here we have ten cases in which the

1 See my Teaching of Jesus, 75-80.

2 It is possible that in this case Mk. preserves the true Hebrew text. 'The two' is given in Gen. ii. 24 not only by LXX and Tg. Jon. but also by the Syriac and Vulgate. St. Paul, who quotes the text in 1 Cor. vi. 16, also has oież δύο.
agreement of Mark with LXX would be really significant, and that in seven out of the ten the Markan quotation sides with the Hebrew or Aramaic against the Greek version.

I turn now to the cases where the quotation in Mark goes its own way against all the witnesses to the O.T. text.

Mk. viii. 18, 'Having eyes do you not see, and having ears do you not hear'. This seems to be the free use of a current expression without direct quotation. Similar expressions occur in Jer. v. 21 and Ezek. xii. 2 as well as in Greek literature (e.g. Herakleitos fr. 34).

Mk. ix. 48 (Is. lxvi. 24) is a free reproduction of a vivid picture. It does not agree exactly with any form of the O.T. text.

Mk. xii. 36 (Ps. cx (cix). 1). Mk. has υποκάτω ¹ against all witnesses to the O.T. text and the quotation in Heb. i. 13; x. 13, υποπόδιον. St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 25) has ὑπό. It seems clear that Mark and Paul are quoting freely.

Mk. xiii. 24-27 (Is. xiii. 10; xxxiv. 4; Dan. vii. 13; Zech. ii. 10; Deut. xxx. 4). In these cases from the 'Little Apocalypse', we have conventional apocalyptic imagery in terms which suggest free reminiscence rather than direct quotation. It is worth noticing that here occurs the one text that is common to this and the preceding group of quotations. Mk. xiii. 26, quoting Dan. vii. 13, has ἐν νεφέλαις,² whereas in the hearing before the High Priest (Mk. xiv. 62) Mk. agrees with M.T. (τού) and Theodotion (μετά) in having μετά τῶν νεφέλων. The difference is worth noting in view of the opinion that the Little Apocalypse may once have had an independent existence.

¹ The witnesses to the Markan text are divided. υποκάτω is supported by BDW Ψ 28 Syr. sin. Sah. Boh. Geo. and should doubtless be preferred. The υποπόδιον of the other witnesses is an obvious correction to agree with the LXX. It is perhaps worth noting that in the Sahidic version of Heb. x. 13, but not i. 13, we have support for a reading υποκάτω; and that υποκάτω is implied by the Sahidic version of the Psalm. This should probably be regarded as due to the influence of the N.T. quotations: there is other evidence of N.T. influence on the text of the Sahidic Psalter.

² Again the witnesses to the Markan text are divided. ἐν is read by the great majority with either νεφέλαις or νεφέλη (many Caesarean witnesses and k). Some Old Latin MSS. have cum nubibus; and D and Syr. sin. support ἐπὶ τῶν νεφέλων. The weight of the evidence seems to be definitely in favour of ἐν in Mk. xiii. 26.
Mk. xiv. 18 (Ps. xli (xl). 10) ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ. This must be regarded as free reminiscence, if indeed there is any connection at all.

If the eight cases covered above are to be regarded as quotations, they raise the total of Mark's disagreements with the Septuagint from seven out of ten to fifteen out of eighteen.

There remain some cases where the textual problems are of special interest or difficulty. Before looking at these I should mention a fact of some interest and importance for the study of the synoptic problem. This is the strong tendency of Matthew to bring the Old Testament quotations into agreement with the LXX text. I have observed twelve examples of this tendency in the cases so far considered. This fact provides a considerable buttress—if any is needed at this time of day—for the view that Matthew is dependent on Mark. It also suggests a canon for the textual criticism of Mark: that where MSS. of Mark in an Old Testament quotation offer a reading which differs from the LXX and Matthew, that reading should not be rejected without the most careful consideration. I now turn to the cases which present textual problems.

Mk. x. 7 already mentioned above. The M.T. (Gen. ii. 24) reads 'and they shall become one flesh'. It has the support of Tg. Onk. and Jubilees iii. 7. On the other hand, the reading 'they two' is attested by LXX, Tgg. Jon. and Sam. as well as the Peshitta and the Vulgate. With these witnesses go Philo, Mark, and Eph. v. 31. It is probable that the Hebrew should be emended accordingly.

Mk. vii. 6 f. (Is. xxix. 13). This quotation presents the most difficult and complicated textual problems; and I have no complete solution to suggest. One point, however, seems worthy of notice. In Mark we have the variant ἀγαπᾷ for τμᾶ. This variant is offered by DW and supported by Clement of Alexandria directly (ἀγαπῶ) or indirectly (φιλοῖσι) in three of the six places in which he quotes or refers to the text. Further

1 H. E. Ryle, Philo and Holy Scripture, 14 f.
2 In Stahlin's edition I. 134 (τμῶσι με); I. 195 (φιλοῦσι με); II. 146 (με τμᾶ); II. 262 (τμᾶ); II. 267, 297 (ἀγαπῶ).
support is given by the Old Latin MSS. a b c and Tertullian; and it may well be that ἀγαπᾷ is the true text of Mark, τῷμᾶ a correction by Matthew to agree with the LXX, and that the Matthaean revision has worked its way into most of the MSS. of Mark.

Mk. xii. 29 f. (Deut. vi. 4 f.) presents a very complex textual problem, which I am unable to solve.

Mk. xiii. 22 (Deut. xiii. 2) has two points of special interest. First, ἐφυλακτόρεξ in agreement with Tg. Jon., already mentioned. Second, the variant readings δώσουσιν and ποιησουσιν. The former is supported by the majority of the uncial s, including Bx fam 1 700 and most of the versions; the latter can claim DΘ fam 128 565 ad Geo. δώσουσιν is the text of Matt. and LXX has δῷ. In this case the canon stated above may well apply; and we should choose the reading in Mark that differs from Matt. and LXX.

Mk. xv. 34 may be a similar case. It has been discussed by Burkitt, C. H. Turner, and Harnack; and it may be that we should accept ἄωηθα from D, supported by c exprobasti, i in opprobrium dedisti, and k maledixisti against all the rest, including LXX and Matt.

So far we have seen that when Mark records our Lord's quotations from the Old Testament they usually agree with the Hebrew or the Targum against the LXX in cases where the witnesses to the O.T. text are divided. Further it appears that in the parallel passages in Matthew there is a definite tendency to redress the balance in favour of the LXX. It remains to consider Luke's treatment of these texts; and we begin by drawing a large number of blanks. Taking our first group of cases, where Mark

1 Adv. Marc. iv. 17 (ed. Kroymann, p. 477), populus iste me labis diligit. Cf. iii. 6 (Kroymann, p. 384); iv. 41 (Kroymann, p. 561); v. 11 (Kroymann, p. 613). It is interesting that Clement (ll. 267) and Tertullian (iv. 17) both bring the text into relation with Luke vi. 46.

2 Jesus Christ, an Historical Outline (1932), p. 56.

3 J.T.S., xi. (1910), 19; xxix. (1928), 12, accepting ἄωηθας.


5 This reading was deciphered by Burkitt (J.T.S., i (1900), 278 f.) and accepted by Hans v. Soden, Das lat. N.T. in Afrika z. Zt. Cyprians (1909), 107, 448. It is not recorded in Jülicher-Matzkow, Itala II Markus-Evangelium (1940), 153.
sides with one or other of the authorities for the O.T. text, we find that in seven cases Luke either has no parallel to Mark or that he does not give the quotation. The remaining cases are:

Mk. iv. 12 || Lk. viii. 10. Here Luke abbreviates, but in what he retains he is nearer to Mk. than is Matthew.

Mk. x. 19 || Lk. xviii. 20. Luke retains the Markan construction μὴ with subjunctive against Matt. and LXX, ὑπ' with indicative. On the other hand Mark's μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς is abandoned.

Mk. xiii. 8 || Lk. xxi. 10. Luke supports Mark (as does Matt.) against LXX.

Mk. xiii. 26 || Lk. xxi. 27 and Mk. xiv. 62 || Lk xxii. 69. In both passages Jesus is quoting from Dan. vii. 13. In the former Luke supports Mark’s use of the preposition ἐν against LXX and Matt. ἐπὶ. In the second quotation before the High Priest Mark has the preposition μετά in agreement with M.T. and Theodotion; Matthew has ἐπὶ in agreement with LXX; and Luke omits the phrase altogether. Here I cannot but think that Luke’s motive is apologetic. His treatment of the quotation as a whole has the effect of turning what looks like the announcement of an imminent revolution in human affairs into the assertion of the coming exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. As Luke reports it, the saying is of immense theological import; but it is freed from all political implications that might rouse suspicion in the minds of responsible Roman authorities, whether at the time of the trial or at the time when the third Gospel was published.

A case where Luke sides with LXX against Mark and Matt. is Mk. xii. 36 || Lk. xx. 42, quoting Ps. cx. 1. Here Luke has ὑποπόδιον with M.T., Tg., and LXX against the ὑποκάτω of Mark and Matt.

It would be rash to draw any dogmatic conclusions from so slender a collection of data. All that can safely be said is that such evidence as there is suggests that Luke is less inclined than Matthew to adapt the quotations in Mk. to the text of the LXX.

With that conclusion in mind we may turn to the O.T. quotations in Q. They are not numerous, about a dozen in all, and most of them belong to the category of reminiscence rather than formal quotation. As an example we take the saying Luke vii. 22 || Matt. xi. 5 in reply to John the Baptist’s question from prison:
"The blind receive their sight again; the lame walk; lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor are evangelised." This saying has echoes of several prophetic passages (Is. xxix. 18 f.; xxxv. 5 f.; lx. 1) without being a reproduction of any. We have here in fact a verbal picture of the Messianic Age, using terms and images drawn from the prophetic treasury without pinning itself down to any particular prophetic formulation. Similarly Lk. vii. 27 || Matt. xi. 10 is reminiscent not only of Mal. iii. 1 but also of Ex. xxiii. 20; while Lk. xiii. 29 || Matt. viii. 11 echoes both Mal. i. 11 and Is. lix. 19; and Lk. xiii. 35 || Matt. xxiii. 38 echoes Jer. xxii. 5 and xii. 7. The presence of so many composite quotations in this very ancient stratum of tradition may be significant.

In some other cases there are verbal echoes of single O.T. texts: e.g. Lk. x. 19 (Ps. xci (xc). 13); Lk. xii. 53 || Matt. x. 35 (Mic. vii. 6); Lk. xvii. 31 || Matt. xxiv. 18 (Gen. xix. 26); Lk. x. 15 || Matt. xi. 23 (Is. xiv. 13-15).

In two cases we have agreement of Matthew and Luke with one another and with both M.T. and LXX. These are Lk. xiii. 35 || Matt. xxiii. 38 (Ps. cxviii (cxvii). 26) and Lk. xvii. 27 || Matt. xxiv. 38 (Gen. vii. 7).

Two cases of some interest remain. The first comes from the eschatological poem in Luke xvii. In v. 29 dealing with the destruction of Sodom we read

εβρεζεν πῦρ καὶ θείου ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ.

In Gen. xix. 24 the Hebrew, both Targums, and LXX all have the order θείου καὶ πῦρ. A considerable number of the MSS. of Lk. have the order accommodated to the LXX; and fam13 agrees with LXX in having ἐκ in place of ἀπ' ὀυρανοῦ. The Old Latin omits the brimstone altogether; and in this it has the support of Syr. cur. and the approval of C. H. Turner.1 Whatever may be the true text of Luke here it seems fairly clear that it was not brought by the Evangelist into conformity with the LXX.

The second case, and our last from Q, is Lk. xiii. 27 || Matt. vii. 23, where the Jewish hearers of Jesus are being threatened with exclusion from the good time coming. The householder

1 J.T.S., xi (1910), 16.
will say to them in the words of Ps. vi. 9, 'Depart from me all workers of iniquity'. Here the LXX text reads:

\[ \text{ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τῇ ἀνομίᾳ.} \]

Luke: "", "", "", "", \( \text{ἐργάται ἀδικίας} \)
Matt.: \( \text{ἀποχωρεῖτε,} "", "", "", οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τῇ ἀνομίᾳ.} \)

Here Luke agrees with M.T., Tg., and LXX in having \( \text{πάντες} \), but it is not clear that the text as he gives it has exactly the same meaning as in the Psalm. There the Hebrew means 'Depart from me all you who work iniquity'; and this is fairly rendered by the LXX. But Luke's text has some ambiguity. If we put a comma after \( \text{ἐργαζόμενοι} \) (with Westcott and Hort), it will most naturally be taken to mean, 'Depart from me; you are all workers of iniquity': and it is explicitly so taken in the Old Syriac and the Palestinian Syriac: 'Depart ye from me, for ye are all . . . ' On the other hand, if, with von Soden, we put the comma after \( \text{πάντες} \), the rendering will be, 'Depart from me all of you. You workers of iniquity!'

Turning now to the sayings of Jesus which are peculiar to Matthew and Luke, we find that of the twenty-eight references in Matthew at least eleven must be regarded as no more than reminiscences of the Old Testament. Of the remainder, seven are cases where the O.T. textual witnesses agree among themselves and Matthew agrees with them. In two cases (Matt. xviii, 16; xxiv. 30) the O.T. witnesses agree among themselves and Matthew goes his own way. There are four interesting cases, where the O.T. witnesses disagree and Matthew takes sides.

Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7 \( \text{ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσιάν.} \) This is a word for word rendering of the Hebrew of Hos. vi. 6. The Targum gives the true sense, which is 'I prefer mercy to sacrifice'. The LXX witnesses are divided between \( \text{kαὶ οὐ} \) and \( \text{γ} \). The most recent editor \(^1\) adopts \( \text{kαὶ οὐ} \) in his text. If he is right, Matt. agrees with M.T. and LXX against Tg.; but the possibility cannot be excluded that \( \text{γ} \) is the true reading in the LXX.

Matt. xi. 29, 'You shall find rest (\( \text{ἀνάπαυσιν} \)) for your souls'. So also M.T. and Tg. in Jer. vi. 16. But LXX has 'purification' (\( \text{ἀ ῥέμοι} \)) in place of 'rest'.

\(^1\) Septuaginta XIII, Duodecim Prophetae, ed. Joseph Ziegler (1943).
Matt. xiii. 41. In the explanation of the parable of the wheat and tares it is said that 'the angels . . . will gather together out of his kingdom πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν'. This appears to be an echo of Zeph. i. 3. There the Hebrew text is very difficult, if not corrupt. The LXX (ed. Ziegler (1943) and Rahlfs (1935)) appears to have omitted the clause. The other Greek versions offer renderings different from Matt. The Targum follows a line of its own. What we have in Matt., if it derives from Zeph. i. 3, is best explained as an independent rendering of the Hebrew.

Matt. xxi. 16 agrees with the LXX of Ps. viii. 3 against M.T. and Tg.

Of the ten cases in Luke six cannot be rated as more than reminiscences. One is a case where all the O.T. witnesses and Luke agree. Of the three remaining cases two show agreement with the LXX against M.T. and in one Luke agrees with M.T. against the LXX. It is worth noting that this last is Lk. xxii. 37 καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἔλογισθη (LXX: ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις), the one unambiguous quotation from the Servant Songs in the words of Jesus. It is significant that it reflects the Hebrew rather than the LXX.

So far we have been dealing with O.T. quotations and reminiscences embodied in the words of Jesus. I think it a fair statement of the case at the end of this part of the enquiry to say that while there is a definite tendency for O.T. quotations to be conformed to the LXX, it does not seem to operate to any great extent in the early period. In some cases it would seem that the accommodation to the LXX is the work of later scribes or redactors rather than of the Evangelists. When we get back to the Evangelists themselves, Mark, so far as one can judge, is freest from the tendency to conform O.T. quotations to the LXX text. Matthew and Luke show movement in that direction; but they too preserve readings which side with the Hebrew or the Targum against the LXX. Does this hold of O.T. quotations in the Synoptic Gospels outside the actual teaching of Jesus? Let us examine some of these.

Particular interest attaches to a group of texts in Matthew, all introduced by a special formula indicating that some incident in
the narrative was the fulfilment of prophecy. They are Matt. i. 23 (Is. vii. 4; cf. viii. 8); ii. 6 (Mic. v. 1); ii. 15 (Hos. xi. 1); ii. 18 (Jer. xxxxi. 15); ii. 23 (no known O.T. text); iv. 15 f. (Is. viii. 23; ix. 1); viii. 17 (Is. liii. 4); xii. 18-20 (Is. xlii. 4-3); xiii. 35 (Ps. lxxviii. 2); xxi. 5 (Is. lxii. 11 and Zech ix. 9 conflated); xxvii. 9 f. (Zech. xi. 12 f., cf. Jer. xxxii. 6-15; xviii. 2 f.). These texts have been fully discussed by Allen and Bacon; and it is unnecessary to go over the ground again. Allen’s conclusion seems well founded that ‘there is a good deal of agreement with the Hebrew against the LXX’, and that ‘it is very unlikely that the quotations are due to the editor’. The most probable hypothesis would seem to be that we have here to do with a collection of proof-texts (Testimonia), which may well have originated in Palestinian Jewish Christian circles and have been drawn upon by the Evangelist.

To conclude, though not to complete, the discussion of the Synoptic quotations outside the teaching of Jesus, I take a few specially important examples. These are: the voice at the baptism, the texts quoted in the narrative of the temptation, and the cry of dereliction. Though not given as teaching in the strict sense, it should be noted that, unless the stories of the baptism and temptations are legendary—which I do not for a moment believe—they must ultimately go back to Jesus himself; so that the gap between these stories and the teaching properly so called is very much narrower than appears at first sight.

The voice at the baptism, as recorded in Mk i. 11, says οὐ εἶ ὁ νῦς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησα. There are two O.T. texts to be compared. Ps. ii. 7 in the LXX has νῦς μου εἶναι, ἐν αὐτῷ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε. Is. xlii. 1 reads Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς μου προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἣ ψυχὴ μου. The first half of the saying differs from M.T. and LXX chiefly by the addition of ὁ ἀγαπητός. The origin of this may well be, as Plooij suggested, in the

2 St. Matthew (I.C.C.), lxi. f.
3 Studies in Matthew, 470-77.
Targum on Ps. ii. 7, where 'Thou art my son' is paraphrased, 'Beloved as a son to his father art thou to me'. In that case we should be in touch with traditional Palestinian Bible interpretation. In this connection it is not without interest that the Midrash on Psalms illustrates the text 'Thou art my son' from the Law (Ex. iv. 22), the Prophets (Is. lii. 13 and xlii. 1), and the Hagiographa (Ps. cx. 1). The collocation of Is. xlii. 1 with Ps. ii. 7 should not be overlooked. The Targum on Is. xlii. 1 runs: 'Behold my servant, I will bring him near; my chosen in whom my Memra is (i.e. I am) well pleased'. For a closer verbal parallel to εν σοι ευδόκησα than is afforded by the LXX, we may turn to the other Greek versions. The rendering δ' εκλεκτός μου εν ευδόκησεν ή ψυχή μου is attributed to Symmachus and Theodotion. Finally, it has been shown by Billerbeck that the interpretation of Ps. ii. as a prophecy of the Davidic Messiah is the oldest and most widespread of all in Jewish circles.

But the question whether this combination of Ps. ii. 7 and Is. xlii. 1 is the authentic text of the voice at the Baptism is complicated by the well known fact that in the parallel passage in Luke (iii.22) Western authorities for the Lukan text give υἱὸς μου εἰς σοῦ, εἰς ό σήμερον γεγένηκα σε, that is, the LXX text of Ps. ii. 7 pure and simple without δ' ἀγαπητός or εν σοι ευδόκησα. Good scholars have accepted this as the true text of Luke, but doubts

---

1 Ed. Buber (1891), 14 b.  
2 Ed. Stenning (1949), 140 f.  
3 Septuaginta XIV, Isaias, ed. J. Ziegler (1939), 276.  
4 Kommentar, iii. 675 ff.  
5 The witnesses for the western reading in Lk. iii. 22 are D abc ff 2 lr Justin ( Dial. §§ 88, 103); Clem. Al. (Paed. I 6, § 25, ed. Stählin, i. 105. 6 f.); Methodius (Symposium, viii. 9, quoted by Otto ad Justin, Dial. § 88, n. 23); Didascalia, ix. (trans. R. H. Connolly, p. 93); Const. Ap., ii. 32 (ed. Funk, p. 115); Acta Petri et Pauli, 29; Lactantius (Inst., iv. 15); Hilary; Faustus; Juvencus; Tyconius. Augustine is also aware of the reading. The testimony of Origen is not clear (see W. Bauer, Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der römischen Apokryphen, 122). The Gospel of the Ebionites (Epiphanius, Haer., xxx. 13) gives a conflate text: σοῦ μου εἰς δ' υἱὸς δ' ἀγαπητός, εν σοι ευδόκησα. Καὶ πάλιν εἰς ό σήμερον γεγένηκα σε. (On this see A. Resch, Agraphe2 (1906), 222 ff.; H. J. Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums, 75 f. For discussion of the textual problem in Lk. iii. 22 see F. Hauck (Theol. Handkomm. ad loc.); E. Klostermann (H.B.N.T., ad loc.); B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, 143, 188. 276; F. C. Burkitt, J.T.S., xxvi. (1925), 190 ff.; W. Bauer, op cit., 120-24; E. Norden, Die Geburt des Kindes, 92.
remain. In Acts xiii. 33 Ps. ii. 7 is used as a proof text for the Resurrection, not for the inauguration of the Messianic Ministry. It seems to me unlikely that Luke would have altered the Markan text, which I think he had before him in his account of the Baptism. Further Ropes has pointed out that it is a characteristic foible of the Western text to complete Old Testament quotations. This may be what has happened here. And even if the D text were the true text of Luke, and so presumably of Q (which I do not believe), I think that we should still have to prefer the Markan account of what Jesus heard at the Baptism, just because it has these direct contacts with Palestinian interpretation of the Bible, while the Western text of Luke is pure LXX.

I turn now to the texts used in the Temptation narrative. Deut. viii. 3 is quoted in our Lord’s reply to the first temptation (Matt. iv. 4 || Lk. iv. 4). Here there is close agreement of the Gospels with the Hebrew and the LXX. The chief difference is that Luke gives only the first half of the verse, while Matthew completes the quotation. Bussmann defends Luke’s shorter text, ‘Man shall not live by bread alone’. It seems to me that he is right and that we have here an instance of the common practice in Rabbinical discussions of referring to a whole verse of Scripture by quoting the opening words, with or without the Hebrew equivalent of ‘etc’.

Next (following Luke’s order) comes the refusal of obeisance to Satan, couched in terms borrowed from Deut. vi. 13 (cf. x. 20), κύριον τὸν θεόν σου φοβηθήσῃ καὶ αὐτῷ λατρεύσεις. In Lk. iv. 9 this becomes προσκυνήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις. Matt. iv. 10 is the same that the order of words is κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις. Matt. and Luke unite against the Hebrew and the LXX in having προσκυνήσεις rather than φοβηθήσῃ (Ἀγγέλ) and in adding μόνῳ to αὐτῷ. The simplest and most satisfying explanation is, I think, that Matt. and Luke give the true text of Q, and that Q embodies the traditional form of the reply, unaffected by the Masoretic text and the LXX.

1 The Beginnings of Christianity, iii. p. ccxxii.
2 Synoptische Studien, ii. 41.
3 Many MSS. of LXX have μόνῳ in Deut. vi. 13; but this may represent the influence of the N.T. form of the saying.
In the third Lukan temptation we have two texts. One offered by the Tempter from Ps. xci. 11 f. requires little comment save a note of the fact that Matt. and Luke again agree against the Masoretic text and the LXX, this time in omitting a few words. The other text, the reply of Jesus quoting Deut. vi. 16, shows full agreement between the Evangelists on the one hand and the Hebrew and Greek of Deuteronomy on the other.

The cry of dereliction (Mark xv. 34, with parallel in Matt. xxvii. 46) is given in three languages in the textual tradition: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. The Greek is there as a translation of the words actually uttered; and it is still a matter of debate whether Mark recorded those words as spoken in Hebrew or Aramaic. The words are a quotation from Ps. xxii (xxi). 2. The Hebrew is:

The Targum (ed. Lagarde) has:

The LXX:

In Mark Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and von Soden print the spoken words in the form:

and in this they have the support of the great majority of the MSS. There is no doubt that this can be read as Aramaic, even though it does not agree with the printed text of the Targum except in the last word. That, however, is not a fatal objection. The printed Targum has no monopoly of possible Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew text; and we know from the case of the Torah that it was possible to have three Targums of the same text in existence side by side. There can, I think, be no question that the text of Mark as printed in the critical editions is Aramaic. But there is MS. evidence in favour of a Hebrew form of the quotation. The reading הֲלַע הֲלָע instead of הֲלַע הֲלָע is offered by D Θ 565, הֲלַע by 059; while the Old Latin MSS. cd ff2 i k n all support the reading Heli heli (i has heli heli). The form λαμα, which comes nearest to the Hebrew is given by B 059 D Θ 565 1582 22 1424*(?) N Σ.1 The Latin evidence for lama is

1 These MSS. are as given by von Soden. Legg omits 1424* and adds D 192 1 1285. He also cites 474 1071 for the reading λαμα.
and the majority of the Vulgate MSS. used by Wordsworth and White. To this, on the authority of Legg, we may add Geo Eth Arm. For the verb we have £apafavei in B and 0112, £aphavei in D, zapthani in di and probably in a predecessor of ff, zap hani in k. These all testify to the Hebrew יתנש ; and though they are not numerous they show an early and widespread diffusion of the reading in Egypt, Western Europe, and North Africa. C. H. Turner accepted the D text and read ηλει ηλει λαμα £aphavei, making Hebrew the language in which the cry was uttered. This was also the view of Dalman. For my own part I am inclined to think that this Hebrew may well represent the earliest form of the tradition, and go back behind Mark to the pre-Markan Passion-narrative, on which Mark depends. In the last resort it seems to me that it goes back to Jesus himself. The notion of the bystanders that he was calling for Elijah suits the reading ηλει as it does not suit ελων. (For what it is worth, the evidence of the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, η δύναμις μου, η δύναμις, points in the same direction.) Now if the cry was in fact uttered by our Lord in Hebrew, the earliest form of the oral Passion-narrative, as told in Palestine in Aramaic, may well have given both the Hebrew words and the Aramaic translation. And when Mark wrote his Gospel it is conceivable that the tradition offered both Hebrew and Aramaic. Whichever he accepted, the other would remain in oral circulation; and this may explain why both forms appear in the textual tradition of Mark. It may not be without significance that the strongest evidence for the Hebrew comes from places where Aramaic was not a spoken language: in other words it may well be that the Hebrew was ousted from the Gospel in those quarters where Aramaic was a living speech.

Something should here be said about the Greek rendering of the cry offered by Mark. At three points it differs from the LXX:

1 We should probably add ff which has lazapmathani, a simple case of metathesis for lamazaphani. k has armetzaphani, which Hans von Soden took into his edition of the African Old Latin as lama zaphtani. According to Julicher-Matzkow i has lamanai; but my copy of Belsheim’s edition of i, corrected by E. Kadlec for Mrs. Lewis, indicates that the i of lamanai has been crossed out.

2 J.T.S., xxix (1928), 12.

3 Jesus-Jeschua (1922), 185. (English translation (1929), 204 f.)

4 Ed. L. Vaganay, 254 ff.
(a) it has μον twice, against LXX once; (b) it does not have πρός μοῦ; and (c) it has εἰς τί for LXX ὑπ' τί. There is also a variant reading in Mark which, if genuine, would give a fourth and most striking difference from LXX. This is ὥσείδισασ for ἐγκατέλυμες, offered by D and the Old Latins ci and k.¹ It has been accepted by Turner,² Burkitt,³ and Harnack.⁴ If it is right, it means that Mark offered an interpretation of the cry rather than a translation; for ὥσείδισασ cannot be regarded as a translation either of the Hebrew or the Aramaic. But in any case Mark's independence of the LXX is sufficiently made out.

So much for the Synoptic Gospels. I turn now to consider the quotations in John, and begin with a different but not, I think, unrelated matter, the Aramaisms in John. These were the subject of a detailed study by C. F. Burney in his *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (1922). Following upon this the Manchester Hellenistic Seminar undertook an examination of the First Epistle of John and found that the Aramaisms claimed by Burney for the Gospel were absent from the Epistle. If we believe that both works are by the same author, this is a very curious and awkward fact. But it would certainly lose a good deal of its awkwardness if the Gospel or considerable parts of it had an Aramaic background; if, for example, the Gospel incorporated sources which went back to Aramaic originals. It occurred to me that we ought to look more closely into the question of the distribution of Burney's Aramaisms in the Fourth Gospel; and it at once appeared that they are not evenly spread through the book: they occur in blocks.⁵

Something similar seems to hold of the Old Testament quotations. They appear in the Fourth Gospel but not in the First Epistle; and, what is more, they tend to appear in those sections of the Gospel which are marked by the presence of Aramaisms. This holds of sixteen out of the twenty Old Testament quotations recognised as such by special type in Westcott and

¹ On the text of k at this point see F. C. Burkitt in *J.T.S.*, i. (1900), 278 f. He read maledixisti as the original text, which had later been altered.
² *J.T.S.*, xxix. (1928), 12.
³ *Jesus Christ, an Historical Outline* (1932), 56.⁴ *Studien*, i. 98-103.
⁵ For a fuller discussion of this matter see my article in the *Bulletin*, xxx. (1947), 312-29.
Hort’s text. These twenty quotations were given a detailed study by Burney; and this led to conclusions very similar to those which we have already reached regarding the Synoptic Gospels. Seven examples were found to be no more than free reminiscence of Old Testament texts or phrases; three are cases where the Masoretic text and the LXX agree, and John agrees with them; two (and a possible third) show agreement with the LXX against the Hebrew; one is claimed by Burney as a misrendering of an Aramaic original; and eight are quotations depending on the Hebrew. These eight are:

i. 23 (Is. xl. 3). John the Baptist says, εὐδοκεῖτε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαίας ὁ προφήτης. Here in the M.T. and LXX the verb is ‘prepare’, not ‘make straight’. John’s εὐθύνατε comes from the parallel clause in Is. xl. 3, and renders the Hebrew יְשׁוּפּוּ (LXX, εἰθείας ποιεῖτε).

i. 51 (Gen. xxviii. 12). Jesus says, ‘Verily, verily I say unto you, ye shall see the heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of man (ἐπὶ τὸν ὦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου)’. The Masoretic text of Gen. xxviii. 12 tells how Jacob dreamed ‘and lo, a ladder . . . and lo, the angels of God ascending and descending upon it (יוֹ). So it is understood in the LXX: καὶ ίδον κλίμαξ . . . καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνέβαινον καὶ κατέβαινον ἐπὶ αὐτῆς. But the way in which the text is applied in the Fourth Gospel involves taking יְו to refer to Jacob and not to the ladder, a feat not possible if the Septuagint is being used, since in Greek men are masculine and ladders feminine. Burney made the further interesting and important point that the Rabbis in the Palestinian academies had discussed this very question of the interpretation of יְו and that both the LXX view that it refers to the ladder, and the alternative view (adopted in John) that it refers to the person, had been maintained. This contact with Palestinian Rabbinic tradition does not stand alone.

1 The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, Ch. VIII.
2 This is the famous saying in vii. 38.
3 Burney, op. cit., 116 n. The point is more fully worked out by H. Odeberg, The Fourth Gospel, 33-42.
4 See my discussion of John iii. 14 f. in J.T.S., xlvi (1945), 130 ff.
vi. 31 (Cf. Ex. xvi. 4; Ps. lxxviii (lxxvii). 24; Wisd. xvi. 20). This, I think, would better be included in the class of free reminiscences.

vi. 45 (Is. liv. 13) stands nearer to the Hebrew and Targum than to the LXX.

xii. 15 (Zech. ix. 9) is part of the description of the Triumphal Entry. As Burney pointed out John's \( \text{kath\'menos } \varepsilon \pi \u03b1\lambda \omicron\nu \delta'\nu \) presupposes the Hebrew \( \text{\pi\nu\iota\lambda\omicron\nu\nu} \) rather than the LXX \( \pi\omega\lambda\omicron\nu \nu\varepsilon\omicron\nu \).

xii. 39 f. (Is. vi. 10). Here Burney claims that ' John's text is a reasonably accurate rendering of the Hebrew, and is nearer to it than LXX '.

xiii. 18 (Ps. xli (xl). 10) ' renders Heb. accurately, and is independent of LXX '.

xix. 37 (Zech. xii. 10). John has \( \sigma\phi\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\varepsilon\varsigma\; \delta\nu \varepsilon\xi\varepsilon\kappa\varepsilon\nu\tau\sigma\rho\alpha\nu \), ' they shall look on him whom they pierced '. The Masoretic text has ' me ' instead of ' him ', and is almost certainly corrupt. As it stands he who is pierced is God himself, an idea repugnant to Hebrew and Jewish piety. Some Hebrew MSS have ' him ' for ' me ' in agreement with the text of John; but this should probably be regarded as mere conjectural emendation designed to get over the difficulty of the Hebrew text. The LXX has a different solution to the problem. Whether by accident or design its creators read ' they danced ' (\( \tau\eta\nu\rho\rho\omicron\nu \)) for ' they pierced ' (\( \tau\rho\rho\omicron\nu \)). The dancing is then understood as an expression of disrespect or irreverence towards God. The Targum takes yet another way. What is clear is that the Johannine version of the saying is an emendation or variant reading of the Hebrew independent of the LXX.

We may conclude our survey of the Johannine material by looking for a moment at the three cases where John sides, or seems to side, with the LXX against the Hebrew.

ii. 17 (Ps. lxix (lxvii). 10). John has \( \o\zeta\iota\lambda\omicron\sigma\nu \tau\omicron\iota\omicron\omega\omicron\nu \sigma\nu \kappa\tau\alpha\f\acute{a}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \me\). The Hebrew text gives the perfect ' has eaten ' where, John has the future ' will eat '. \( \kappa\tau\alpha\f\acute{a}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \) is read by B and \( \aleph \) in the LXX; but it seems probable that this is due to

reminiscence of the Johannine text, and that the true reading in
the Psalter is κατέφαγεν με. This is the reading adopted by
Rahlfs. If that is right, we have here a case in which the Fourth
Gospel differs from both Hebrew and LXX.

vi. 45 (Is. liv. 13). The one point on which John agrees with
the LXX against the Hebrew is in having ' taught of God ' instead of ' taught of Jehovah '. But interchange of the two
divine names is very easy and involves no change of meaning. It
is as likely that we have faulty recollection of the Masoretic text
as that we have agreement with the LXX against the Hebrew.

xii. 38 (Is. liii. 1). John agrees verbally with the LXX
including the two points (addition of κύπεμ and the simple dative
τίνε) at which the LXX diverges from the Hebrew.

So much for the technicalities. It seems to me that our
consideration of the texts points to the conclusion that our Lord
did make frequent appeal to the Old Testament in his teaching;
and we have definite traces in the Gospels of the fact that he
quoted it in the original Hebrew and/or in the Aramaic Targum.
It remains to indicate briefly what kind of use he makes of the
Old Testament texts.

There is first of all the fact that apart altogether from direct
quotations the whole language of the New Testament, including
the words of Jesus, is strongly coloured by the style and idiom of
the Hebrew Bible. It is quite natural that it should be so; and
I suggest that we should not be in too big a hurry to find quota-
tion or even allusion where there may be nothing more than
verbal echoes and reminiscences.

When we turn to the clear and obvious quotations, we note
that the quotation rests on a real parallel between the situation
reflected in the Old Testament text; and the situation in the
Ministry to which it is applied. Mk. vii. 6 f. = Is. xxix. 13 is a case
in point. In both places the divine revelation through the pro-
phet or through Christ is frustrated by the rigid adherence of the
people to their man-made religious conventions. Again the
quotation of Isaiah lxvi. 7 and Jer. vii. 11 at the cleansing of the
Temple reflects the fact that the Jerusalem Temple should have
been and was meant by God to be a place of worship for Gentiles
as well as Jews; and that at the time of the Ministry, the only
part of it to which non-Jews had access was made useless for worship by the business activities that went on it in.

Or again take matters of doctrine or practice. What is the essence of Jewish ethics? The answer is given by bringing together two key texts from the Pentateuch. What is the basic truth about marriage and divorce? The answer is found by going back to the purpose of God when he founded the first human family. Or what about the resurrection? It would have been easy to quote from Daniel the most unambiguous statement of the doctrine in the Old Testament. Instead Jesus goes to something more fundamental still, and uses an Old Testament text to show that the real and abiding life of man is bound up with his relation to God. In a word, our Lord's treatment of the Old Testament is based on two things: a profound understanding of the essential teaching of the Hebrew Scriptures and a sure judgement of his own contemporary situation. There is nothing trivial or artificial about his use of the Old Testament: throughout we feel that we are in touch with realities, the realities of the divine revelation and the realities of the historical situation. I suggest that this should provide the standard and pattern for our own exegesis of the Old Testament and the New.