# ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

# SEMINARY STUDIES

## CONTENTS

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY SEMINARY STUDIES publishes papers and short notes in English, French, and German on the following subjects: Biblical linguistics and its cognates, textual criticism, exegesis, Biblical archaeology and geography, ancient history, church history, theology, philosophy of religion, ethics, and history of religions.

The opinions expressed in articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

# PROLEGOMENA TO A STUDY OF THE DOMINICAL
*LOGOI* AS CITED IN THE *DIDASCALIA APOSTOLORUM*
PART II: METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS (Cont.)*

JAMES J. C. COX

Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan

In an earlier article[1] in this series, I set forth the methodologies
which I am persuaded are necessary for an adequate and
responsible "determination" and "evaluation" of the dominical
*logoi* as cited in the original text of the Greek *Didascalia
Apostolorum;* and in a more recent article[2] in the same series, I
sought to demonstrate both the adequacy and the validity of
those methodologies by applying them to the extra-canonical
dominical *logos*, "Be approved money-changers," as it is cited in
the *Didascalia* (*Didasc.* 2.36.9). I now attempt a further demon-
stration of the adequacy and validity of the said methodologies

---

*Abbreviations employed in this article, which are not spelled out on the
back cover of this journal, indicate the following series: *AAA* = *Acta Apos-
tolorum Apocrypha; CAC* = *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi
Secundi; CCL* = *Corpus Christianorum*, Series *Latina; CSCO* = *Corpus Scrip-
torum Christianorum Orientalium; CSEL* = *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasti-
corum Latinorum; GCS* = *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der
ersten drei Jahrhunderte; NTG* = *Novum Testamentum Graece; PTC* =
*Patristische Texte und Studien; SC* = *Sources chrétiennes.*

(*Editor's Note:* The style used in this article, including that for citing
biblical texts, differs somewhat from current *AUSS* style. This is in order to
maintain consistency throughout the series, which was begun prior to
adoption of the present *AUSS* Style Guidelines.)

[1] "Prolegomena to a Study of the Dominical *Logoi* as cited in the *Didas-
calia Apostolorum*, Part II: Methodological Questions," *AUSS* 15 (1977):
1-15.
[2] "Prolegomena to a Study of the Dominical *Logoi* as cited in the
*Didascalia Apostolorum*, Part II: Methodological Questions (cont.)," *AUSS* 15
(1977): 97-113.

by applying them to the canonical dominical *logos*,[3] "For it is written in the Law, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you (that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you), Everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife, to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart," as it is similarly cited in the *Didascalia* (*Didasc.* 1.1.4). Cf. Mt 5.27-28.

This citation is extant in the Syriac and Latin versions of the *Didascalia* (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 1.23ff.; Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 3.8ff.), and in the Greek, Arabic, and Ethiopic *Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:5.19ff.; Dawud, *'ldsqwlyt*, p. 17.9ff.; Harden, *Ethiopic Didascalia*, p. 3.18ff.). Concerning it several preliminary factors should be taken into consideration at the outset:

1. In all five witnesses (the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae*, the Greek, Arabic, and Ethiopic *Constitutiones Apostolorum*), it occurs in essentially the same *context:* The "children of God" are to flee from "all avarice and evil dealing." They are not to "desire that which is any man's," for "he who desires his neighbor's wife, or his servant, or his maidservant, is already an adulterer, and a thief." This admonition is supported by two citations, the one (cf. Exod 20.17) from the Torah, and the other (the citation under consideration) from the "Gospel" (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 1.11ff.; Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 2.14ff.; Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:5.5ff.; Dawud, *'ldsqwlyt*, p. 16.10ff.; Harden, *Ethiopic Didascalia*, p.2.33ff.).

---

[3] The author of this *logos* is designated *mrn wmlpnn yšwᶜ mšyḥ'* ("Our Lord and Teacher, Jesus the Messiah") (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 1.21) = *dominus et doctor noster Iesus Christus* ("Our Lord and Teacher, Jesus Christ") (Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum*, p. 3.5f.) = κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ("Our Lord Jesus Christ") (Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 1:5.16) = "Christ" (Dawud, *'ldsqwlyt*, p. 17.8) = "Our Lord Jesus Christ" (Harden, *Ethiopic Didascalia*, p. 3.13).

2. In all five witnesses, it is introduced with similar *citation formulae:* '*yk d'p b'wnglywn mhdt wmšrr wmšml 'sr' ptgm' dnmws' ['mr]* ("as also in the Gospel, renewing and confirming and fulfilling the Ten Words of the Law, [he says]") (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum,* p. 1.22f.) = *dicit enim in evangelio recapitulans et confirmans et conplens decalogum legis* ("for he says in the Gospel, recapitulating and confirming and fulfilling the Decalogue of the Law,") (Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum,* p. 3.7f.)= λέγει γὰρ ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ, ἀνακεφαλαιούμενος καὶ στηρίζων καὶ πληρῶν τὴν δεκάλογον τοῦ Νόμου ("for he says in the Gospel, summing-up and confirming the Decalogue of the Law,") (Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum,* 1:5.17f.) = "for Christ says in one of the chapters of the Holy Gospel, and confirms and fulfills the "Ten Words' of the Law' (Dawud, *'ldsqwlyt,* p.17.8f.) = "for he teaches us and gives us understanding and strengthens us by the Holy Spirit, that he may fulfill the Law, in which it is written, saying" (Harden, *Ethiopic Didascalia,* p. 3.15ff.).

3. In the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae,* and in the Greek and Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum,* it has essentially the same *form:* part (i), an introductory citation formula, "for it is written in the Law" + part (ii), a citation from the Torah + part (iii), an introductory *logos* formula, "but I say to you" + part (iv), a parenthetical statement emphasizing the authority of the one who pronounces the *logos* which follows + part (v), the *logos* itself (Lagarde, *Didascalia Apostolorum,* p. 1.23ff.; Tidner, *Didascaliae Apostolorum,* p. 3.8ff.; Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum,* 1:5.19ff.; Dawud, *'ldsqwlyt,* p. 17.9ff.).[4]

4. In the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae,* and in the Greek and Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum,* it consists of essentially the

---

[4] The Ethiopic *Constitutiones Apostolorum* renders the citation in a form essentially identical with the form of the Matthaean parallel (Mt 5. 27-28). See Harden, *Ethiopic Didascalia,* p. 3.18ff.

same *content:* "For it is written in the Law, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you (that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you), Everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife, to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart."[5]

5. And finally, in all five witnesses, it fulfills the same *function,* namely, to support the contention that the Christian is not to "desire that which is any man's." See the first item above.

It is clear, from the foregoing, that any attempt to "determine" the *form* (in the less technical sense of the term) and the *content* of this citation, as it was employed in the original text of the Greek *Didascalia,* must take into consideration, with the qualifications indicated, all the extant versions, both of the *Didascalia* and of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum.*

## THE VERSIONS
### Didasc. 1.1.4

| (a) | (b) | (c) |
|---|---|---|
| *Didasc. Syr.*<br>(Lagarde, 1.23ff.) | *Didasc. Lat.*<br>(Tidner, 3.8ff.) | *Constit. Apost.*[6]<br>(Funk, 1:5.19ff.) |
| (i) *mṭl*<br>  *dktyb*<br>  *bnmws'* | *quoniam*<br><br>*in lege*<br>*scriptum est:* | ὅτι<br><br>ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ<br>γέγραπται· |
| (ii) *dl'*<br>  *tgwr* | *Non*<br>*moechaberis;* | Οὐ<br>μοιχεύσεις· |
| (iii) *'n' dyn*<br>  *'mr 'n'*<br>  *lkwn*<br>  *hd'* | *ego autem*<br>*dico*<br>*vobis* | ἐγὼ δὲ<br>λέγω<br>ὑμῖν, |

[5] See n. 4, above.

[6] The Arabic Constitutor renders the citation in a form essentially identical to that of the Greek text (see Dawud, *'ldsqwlyt,* p. 17.9f.); but the Ethiopic Constitutor renders it in a form (probably as the result of accommodation) essentially identical to its Matthaean parallel (Mt 5.27-28).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| (iv) *hw* | (*id est:* | τοῦτ' ἔστιν |
| *dbnmws'* | *in lege* | ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ τῷ |
| *byd mwš'* | *per Moysen* | διὰ Μωϋσέως |
| *mllt* | *locutus sum,* | ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, |
| *hš' dyn* | *nunc autem* | νῦν δὲ |
| *'n' qnwmy* | *ipse* | ὁ αὐτὸς |
| | *vobis* | ὑμῖν |
| *'mr 'n'* | *dico):* | λέγω· |
| *lkwn* | | |
| | | |
| (v) *dklmn* | *Omnis,* | Πᾶς, |
| | *quicumq[ue]* | ὅστις |
| *dnḥwr* | *intenderit* | ἐμβλέψει |
| *b'ntt* | *in mulierem* | εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα |
| *qrybh* | *proximi sui* | τοῦ πλησίον |
| *'yk* | *ad* | πρὸς |
| *dnrgh* | *concupiscendum* | τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι |
| | *[e]am,* | αὐτήν, |
| *mn kdw* | *iam* | ἤδη |
| *grh* | *moechatus est* | ἐμοίχευσεν |
| | *eam* | αὐτὴν |
| *blbh* | *in corde* | ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ |
| | *suo.* | αὐτοῦ. |

|  (d) | (e) |
|---|---|
| *Didasc. Grk.* (Reconstruction) | *Mt 5.27-28*[7] (Legg, *NTG:Matthaeum*, ad loc.) |

(i) ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ γέγραπται·      ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη·

(ii) Οὐ μοιχεύσεις.      Οὐ μοιχεύσεις.

(iii) 'Εγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν,      'Εγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι

(iv) τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ
(τῷ) διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα,
νῦν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν λέγω·

(v) Πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψει      Πᾶς ὁ βλέπων
εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα      γυναῖκα
τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ
πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτην,      πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν,
ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν      ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν
ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.      ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

[7] S. C. E. Legg, *Novum Testamentum Graece secundum Textum West-cotto-Hortianum: Evangelium secundum Matthaeum* (Oxford, 1940), ad loc.

## THE ORIGINAL GREEK FORM

The questions with which we now concern ourselves have to do with the value of the versions (the Syriac and Latin versions of the *Didascalia;* the Greek, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*) for the determination of the original Greek form.

On the one hand, do the versions represent *ad hoc* translations of their respective Greek exemplars? If they do, they are obviously of real value for our purposes. On the other hand, are they "dubbed in" equivalents of those Greek exemplars drawn on contemporary Gospel traditions? Or, further, are they constructions contrived by the authors of the various versions to suit their respective contexts? If either of these, they are patently of little value for our purposes.

Furthermore, if we finally conclude that they do represent *ad hoc* translations of their respective Greek exemplars, how precisely do they represent those Greek exemplars? Do they contain accommodations to contemporary Gospel traditions? If they do, to what extent? Do they contain accommodations to their respective contexts? If so, to what extent?

### 1. *Evaluation of the Versions as Evidence for the Original Greek Form*

In order to answer these questions I first compare the various versions of the *Didascalia* and the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* with their comparable canonical parallel, namely, Mt 5.27-28, as it occurs in their respective Gospel traditions, both in the Gospel manuscripts and in the Patristic literature; and then analyze them in relationship to their respective contexts (the aim of both processes being to determine whether or not the versions represent *ad hoc* translations of their respective Greek exemplars); and, finally, if it is clear that the versions are, in fact,

*ad hoc* translations, I examine them for possible accommodations both to their respective contexts and to their contemporary Gospel traditions.

### The Parallel in the Syriac Gospel Traditions

I turn immediately to a comparison of the Syriac Didascalist's citation with its comparable parallel in the Syriac Gospel traditions. The following distinctive features should be noted:

1. The formula *mṭl dktyb bnmws'* ("for it is written in the Law") (*Didasc. Syr.*, part i) occurs nowhere else in the Syriac Gospel traditions. While the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ either the formula *šm'twn d't'mr* ("you have heard that it was said") (so syr[s p]), *šm'twn d't'mr lqdmy'* ("you have heard that it was said to the ancients") (so syr[c h], cf. syr[pal]), or *'t'mr lqdmy'* ("it was said to the ancients") (so Titus of Bostra [1/1][8] and Philoxenus of Mabbug [1/1][9]), the *Didascalia* alone employs the formula *mṭl dktyb bnmws'* ("for it is written in the Law").

2. The formula *'n' dyn 'mr' 'n' lkwn hd'* ("but I say to you this") (*Didasc. Syr.*, part iii) occurs, in precisely this form, nowhere else in the Syriac Gospel traditions. While the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ the clause *'n' dyn 'mr 'n lkwn* ("but I say to you") *without* the demonstrative pronoun *hd'* ("this") (so syr[s c p h pal], Titus of Bostra [1/1][10]), the *Didascalia* employs the same clause *with* the pronoun *hd'* ("this").

---

[8] *Contra Manichaeos*, 4.ṛ75 (P. A. de Lagarde, *Titi Bostreni, Contra Manichaeos libri quattuor Syriace* [Berlin, 1859 (reprint, Osnabrück/ Wiesbaden, 1967)], p. 120.31f.).

[9] *Hom.* 13 (E. A. W. Budge, *Philoxenus of Mabbug: The Discourses. Syriac Text . . . Translation, Introduction, Appendix, Index*, 2 [London, 1894]: 555.10f).

[10] *Contra Manichaeos*, 4.ṛ75 (Lagarde, *Contra Manichaeos*, p. 120.31f.).

3. The parenthesis *hw dbnmws' byd mwš' mllt hš' dyn 'n' qnwmy 'mr 'n' lkwn* ("that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you") (*Didasc. Syr.*, part iv) occurs nowhere else in the Syriac Gospel traditions. Cf. syr[s c p h pal], Titus of Bostra (1/1).[11]

4. The clause *dklmn dnhwr b'ntt qrybh* ("everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife") (*Didasc. Syr.*, part v) occurs, in precisely this form, nowhere else in the Syriac Gospel traditions. While (a) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, the active participle *hz'* ("looks") (so syr[s c p h], Titus of Bostra [1/1],[12] Philoxenus of Mabbug [1/2],[13] and Martyrius [1/1] [14, 15]), the *Didascalia* alone employs the imperfect *nhwr* ("shall look");[16] while (b) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, the construction of participle or finite verb (e.g. *hz'* ["looks"] or *nhz'* ["shall look"]) + noun (*'ntt* ["woman," "wife"]) (so syr[s c p h pal], Ephraem[?] [1/1],[17] Titus of Bostra [1/1],[18] Philoxenus of Mabbug [1/2],[19] Martyrius [1/1],[20] and Dionysius bar Ṣalibi [1/1][21]), the *Didascalia* employs the construction of finite verb (*nhwr* ["shall look"]) + preposition (*b* ["on," "at"] + construct noun

---

[11] *Contra Manichaeos*, 4.ᴦ75 (Lagarde, *Contra Manichaeos*, p. 120.31f.).

[12] *Contra Manichaeos*, 4.ᴦ75 (Lagarde, *Contra Manichaeos*, p. 120.31ff.).

[13] *. Hom.* 13 (Budge, *Discourses* 2:600.9ff.).

[14] *Book of Perfection*, 2.6.20 (A. de Halleux, *Martyrius* [Sahdona]: *Ouvres spirituelles*, II: *Livre de la Perfection, 2me Partie*, CSCO 214/syr 90 [Louvain, 1961]: 71.21f.).

[15] Syr[pal] has the active participle *hm'* ("burns with desire"), and Philoxenus of Mabbug (1/2) (*Hom.* 13 [Budge, *Discourses* 2:555.6f.]) the active participle *h'r* ("looks").

[16] Ephraem (?) (1/1) (*In Ezechielem* 9.4 [J. S. Assemani, *Sancti Patris nostri Ephraemi Syri, Opera omnia*, 1 (Rome, 1737): 5.174c]) and Dionysius bar Ṣalibi (1/1) (*Commentarii*, ad loc. [I. Sedlacek and I.-B. Chabot, *Dionysii bar Ṣalibi, Commentarii in evangelia*, 1, fasc. 2, CSCO 77/syr 33 (Louvain, 1915): 219.13]) have the imperfect *nhz'* ("shall look").

[17] *In Ezechielem*, 9.4 (Assemani, *Ephraemi Syri, Opera*, 1:5. 174c).

[18] *Contra Manichaeos*, 4.ᴦ75 (Lagarde, *Contra Manichaeos*, p. 120.31ff.).

[19] *Hom.* 13 (Budge, *Discourses* 2:600.9ff.).

[20] *Book of Perfection*, 2.6.20 (Halleux, CSCO 214/syr 90:71.21f.).

[21] *Commentarii*, ad loc. (Sedlaček and Chabot, CSCO 77/syr 33:219.13).

('*ntt* ["wife of"]);[22] while (c) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ the emphatic form of the noun ('*ntt*' ["woman," "wife"]) (so syr[s c p h pal], Ephraem[?] [1/1],[23] Titus of Bostra [1/1],[24] Philoxenus of Mabbug [2/2],[25] Martyrius [1/1],[26] and Dionysius bar Ṣalibi [/1]),[27] the *Didascalia* alone employs the construct form ('*ntt* ["wife of"]); and while (d) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations, without exception, employ the noun without modification,[28] the *Didascalia* employs the modifier *qrybh* ("his neighbor").[29]

The immediate implications of this comparison, so far as our questions are concerned, are that this citation, as employed by the Syriac Didascalist, is, on the negative side, not a "dubbed in" form drawn on contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions, and, on the positive side, either an *ad hoc* translation of the Syriac Didascalist's Greek exemplar, or an *ad hoc* construction contrived by the Syriac Didascalist to suit the special needs of its particular context.

As far as the *latter alternative* is concerned (namely, that the Syriac rendering is possibly a construction contrived by the Syriac Didascalist to suit the special needs of its particular context) the following factors are pertinent: (1) The parallel citation in the Latin *Didascalia* and in the Greek and Arabic

[22] Philoxenus of Mabbug (1/2) (*Hom.* 13 [Budge, *Discourses* 2:555.6f.]) has the construction: participle (*h'r* ["looks"]) + preposition (*b* ["on," "at"]) + noun ('*ntt*' ["woman," "wife"]).

[23] *In Ezechielem*, 9.4 (Assemani *Ephraemi Syri, Opera*, 1:5.174c).

[24] *Contra Manichaeos*, 4.ṛ5 (Lagarde, *Contra Manichaeos*, p. 120.31ff.).

[25] *Hom.* 13 (Budge, *Discourses* 2:555.6f., 600.9ff.).

[26] *Book of Perfection*, 2.6.20 (Halleux, *CSCO* 214/syr 90:71.21f.).

[27] *Commentarii*, ad loc. (Sedláček and Chabot, *CSCO* 77/syr 33:219.13).

[28] So all the witnesses cited under (c). See nn. 23-27, above.

[29] Cf. the modifiers *proximi sui* ("his neighbor's") and τοῦ πλησίον ("[his] neighbor's") in the Latin *Didascalia* and the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum* respectively. There is an equivalent form in the Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum*.

*Constitutiones Apostolorum* is essentially identical. (2) Of the
distinctive features of the citation (as compared with its com-
parable parallel in the Syriac Gospel traditions), none is de-
termined by its particular context.

Since the four distinctive features discussed above[30] have
equivalent forms in the Latin *Didascalia* and in the Greek and
Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum,* I conclude that they already
existed in the original Greek *Didascalia,* and therefore they are
not constructions contrived by the Syriac Didascalist.

There is only one feature, namely, the use of the demon-
strative pronoun *hd'* ("this"), that calls for attention here. As
far as I can determine, there is nothing in the context that requires
this particular element. Therefore, in view of the fact that it has
no equivalent in its parallels in the Latin *Didascalia* and in the
Greek and Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum,* I conclude that
it is merely an editorial element added by the Syriac Didascalist
and inspired by stylistic preference. An equivalent probably did
not occur in the Syriac Didascalist's Greek exemplar.

These factors, taken together, require the conclusions (a)
that this citation is not, on the negative side, an *ad hoc* construc-
tion contrived to meet the special needs of its particular context,
and (b) that it is, on the positive side, an *ad hoc* translation of
the Syriac Didascalist's Greek exemplar.

I turn then to a consideration of the *former alternative*
(namely, that the Syriac rendering is an *ad hoc* translation of the
Syriac Didascalist's Greek exemplar). The question of possible
accommodation calls for immediate attention. Given the con-
clusion that the Syriac Didascalist's citation is, in fact, an *ad hoc*
translation, one question remains, that of possible accommoda-
tion either (a) to the context of the citation itself and/or (b) to
the form of the comparable parallel in the contemporary Gospel
traditions.

[30] See pp. 143-145, above.

In regard to (a), the factors just considered (namely, that of the distinctive features of the citation [as compared with its comparable parallel in the Gospel traditions], none is determined by its particular context; and that the parallel citation in the Latin *Didascalia* and in the Greek and Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum* is essentially identical) imply not only, as we have argued above, that the Syriac Didascalist did not contrive the form of the citation to suit the special needs of its particular context, but also that, given the conclusion we have now reached (namely, that the Syriac rendering represents an *ad hoc* translation of its Greek exemplar), the Syriac Didascalist has not accommodated his translation to the context in which it occurs.

In regard to (b), the factors noted above (to the effect that, both in structure and content, the citation we are discussing is distinctly different from the form of its comparable parallel in the contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions) imply not only, as we have contended, that the Syriac Didascalist's citation is not a "dubbed in" equivalent (drawn on contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions) of its Greek exemplar, but also that, given the conclusion that the Syriac rendering is indeed an *ad hoc* translation of its Greek exemplar, the Syriac Didascalist has not accommodated his translation to the form of its parallel in the contemporary Syriac Gospel traditions.

### The Parallel in the Latin Gospel Traditions

I take up now a comparison of the Latin Didascalist's citation with its comparable parallel in the Latin Gospel traditions. Several distinctive, and significant, features should be noted:

1. The formula *quoniam in lege scriptum est* ("for it is written in the Law") (*Didasc. Lat.*, part i) occurs, in precisely this form, nowhere else in the Latin Gospel traditions. While the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ either the formula *auditis quia dictum est* ("you have heard that it was said")

(so it[a b d f], Augustine [3/3],[31] and Eugippius [1/1][32]), *auditis quia dictum est antiquis* ("you have heard that it was said to the ancients") (so it[aur] ff[1] g[1] h[1] l, vg, Chromatius Aquileiensis [1/1],[33] Gregorius Magnus [1/1][34]), or *dictum est (enim) antiquis* ("[for] it was said to the ancients") (so Irenaeus [1/1],[35] and Origen [3/3][36]), the *Didascalia* employs the formula *quoniam in lege scriptum est* ("for it is written in the Law"). Only Jerome [1/1][37] has anything comparable, namely, *scriptum est, inquit, in lege* ("it is written, it is said, in the Law").

2. The parenthesis *id est in lege per Moysen locutus sum, nunc autem ipse vobis dico* ("that is, I have spoken, in the Law, through Moses, now however, I myself speak to you") (*Didasc. Lat.*, part iv) occurs nowhere else in the Latin Gospel traditions. Cf. it, vg, Irenaeus (1/1,)[38] Origen (3/3),[39] Chromatius Aquileien-

---

[31] *De divinis Scripturis sive Speculum*, 45 (F. Weihrich, *S. Aurelii Augustini, Speculum, CSEL* 12 [Vienna, 1887]: 479.10ff.); *De sermone Domini*, 1.12.33 (A. Mutzenbecher, *S. Aurelii Augustini, De sermone Domini in monte, CCL* 25.7 [Turnholti, 1967]: 35.21ff.); and *Contra Faustum*, 19.21 (I. Zycha, *S. Aureli Augustini, De utilitate credendi . . . contra Faustum, CSEL* 25.1 [Vienna, 1891]: 520.5ff.).

[32] *Excerpta ex operibus Augustini*, 303 (P. Knöll, *Eugippius: Excerpta ex operibus S. Augustini, CSEL* 9.1 [Vienna, 1885]: 976.5ff.).

[33] *Tract. in evangel. Matthaei*, 9.1.1 (V. Bulhart, *Chromatii Aquileiensis Episcopi, Tractatus XVII, CCL* 9 [Turnholti, 1957]: 416.23ff.).

[34] *In librum primum Regum*, 3.156 (P. Verbraken, *S. Gregorii Magni, Expositiones . . . In librum I. Regum, CCL* 144 [Turnholti, 1963]: 284.27ff.).

[35] *Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1 (A. Rousseau, et al., *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies, livre IV, SC* 100 [Paris, 1965]: 524.5ff.).

[36] *Hom. in Jesu Nave*, 9.3 (W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes: Werke*, VII: *Homilien zum Hextateuch in Rufins Übersetzung*, 2: *Die Homilien zu Numeri, Josua, und Judices, GCS* 30 [Leipzig, 1921]: 7.348.20ff.); *In Canticum Canticorum*, 1 (Baehrens, *Origenes: Werke*, VIII: *Homilien zu Samuel I, zu Hohelied und zu den Propheten, GCS* 33 [Leipzig, 1925]: 8.95.3ff.); and *Comm. in evangel. Matthaei*, 24 (E. Klostermann, *Origenes: Werke*, X: *Matthäuserklärung*, 1: *Die griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi, GCS* 40 [Berlin, 1935]: 10.244.17ff.).

[37] *Tract. in Marci evangel.*, 1.1-12 (B. Capelle, et al., *S. Hieronymi, Opera*, II: *Tractatus . . . in Marci evangelium, CCL* 78 [Turnholti, 1958]: 455.1ff.).

[38] *Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., *SC* 100:524.5ff.).

[39] See n. 36, above.

sis (1/1),[40] Jerome (1/1),[41] Augustine (3/3),[42] and Gregorius Magnus (1/1).[43]

3. The clause *omnis, quicumque intenderit in mulierem proximi sui* ("everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife") (*Didasc. Lat.*, part v) occurs, in precisely this form, nowhere else in the Latin Gospel traditions. While (a) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, either the simple relative pronoun *qui* ("who") (so Irenaeus [1/2],[44] Tertullian [6/6],[45] Origen [1/5],[46] Hilary [1/1],[47] Athanasius [1/1],[48] Ambrose [4/5],[49] Chrysostom [1/1],[50] Jerome [7/9],[51] Augustine [1/6],[52] John Cassian [2/3],[53] Claudianus Mamertu

---

[40] *Tract. in evangel. Matthaei*, 9.1.1 (Bulhart, *CCL* 9:416.23ff.).

[41] *Tract. in Marci evangel.*, 1.1-12 (Capelle, et al., *CCL* 78:455.1ff.).

[42] See n. 31, above.

[43] *In librum primum Regum*, 3.156 (Verbraken, *CCL* 144:284.27ff.).

[44] *Adversus haereses*, 4.16.5 (Rousseau et al., *SC* 100:572.10f.).

[45] *De anima*, 15.4; 40.4; 58.6; *De exhort. castitatis* 9.2; *De resurrectione mortuorum* 15.4; *De pudicitia*, 6.6 (J. W. P. Borleffs, et al., *Tertulliani, Opera, CCL* 2.2 [Turnholti, 1954]: 801.28ff.; 843.28ff.; 868.33ff.; 938.14; 1027.16ff.; 1290.7ff.).

[46] *Comm. in evangel. Matthaei*, 21 (Klostermann, *Origenes: Werke XI: Matthäuserklärung*, 2: *Die lateinische Übersetzung der Commentariorum, GCS* 38 [Berlin, 1933]: 11.37.16f.).

[47] *Tract. in psalmum*, 139.7 (A. Zingerle, *S. Hilarii episcopi Pictaviensis, Tractatus super Psalmos, CSEL* 22 [Vienna, 1891]: 781.29f.).

[48] *Epist. heortasticae*, 11.7 (Migne, *PG* 26:1408.10ff.).

[49] *Exposit. psalmi*, 118.1.12; 118.8.34; 118.16.3 (M. Petschenig, *S. Ambrosii, Opera*, V: *Expositio Psalmi CXVIII, CSEL* 62 (Vienna, 1913): 13.20f.; 169.28ff.; 353.8f.); *Exposit. evangel. Lucae*, 6.91 (C. Schenkl, *S. Ambrosii, Opera*, IV: *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam, CSEL* 32.4 [Vienna, 1902]: 271.21f.).

[50] *In Matthaeum, Hom.* 7.7 (Migne, *PG* 57:80.33f.).

[51] *In Essaiam* 118.66.18f. (G. Morin, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri, Opera* 1.2, *In Esaia parvula abreviatio, CCL* 73A.1 (Turnholti, 1963): 787.15ff); *Tract. in Marci evangel.*, 1.1-12 (Capelle, et al., *CCL* 78:455.1ff. [twice]); *Adversus Pelagianos* 1.33 (Migne, *PL* 23:526.36f.); *Epistula*, 22.5; 76.2; 125.7 (I. Hilberg, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi, Opera I.1-3: Epistulae, CSEL* 54 [Vienna, 1910]: 150.9ff.; *CSEL* 55 [Vienna, 1914]: 36.1f.; *CSEL* 56 [Vienna, 1918]: 125.15ff.).

[52] *Sermo* 98.5 (Migne, *PL* 38:593.52ff.).

[53] *Conlatio. Patrum*, 5.11; 12.2 (Petschenig, *CSEL* 13:133.7f.; 336.21ff.).

[1/1],[54] Faustur of Riez [1/1],[55] Salvian [1/2],[56] Fulgentius of Ruspe [1/1],[57] Caesarius of Arles [2/2],[58] Gregorius Magnus [2/2][59]), the construction *omnis qui* ("everyone who") (so it, vg, Irenaeus [1/2],[60] Origen [1/5],[61] Augustine [2/6],[62] and Eugippius [1/1][63]), or the construction *si quis* ("if anyone") (so Origen [3/5],[64] Ambrose [1/5],[65] Chromatius Aquileiensis [1/1],[66] Jerome [1/9],[67] Augustine [2/6],[68] and Salvian [1/2][69]), the *Didascalia* (with Pseudo-Clement [1/1],[70] Jerome [1/9],[71] Sulpi-

[54] *De statu animae*, 1.24 (A. Engelbrecht, *Claudiani Mamerti, Opera, CSEL* 11 [Vienna, 1885]: 86.15f.).

[55] *Ruricii epistularum*, 2.17 (Engelbrecht, *Fausti Reiensis, Opera, CSEL* 21 [Vienna, 1891]: 401.14f.).

[56] *De gubernatione Dei*, 6.49 (F. Pauly, *Salviani presbyteri Massiliensis, Opera omnia, CSEL* 8 [Vienna, 1883]: 138.28ff.).

[57] *De incarnatione*, 50 (J. Fraipont, *S. Fulgentii Ruspensis, Opera, CCL* 91A [Turnholti, 1968]: 353.7f.).

[58] *Sermo*, 41.4; 5 (Morin, *Caesarii Arelatensis, Sermones, CCL* 103 [Turnholti, 1953]: 183.16f.; 31f.).

[59] *In librum primum Regum*, 1.26; 3.156 (Verbraken, *CCL* 144:69.8f.; 284.27ff.).

[60] *Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., *SC* 100:524.5ff.).

[61] *In Canticum Canticorum* 1 (Baehrens, *GCS* 33:8.95.3ff.).

[62] *De divinis Scripturis sive Speculum*, 45 (Weihrich, *CSEL* 12: 497.10ff.); *De sermone Domini*, 1.12.33 (Mutzenbecher, *CCL* 25.7:35.21ff.).

[63] *Excerpta ex operibus Augustini*, 303 (Knöll, *CSEL* 9.1:976.5ff.).

[64] *Hom. in Leviticum*, 3.3 (Baehrens, *Origenes: Werke*, VI: *Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung, 1: Die Homilien zu Genesis, Exodus, und Leviticus, GCS* 29 [Leipzig, 1920]: 6.303.23ff.); *Hom. in Jesu Nave*, 9.3 (Baehrens, *GCS* 30:7.348.20ff.); *Comm. in evangel. Matthaei*, 24 (Klostermann, *GCS* 40:10.244.17ff.).

[65] *De paenitentia*, 1.14.70 (P. O. Faller, *S. Ambrosii, Opera VII: De excessu fratis, de obitu Theodosii, de obitu Valentiniani, de paenitentia, de mysteriis, de sacramentis, CSEL* 73 [Vienna, 1955]: 152.13f.).

[66] *Tract. in evangel. Matthaei*, 9.1.1 (Bulhart, *CCL* 9:416.23ff.).

[67] *Tract, de psalmo*, 138.9 (Capelle, et al., *CCL* 78:300.21ff.).

[68] *Contra Faustum*, 19.21 (Zycha, *CSEL* 25.1:520.5ff.); *De civitate Dei*, 14.10 (B. Dombart and A. Kalb, *S. Aurelii Augustini, De Civitate Dei, CCL* 48 [Turnholti, 1955]: 430.32ff.).

[69] *De gubernatione Dei*, 3.37 (Pauley, *CSEL* 8:54.18ff.).

[70] *Recognitiones*, 7.37 (B. Rehm and F. Paschke, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, II: *Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung, GCS* 51 [Berlin, 1965]: 215.5ff.).

[71] *Tract. de Psalmo*, 90.2f. (Capelle, et al., *CCL* 78:421.2f.).

cius Severus [1/1],[72] and John Cassian [1/3][73]) employs the pronoun *quicumque* ("whoever");[74] while (b) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, the verb *viderit* ("shall look") (so it, vg, Irenaeus [2/2],[75] Tertullian [5/6],[76] Origen [4/5],[77] Ambrose [5/5],[78] Pseudo-Clement [1/1],[79] Chromatius Aquileiensis [1/1],[80] Jerome [9/9],[81] Sulpicius Severus [1/1],[82] Augustine [6/6],[83] John Cassian [3/3],[84] Claudianus Mamertu [1/1],[85] Faustus of Riez [1/1],[86] Salvian [2/2],[87] Eugippius [1/1],[88] Fulgentius of Ruspe [1/1],[89] Caesarius of Arles

[72] *Epistula,* 2.11 (C. Halm, *Sulpicii Severi, Opera, CSEL* 1 [Vienna, 1866]: 240.9ff.).

[73] *De instit. coenobiorum,* 6.12 (Petschenig, *Cassiani, Opera I: De institutis coenobiorum . . . de incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium, CSEL* 17 [Vienna, 1888]: 121.21ff.).

[74] Augustine (1/6) *(Sermo,* 46.9 [C. Lambot, *S. Aurelii Augustini; Sermones de Vetere Testamento, CCL* 41 (Turnholti, 1961): 536.4f.]).

[75] *Adversus haereses,* 4.13.1; 4.16.5 *(Rousseau,* et al., *SC* 100: 524.5ff.; 572.10f.).

[76] *De anima* 15.4; 40.4; 58.6; *De exhort castitatis,* 9.2; *De pudicitia,* 6.6 (Borleffs, *CCL* 2.2:801.28ff.; 843.28ff.; 868.33ff.; 1027.16ff; 1290.7ff.).

[77] *Hom. in Leviticum,* 3.3 (Baehrens, *GCS* 29:6.303.23ff.); *In Canticum Canticorum,* 1 (Baehrens, *GCS* 33:8.95.3ff.); *Comm. in evangel. Matthaei.* 21; 24 (Klostermann, *GCS* 38:11.37.16f.; *GCS* 40:10.244.17ff.).

[78] *Exposit. psalmi,* 118.1.12; 118.8.34; 118.16.3 (Petschenig, *CSEL* 62:13. 20f.; 169.28ff.; 353.8f.); *De paenitentia,* 1.14.70 (Faller, *CSEL* 73:152.13f.); *Exposit. evangel. Lucae,* 6.91 (Schenkl, *CSEL* 32.4:271.21f.).

[79] *Recognitiones* 7.37 (Rehm and Paschke, *GCS* 51:215.5ff.).

[80] *Tract. in evangel. Matthaei,* 9.1.1 (Bulhart, *CCL* 9:416.23ff.).

[81] *In Esaiam,* 18.66.18f. (Morin, *CCL* 73A.1:787.15ff.); *Tract. de psalmo* 138.9; 90.2f.; *Tract. in Marci evangel.* 1.1-12 (twice) (Capelle, et al., *CCL* 78:300.21ff.; 421.2f.; 455.1ff.); *Adversus Pelagianos,* 1.33 (Migne, *PL* 23:526. 36f.); *Epistulae,* 22.5; 76.2; 125.7 (Hilberg, *CSEL* 54:150.9ff.; *CSEL* 55:36.1f.; *CSEL* 56:125.15ff.).

[82] *Epistula,* 2.11 (Halm, *CSEL* 1:240.9ff.).

[83] *De divinis Scripturis sive Speculum,* 45 (Weihrich, *CSEL* 12:497.10ff.); *De sermone Domini,* 1.12.33 (Mutzenbecher, *CCL* 25.7:35.21ff.); *Contra Faustum,* 19.21 (Zycha, *CSEL* 25:520.5ff.);*Sermo* 98.5 (Migne, *PL* 38:593.52ff.); *De civitate Dei,* 14.10 (Dombart and Kalb, *CCL* 48:430.32ff.); *Sermo,* 46.9 (Lambot, *CCL* 41:536.4F.).

[84] *De instit. coenobiorum,* 6.12 (Petschenig, *CSEL* 17:121.21ff.); *Conlatio. Patrum,* 5.11; 12.2 (Petschenig, *CSEL* 13:133.7f.; 336.21ff.).

[85] *De statu animae,* 1.24 (Engelbrecht, *CSEL* 11:86.15f.).

[86] *Ruricii epistularum,* 2.17 (Engelbrecht, *CSEL* 21:401.14f.).

[87] *De gubernatione Dei,* 3.37; 6.49 (Pauly, *CSEL* 8:54.18ff.; 138.28ff.).

[88] *Excerpta ex operibus Augustini,* 303 (Knöll, *CSEL* 9.1:976.5ff.).

[89] *De incarnatione,* 50 (Fraipont, *CCL* 91a:353.7f.).

[2/2],[90] and Gregorius Magnus [2/2][91]), the *Didascalia* employs the verb *intenderit* ("shall look");[92] while (c) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ the construction of finite verb (e.g. *viderit* ["shall look"]) + noun (e.g. *mulierem* ["woman," "wife"]) (so it, vg, Irenaeus [2/2], Tertullian [2/6],[93] Origen [5/5], Athanasius [1/1], Ambrose [5/5], Pseudo-Clement [1/1], Chromatius Aquileiensis [1/1], Chrysostom [1/1], Jerome [9/9], Sulpicius Severus [1/1], Augustine [6/6], John Cassian [3/3], Claudianus Mamertu [1/1], Faustus of Riez [1/1], Salvian [2/2], Eugippius [1/1], Fulgentius of Ruspe [1/1], Caesarius of Arles [2/2], and Gregorius Magnus [2/2]),[94] the *Didascalia* alone employs the construction of finite verb (*intenderit* ["shall look"]) + preposition (*in* ["on," "at"]) + noun (*mulierem* ["wife"]);[95] and while (d) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations, without exception, employ the noun without modification (so all the witnesses cited under [b] and [c] above), the *Didascalia* employs the modifier *proximi sui* ("his neighbor's").[96]

[90] *Sermo*, 41.4; 5 (Morin, *CCL* 103:183.16f.; 31f.).

[91] *In librum primum Regum*, 1.26; 3.156 (Verbraken, *CCL* 144:69.8f.; 284.27ff.).

[92] Tertullian (1/6) *(De resurrectione mortuorum*, 15.4 [Borleffs, *CCL* 2.2:938.14]), has *conspexerit* ("shall have gazed"); Origen (1/5) *(Hom. in Jesu Nave*, 9.3 [Baehrens, *GCS* 30:7.348.20ff.]) has *adspexerit* ("shall have looked"); Athanasius (1/1) *Epistolae heortasticae*, 11.7 [Migne,*PG* 26:1408.10ff.]) has *spectat* ("observes"); and Chrysostom (1/1) *(In Matthaeum, Hom.*, 7.7 [Migne, *PG* 57:80.33f.]) has *respicit* ("reflects"). Hilary (1/1) *(Tract. in psalmum* 139.7 [Zingerle, *CSEL* 22:781.29f.]) has *vidit* ("looks").

[93] Tertullian (4/6) *(De anima*, 40.4; 58.6; *De resurrectione mortuorum*, 15.4; *De pudicitia*, 6.6 [Borleffs, *CCL* 2.2, 843.28ff.; 868.33f.; 983.14; 1290.7ff.]) and Hilary (1/1) *(Tract. in psalmum* 139.7 [Zingerle, *CSEL* 22:781.29f.]) omit the object altogether.

[94] See nn. 75-93, above, for the witnesses.

[95] Cf. the comparable construction in both the Syriac *Didascalia* and the Greek and Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum* at this point.

[96] Cf. the parallel modifiers *qrybh* ("his neighbor") and τοῦ πλησίον ("[his] neighbor's") in the Syriac *Didascalia* and the Greek *Constitutiones Apostolorum* respectively. There is an equivalent form in the Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum*.

The immediate implications of this comparison, as far as our questions are concerned, are that this citation, as employed by the Latin Didascalist, is, on the negative side, not a "dubbed in" form drawn on contemporary Latin Gospel traditions, and, on the positive side, either an *ad hoc* translation of the Latin Didascalist's Greek exemplar, or an *ad hoc* construction contrived by the Latin Didascalist to suit the special needs of its particular context.

As far as the *latter alternative* is concerned (namely, that the Latin rendering is possibly a construction contrived by the Latin Didascalist to suit the special needs of its particular context), the following factors are pertinent: (1) The parallel citation in the Syriac *Didascalia* and in the Greek and Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum* is essentially identical. (2) Of the distinctive features of the citation (as compared with its comparable parallel in the Latin Gospel traditions), none is determined by its particular context.

Since the three distinctive features discussed above[97] have equivalent forms in the Syriac *Didascalia* and the Greek and Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, I conclude that they already existed in the original Greek *Didascalia* and therefore they are not constructions contrived by the Latin Didascalist.

These factors, taken together, require the conclusions (a) that this citation is not, on the negative side, an *ad hoc* construction contrived to meet the special needs of its particular context, and (b) that it is, on the positive side, an *ad hoc* translation of the Latin Didascalist's Greek exemplar.

I turn then to a consideration of the *former alternative* (namely, that the Latin rendering is an *ad hoc* translation of the Latin Didascalist's Greek exemplar). The question of possible accommodation calls for immediate attention. Given the conclusion

[97] See pp. 147-152, above.

that the Latin Didascalist's citation is, in fact, an *ad hoc* transla-
tion, one question remains, that of possible accommodation
either (a) to the context of the citation itself and/or (b) to the
form of the comparable parallel in the contemporary Gospel
traditions.

In regard to (a), the factors just considered (namely, that
of the distinctive features of the citation [as compared with its
comparable parallel in the Gospel traditions], none is determined
by its particular context; and that the parallel citation in the
Syriac *Didascalia* and in the Greek and Arabic *Constitutiones
Apostolorum* is essentially identical) imply not only, as we have
argued above, that the Latin Didascalist did not contrive the
form of the citation to suit the special needs of its particular
context, but also that, given the conclusion we have now reached
(namely, that the Latin rendering represents an *ad hoc* translation
of its Greek exemplar), the Latin Didascalist has not accom-
modated his translation to the context in which it occurs.

In regard to (b), the factors noted above (to the effect that,
both in structure and content, the citation we are discussing is
distinctly different from the form of its comparable parallel in the
contemporary Latin Gospel traditions) imply not only, as we
have contended, that the Latin Didascalist's citation is not a
"dubbed in" equivalent (drawn on contemporary Latin Gospel
traditions) of its Greek exemplar, but also that, given the con-
clusion that the Latin rendering is indeed an *ad hoc* translation
of its Greek exemplar, the Latin Didascalist has not accommo-
dated his translation to the form of its parallel in the contempor-
ary Latin Gospel traditions.

## The Parallel in the Greek Gospel Traditions

I take up now a comparison of the Greek Constitutor's citation
with its comparable parallel in the Greek Gospel traditions. The
following distinctive features should be noted:

1. The formula ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ γέγραπται ("for it is written in the Law") (*Constit. Apost.*, part i) occurs nowhere else in the Greek Gospel traditions. While the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, either the formula ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη (" you have heard that is was said") (so ℵ B D E K S U V W Γ Π Σ Ω 1 209 22 1582 346 28 157 349 517 565 *al plur.*,[98] and Cyril of Alexandria [1/3][99]), ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ("you have heard that it was said to the ancients") so L M Δ ⊕ 13 124 543 33 892 *al. plur.*,[100] and Chrysostom [1/1][101]), or ἐρρέθη (γὰρ) τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ("[for] it was said to the ancients") (so Irenaeus [1/1],[102] and Cyril of Alexandria [2/3][103, 104] the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* alone employs the formula ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ γέγραπται ("for it is written in the Law").[105]

2. The parenthesis τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ τῷ διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, νῦν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν λέγω ("that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you") (*Constit. Apost.*, part iv) occurs nowhere else in the Greek Gospel traditions. Cf. the Gospel manuscripts,[106] Irenaeus (1/1),[107] Clement of Alexandria (4/4),[108] Origen (1/1),[109]

---

[98] See Legg, *NTG: Matthaeum*, ad loc.

[99] *In Zachariam*, 768c (P. E. Pusey, *Cyrilli Alexandrini, Opera: In XII Prophetas*, 2 [Oxford, 1869 (reprint, 1965)]: 468.17ff.).

[100] See Legg, *NTG: Matthaeum*, ad loc.

[101] *In Matthaeum, Hom.* 61.2 (Migne, *PG* 58:594.2ff.).

[102] *Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1 *(Rousseau, et al., SC* 100:525.5ff.).

[103] *In S. Joannem*, 3.3.267a; 11.9.982d (Pusey, *In D. Joannis Evangelium*, 1:393.30ff.; 2:712.7ff.).

[104] Origen (1/1) *(Comm. on John,* 20.17 [E. Preuschen, *Origenes: Werke, IV: Der Johanneskommentar, GCS* 10 (Leipzig, 1903): 4.349.33f.]) has simply ἐρρέθη ("it was said").

[105] Clement of Alexandria (1/1) *(Stromata,* 3.11;71.3 [O. Stählin and L. Früchtel, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, II: *Stromata* I-VI, *GCS* 52³ (Berlin, 1960): 3.228.15f.]) has ἠκούσατε τοῦ νόμου παραγγέλλοντος ("you have heard the command of the Law"); and Dorotheus of Gaza (1/1) *(Instructions,* I.6 [L. Regault and J. de Préville, *Dorothée de Gaza: Oeuvres Spirituelles, SC* 92 (Paris, 1963): 154.14f.]) has ὁ νόμος εἶπε("the Law has said").

[106] See Legg, *NTG: Matthaeum*, ad loc.

[107] *Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., *SC* 100.525.5ff.).

Chrysostom (1/1),[110] Cyril of Alexandria (3/3),[111] and Dorotheus of Gaza (1/1)[112]

3. The clause πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψει εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον("everyone who shall look at [his] neighbor's wife") (*Constit. Apost.*, part v) occurs, in precisely this form, nowhere else in the Greek Gospel traditions. While (a) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ either the construction of adjective (πᾶς ["every(one)"]) + article (ὁ ["the" ("who")]) + participle βλέπων ["looks"]) (so the majority of Gospel mss,[113] Theophilus of Antioch [1/1],[114] Irenaeus [1/2],[115] Clement of Alexandria [2/7],[116] Origen [1/5],[117] Eusebius [1/1],[118] Basil [1/1],[119] Macarius of Egypt [1/1],[120] *Acta Philippi* (2) [1/1],[121] Chrysostom [1/6],[122] and Cyril of Alexandria [1/1][123]), [124] article

---

[108] *Stromata* 3.2;9.1; 3.2;31.1; 3.11;71.3; 4.18;114.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52³:3.199.27f.; 210.9; 228.15f.; 298.24f.).

[109] *Comm. on John*, 20.17 (Preuschen, GCS 10:4.349.33f.).

[110] *In Matthaeum, Hom.* 17 (Migne, PG 57:255.1ff.).

[111] *In Zachariam*, 768c (Pusey, *In XII Prophetas*, 2:468.17ff.); *In S. Joannem*, 3.3.267a; 11.9.982d (Pusey, *In D. Joannis Evangelium* 1:393.30ff.; 2:712.7ff.).

[112] *Instructions*, 1.6 (Regault and Préville, SC 92:154.14f.).

[113] See Legg, *NTG: Matthaeum*, ad loc.

[114] *Ad Autolycum*, 3.13 (G. Bardy, *Ad Autolycum*, SC 20 [Paris, 1960]: 230.24ff.).

[115] *Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1 (Rousseau, et al., SC 100:525.5ff.).

[116] *Stromata*, 3.2;8.4; 3.14;94.3 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52³:3.199.16; 239.18f.).

[117] *Comm. on John*, 20.17 (Preuschen, GCS 10:4.349.33f.).

[118] *Demonstratio Evangelica* 3.6.4 (I. A. Heikel, *Eusebius: Werke*, VI: *Die Demonstratio Evangelica*, GCS 23 [Leipzig, 1913]: 132.24f.).

[119] *Letter*, 46.1 (R. J. Defarrari, *S. Basil: Letters*, LCL 190 [London, 1926]: 284.21ff.).

[120] *Homiliai pneumatikai*, 26.13 (H. Dörries, et al., *Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, PTS 4 [Berlin, 1964]: 211.3f.).

[121] *Acta Philippi* (2), 142 (R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, 2.2 [Darmstadt, 1959]: 80.26ff.).

[122] *In Matthaeum, Hom.* 17 (Migne, PG 57:255.1ff.).

[123] *In Zachariam*, 786c (Pusey, *In XII Prophetas*, 2:468.17ff.).

[124] Theophilus (1/1) has πᾶς ὁ ἰδών("everyone who has looked"); Clement of Alexandria (1/2),πᾶς ὁ προσβλέπων ("everyone who looks"); Basil (1/1), πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέπων("everyone who looks"); *Acta Philippi* (2) (1/1), πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέψας ("everyone who has looked"); and Chrysostom (1/1), πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέπων("everyone who looks"). All the other witnesses listed have πᾶς ὁ βλέπων ("everyone who looks").

( ὁ ["the" ("who")] ) + participle ( βλέπων ["looks"] ) (so some Gospel manuscripts,[125] Athenagoras [1/1],[126] Irenaeus [1/2],[127] Clement of Alexandria [5/7],[128] Chrysostom [5/6],[129] Nemesius of Emesa [1/1],[130] and Theodoret of Cyrrhus [1/1[131]]),[132] or indefinite relative pronoun construction (e.g. ὅ [ἐ]άν ["whoever"] ) + finite verb in the subjunctive mood (e.g. ἐμβλέψῃ ["should look"] ) (so some Gospel mss, [133] Justin Martyr [1/1],[134] Origen [4/5],[135] and Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1[136]]), [137, 138] the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* alone employs the construction of adjective ( πᾶς ["every(one)"] ) + indefinite relative pronoun ( ὅστις ["who"] ) + finite verb ( ἐμβλέψει ["shall look"] ); and while

[125] See Legg, *NTG: Matthaeum*, ad loc.

[126] *Supplicatio pro Christianis*, 32.8 (J. C. T. Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi*, 7 [Wiesbaden, 1888 (reprint, 1969)]: 166.7ff.).

[127] *Adversus haereses*, 4.16.5 (Rousseau, et al., SC 100:573.9ff.).

[128] *Paedagogus*, 3.5;33.2 (Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, I: *Protrepticus und Paedagogus*, GCS 12 [Leipzig, 1905]:1.77.22f.); *Stromata*, 2.11;50.2; 2.14;61.3; 2.15;66.1; 4.18;114.2 (Stählin and Früchtel, GCS 52³:3.139.18f.; 146.9f.; 148.13; 298.24f.).

[129] *In Matthaeum, Hom.* 61.2 (Migne, PG 58:594.2ff.); *In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom.*, 7.7; 42.3 (Migne, PG 61:64.64f.; 366.49f.); *Catechesis*, 1.32 (A. Wenger, *Jean Chrysostome: Huit Catéchèses baptismales*, SC 50 [Paris, 1970]: 124.30f.); 2.5 (Migne, PG 49:240.17f.).

[130] *De natura hominis*, 40.86f. (Migne, PG 40:769.24f.).

[131] *Graecorum affectionum curatio*, 9.57 (P. Canivet, *Theodoret de Cyre: Thérapeutique de maladies helléniques*, SC 57 [Paris. 1958]: 354.10f.).

[132] Athenagoras (1/1) and Irenaeus (1/2) have ὁ βλέπων ("who looks"); Clement of Alexandria (3/5), Chrysostom (5/5), Nemesius of Emesa (1/1), and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (1/1) have ὁ ἐμβλέψας ("who has looked"); and Clement of Alexandria has ὁ ἰδών ("who has looked") and ὁ ἐπιθυμήσας ("who has desired").

[133] See Legg, *NTG: Matthaeum*, ad loc.

[134] *Apologia*, 1.15.1 (Otto, CAC 1:46.6ff.).

[135] *Contra Celsum*, 3.44 (P. Koetschau, *Origenes: Werke, I: Die Schrift vom Martyrium. Gegen Celsus I-IV*, GCS 2 [Leipzig, 1899], 1.240.7ff.); *Comm. on John*, 20.23 (Preuschen, GCS 10:4.350.14f.); *De Principiis*, 3.1.6 (Koetschau, *Origenes: Werke, V: Die Principiis*, GCS 22 [Leipzig, 1913]: 5.202.7f.); *Selecta in Ezechiel*, 6 (C. H. E. Lommatzsch, *Origenis, Opera omnia*, 14 [Berlin, 1840]: 195).

[136] *Catecheses*, 1.13.5 (W. C. Reischl and J. Rupp, *Cyrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera omnia*, 2 [Munich, 1860 (reprint, 1967)]: 56.6f.).

[137] *Acta Philippi* (1), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, AAA 2.2:80.12ff.) has πᾶς ὅς ἐάν ἐμβλέψῃ ("everyone who should look').

[138] All the witnesses listed employ the verb ἐμβλέψῃ ("should look").

(b) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ the construction of participle or finite verb ( βλέπων ["looks"] or ἐμβλέψει ["shall look"]) + anarthrous noun in the accusative or dative case (e.g. γυναῖκα/γυναικί ["woman," "wife"]) (so the Gospel mss,[139] Justin Martyr [1/1], Athenagoras [1/1], Theophilus of Antioch [1/1], Irenaeus [2/2], Clement of Alexandria [1/7],[140] Origen [5/5], Eusebius [1/1], Basil [1/1], Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1], Macarius of Egypt [1/1], *Acta Philippi* (1) [1/1], Chrysostom [6/6], Nemesius of Emesa [1/1], Cyril of Alexandria [1/1], and Theodoret of Cyrrhus [1/1]),[141] the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* alone employs the construction of finite verb ( ἐμβλέψει ["shall look"]) + preposition ( εἰς ["on," "at"]) + articular noun in the accusative case ( τὴν γυναῖκα ["wife"]);[142] and while (c) the Gospel manuscripts and the Patristic citations employ, in the main, the noun without modification (so all the witnesses, with the exception of Theophilus of Antioch [1/1],[143] and *Acta Philippi* (2) [1/1],[144] cited under (b) above), the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* employs the modifier τοῦ πλησίον ("[his] neighbor's").[145]

The immediate implications of this comparison, as far as our questions are concerned, are that this citation, as employed by the Greek Constitutor, is, on the negative side, not a "dubbed in"

[139] See Legg, *NTG: Matthaeum*, ad loc.

[140] Clement of Alexandria (5/7) omits the noun altogether.

[141] For the references see nn. 114-136, above.

[142] *Acta Philippi* (2), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA* 2.2:80.26ff.) has a very similar form, namely, πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέψας εἰς γυναῖκα ("everyone who has looked at a woman/wife").

[143] Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autolycum*, 3.13 [Bardy,*SC* 20:230.24ff.]) has the modifier ἀλλοτρίαν ("another's"). Cf. Clement of Alexandria *(Stromata*, 7.13;82.3 [Stählin *et al., Clemens Alexandrinus, III: Stromata VII and VIII, GCS* 17² (Berlin, 1970): 3.58.28]):Μὴ ἐμβλέψῃς πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ἀλλοτρίᾳ γυναικί("You shall not look with desire at another's wife").

[144] *Acta Philippi* (2), 142 (Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA* 2.2:80.26ff.) has τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ("his neighbor's").

[145] Cf. the parallel modifiers *qrybh* ("his neighbot") and *proximi sui* ("his neighbor's") in the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae* respectively. There is an equivalent form in the Arabic *Constitutiones Apostolorum*.

form drawn on contemporary Greek Gospel traditions, and, on the positive side, either an *ad hoc* copy of the Greek Constitutor's Greek exemplar, or an *ad hoc* construction contrived by the Greek Constitutor to suit the special needs of its particular context.

As far as the *latter alternative* is concerned (namely, that the Greek rendering is possibly a construction contrived by the Greek Constitutor to suit the special needs of its particular context), the following factors are pertinent: (1) The parallel citation in the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae* is essentially identical. (2) Of the distinctive features of the citation (as compared with its comparable parallel in the Greek Gospel traditions), none is determined by its particular context.

, Since the three distinctive features discussed above[146] have essentially identical forms in the parallel citation in the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae,* I conclude that they already existed in the Greek exemplar(s) on which all three versions drew.

These factors, taken together, require the conclusions (a) that this citation is not, on the negative side, an *ad hoc* construction contrived to meet the special needs of its particular context, and (b) that it is, on the positive side, an *ad hoc* copy of the Greek Constitutor's Greek exemplar.

I turn then to a consideration of the *former alternative* (namely, that the Greek rendering is an *ad hoc* copy of the Greek Constitutor's Greek exemplar). The question of possible accommodation calls for immediate attention. Given the conclusion that the Greek Constitutor's citation is, in fact, an *ad hoc* copy, one question remains, that of possible accommodation either (a) to the context of the citation itself and/or (b) to the form of the comparable parallel in the contemporary Gospel traditions.

[146] See pp. 155-158 above.

In regard to (a), the factors just considered (namely, that of the distinctive features of the citation [as compared with its comparable parallel in the Gospel traditions], none is determined by its particular context; and that the parallel elements in the Syriac and Latin *Didascaliae* are essentially identical) imply not only, as we have already argued, that the Greek Constitutor did not contrive the form of the citation to suit the special needs of its particular context, but also that, given the conclusion we have now reached (namely, that the Greek rendering represents an *ad hoc* copy of its Greek exemplar), the Greek Constitutor has not accommodated his copy to the context in which it occurs.

In regard to (b), the factors noted above (to the effect that, both in structure and content, the citation we are discussing is distinctly different from the form of its comparable parallel in the contemporary Greek Gospel traditions) imply not only, as we have contended, that the Greek Constitutor's citation is not a "dubbed in" equivalent (drawn on contemporary Greek Gospel traditions) of the form found in his Greek exemplar, but also that, given the conclusion that the Greek rendering is indeed an *ad hoc* copy, the Greek Constitutor has not accommodated his copy to the form of its parallel in the contemporary Greek Gospel traditions.

## The Text in the Arabic and Ethiopic Versions

The text of the Arabic version reads as follows: "It is written in the Law, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you (it was I who spoke, in the Law, by the mouth of Moses, but now I say to you), Everyone who has looked at the wife of his friend, to desire her, has committed adultery with her in his heart."[147]

The same distinctive features which we have noted in the Greek version occur here: (1) the formula, "It is written in the Law"; (2) the parenthesis, "it was I who spoke, in the Law, by the mouth of Moses, but now I say to you"; and (3) the

---

[147] For the Arabic text see Dawud, *'ldsqwlyt*, p. 17.8f.

unique reading, "Everyone who has looked at the wife *of his friend.*"

For reasons parallel to those given with respect to the Greek version, I conclude that the Arabic version represents an *ad hoc* translation of an exemplar essentially identical, in form and content, to that which the Greek Constitutor employed.

The text of the Ethiopic version reads as follows: "For he teaches us and gives us understanding and strengthens us by the Holy Spirit, that he may fulfill the Law, in which it is written, saying, 'You shalt not commit adultery.' But I say to you, Everyone who has looked at a woman and lusted after her has committed adultery with her already in his heart."[148]

Of the distinctive features of the Greek and Arabic versions, only a vestige of item (1) (the formula ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ γέγραπται ["for it is written in the Law"] [*Constit. Apost. Grk.*] = "it is written in the Law" [*Constit. Apost. Arab.*]) remains. It has been editorialized so that it no longer functions as an integral part of the *logos* itself, but as a part of the general introductory formula. The parenthesis, item (2) (τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ τῷ διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, νῦν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν λέγω ["that is, I spoke, in the Law, by Moses, but now I myself speak to you"] [*Constit. Apost. Grk.*] = "It was I who spoke, in the Law, by the mouth of Moses, but now I say to you" [*Constit. Apost. Arab.*]) no longer appears. Nor does the unique reading, item (3) ( πᾶς , ὅστις ἐμβλέψει εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον ["everyone who shall look at *(his)* neighbor's wife"] [*Constit. Apost. Grk.*] = "Everyone who has looked at the wife *of his friend*" [*Constit. Apost. Arab.*]).

Apart from the *past* tense in the clause, 'Everyone who has looked at a woman' (instead of the *present* tense),[149] and the *coordinating* clause "and lusted after her" (instead of a *telic* or

---

[148] Cf. Harden, *Ethiopic Didascalia*, 3.15ff.

[149] The majority of the Gospel manuscripts and Patristic citations have

*consequential* clause),[150] the *logos*, as cited by the Ethiopic Constitutor, is essentially identical with its parallel in the first Gospel.

It is patent that the Ethiopic Constitutor has accommodated his translation to the form of the *logos* as it appeared in the contemporary texts of Matthew.


## 2. *Reconstruction of the Greek Original*

In view of the fact that, as has been demonstrated, the Syriac and Latin versions of the *Didascalia*, and the Greek and Arabic versions of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*,[151] represent *ad hoc* renderings of their respective Greek exemplars, we may with some confidence conjecture the form of those exemplars and thereby determine the form of the original Greek text. The implications of the evidence, as set out above, are:

a present-tense participle (in addition to the majority of manuscripts, Athenagoras [1/1], Irenaeus [2/2], Clement of Alexandria [1/7], Origen [1/5], Eusebius [1/1], Macarius [1/1], and Cyril of Alexandria [1/1] have ὁ βλέπων ["who looks"]; Basil [1/1] and Chrysostom [1/6] have ὁ ἐμβλέπων ["who looks"]; Clement of Alexandria [1/7] has ὁ προσβλέπων [who looks"]). However, a number of witnesses have the aorist tense (in addition to K 28 117 157 243 477 1093 and 1606, Clement of Alexandria [3/7], *Acta Philippi* [2] [1/1], Chrysostom [5/6], Nemesius of Emesa [1/1], and Theodoret of Cyrrhus [1/1] have ὁ ἐμβλέψας ["who has looked"]; Theophilus of Antioch [1/1], and Clement of Alexandria [1/7] have ὁ ἰδών ["who has looked"]).

[150] The majority of Gospel manuscripts and Patristic citations have a telic or consequential clause (in addition to the majority of manuscripts, Justin Martyr [1/1], Athenagoras [1/1], Theophilus of Antioch [1/1], Irenaeus [2/2], Clement of Alexandria [1/5], Origen [5/5], Eusebius [1/1], Basil [1/1], Cyril of Jerusalem [1/1], Macarius of Egypt [1/1], Chrysostom [6/6], Nemesius of Emesa [1/1], Cyril of Alexandria [1/1], and Theodoret of Cyrrhus [1/1] have πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν [αὐτῆς] ["to desire her"]). Clement of Alexandria (4/5) has πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ("with desire"). Only the *Acta Philippi* (2), 142 has a form comparable to that of the Ethiopic *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, namely, καὶ ἐπιθυμήσας αὐτήν ("and desired her"). Cf. the reading *wr'g lh* ("and desires her") in codices *Sinaiticus* and *Curetonianus*, and Titus of Bostra (1/1).

[151] As has been demonstrated, the Ethiopic version of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum* is considerably accommodated to its Matthaean parallel and therefore of little if any practical value in the determination of the original Greek text.

1. That the Greek Didascalist began his citation with the formula ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ γέγραπται ("for it is written in the Law") (and not, as in the contemporary Gospel traditions, with the clause ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη [τοῖς ἀρχαίοις] ["you have heard that it was said (to the ancients")]).[152] All four witnesses imply this: *mṭl dktyb bnmws'* ("for it is written in the Law") (*Didasc. Syr.*) =*quoniam in lege scriptum est* ("for it is written in the Law") (*Didasc. Lat.*) = ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ γέγραπται ("for it is written in the Law") (*Constit. Apost. Grk.*) = "it is written in the Law" (*Constit. Apost. Arab.*).

2. That the Greek Didascalist employed the parenthesis τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Νομῳ (τῷ) διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, νῦν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν λέγω ("that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you"). All four witnesses imply such: *hw dbnmws' byd mws' mllt hs' dyn 'n' qnwmy 'mr 'n' lkwn* ("that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you") (*Didasc. Syr.*) = *id est in lege per Moysen locutus sum, nunc autem ipse vobis dico* ("that is, I have spoken, in the law, through Moses, now however, I myself speak to you") (*Didasc. Lat.*) = τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Νομῳ τῷ διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, νῦν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν λέγω ("that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you") (*Constit. Apost. Grk.*) = "it was I who spoke, in the Law, by the mouth of Moses, but now I say to you" (*Constit. Apost. Arab.*).

3. That the Greek Didascalist employed the unique reading

[152] The majority of the Gospel manuscripts and Cyril of Alexandria (1/3) (*In Zachariam*, 768c [Pusey, *In XII Prophetas*, 2:468.17ff.]) have ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη ("you have heard that it was said"); a number of Gospel manuscripts and Chrysostom (1/1) (*In Matthaeum, Hom.* 61.2 [Migne, *PG* 58:594.2ff.] have ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ("you have heard that it was said to the ancients"); Irenaeus (1/1) (*Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1 [Rousseau, *et al.*, *SC* 100:525.5ff.]), and Cyril of Alexandria (2/3) (*In S. Joannem*, 3.3.267a; 11.9.982d [Pusey, *In D. Joannis Evangelium*, 1:393.30ff.; 2:712.7ff.]) have ἐρρέθη (γὰρ) τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ("[for] it was said to the ancients").

πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψει εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ ("everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife") (and not one of the more common readings of the contemporary Gospel traditions, e.g. [πᾶς] ὁ [ἐμ]βλέπων γυναῖκα ["everyone who looks on/at a woman/wife"]).[153] All four witnesses imply this: *dklmn dnḥwr b'ntt qrybh* ("everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife") (*Didasc. Syr.*) = *omnis, quicumque intenderit in mulierem proximi sui* ("everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife") (*Didasc. Lat.*) = πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψει εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον ("everyone who shall look at [his] neighbor's wife") (*Constit. Apost. Grk.*) = "everyone who has looked at the wife of his friend" (*Constit. Apost. Arab.*).

4. That the Greek Didascalist employed the construction: adjective πᾶς ("every[one]") + indefinite relative pronoun ὅστις ("who") + the finite verb ἐμβλέψει ("shall look") (and not one of the more common constructions of the contemporary Gospel traditions, e.g. the adjective πᾶς ["every(one)"] + the article ὁ ["the" ("who")] + the participle βλέπων ["looks"]).[154] That he employed the adjective πᾶς ("every-[one]") is implied by the combined testimony of the Syriac Didascalist's *kl* ("everyone") and the Latin Didascalist's *omnis*

---

[153] So the majority of Gospel manuscripts, Athenagoras (1/1) *(Supplicatio pro Christianis*, 32.8 [Otto, *CAC* 7:166.7ff.]), Irenaeus (2/2) *(Adversus haereses*, 4.13.1; 4.16.5 [Rousseau, et al., *SC* 100: 525.5ff.; 573.9ff.]), Clement of Alexandria (1/7) (Stromata, 3.14; 19.3 [Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52³:3.239.18f.]), Origen (1/5) *(Comm. on John*, 20.17 [Preuschen, *GCS* 10:4.349.33f.]), Eusebius (1/1) *(Demonstratio Evangelica*, 3.6.4 [Heikel, *GCS* 23:132.24f.]), Basil (1/1) Letter 46.1 [Deferrari, *LCL* 190:284.21ff.]), Macarius of Egypt, *Homiliai pneumatikai*, 26.13 [Dörries, et al., *PTS* 4:211.3f.]), Chrysostom (1/6) *(In Matthaeum, Hom.* 17 [Migne, *PG* 57:255.1ff.]), and Cyril of Alexandria (1/1) *(In Zachariam*, 768c [Pusey, *In XII Prophetas*, 2:468.17ff.]).

Chrysostom (5/6) *(In Matthaeum, Hom.* 17 [Migne, *PG* 57:255.1ff.]; *In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom.* 7.7; 42.3 [Migne, *PG* 61:64.64f.; 366.49f.]; *Catechesis* 1.32 [Wenger, *SC* 50:124.30f.]; 2.5 [Migne, *PG* 49: 240.17f.]), Nemesius of Emesa (1/1) *(De natura hominis*, 40.86f. [Migne, *PG* 40:769.24f.]), and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (1/1) *(Graecorum affectionum curatio*, 9.57 [Canivet, *SC* 57:354.10f.]) have ὁ ἐμβλέψας γυναικί ("who has looked [at] a woman/wife").

[154] See n. 153, above.

("everyone"), supported by the Greek Constitutor's πᾶς
("every[one]") and the Arabic Constitutor's *kl* ("everyone");
that he employed the indefinite relative pronoun ὅστις ("who-
ever") seems to be implied by the combined testimony of the
Syriac Didascalist's *mn* ("whoever") and the Latin Didascalist's
*quicumque* ("whoever"), supported by the Greek Constitutor's
ὅστις ("whoever") and the Arabic Constitutor's *mn* ("who-
ever"); and, finally, that he employed the finite verb ἐμβλέψει
("shall look") seems to be implied by the combined testimony
of the Syriac Didascalist's finite verb *nḥwr* ("shall look") and the
Latin Didascalist's finite verb *intenderit* ("shall look"), supported
by the Greek Constitutor's finite verb ἐμβλέψει ("shall look")
and the Arabic Constitutor's finite verb *ndr* ("has looked").

In view of the fact that the Greek Constitutor appears to be
following his exemplar rather closely here, and in view of the
fact that a Greek text identical with his would yield quite
naturally constructions essentially identical with those of the
Syriac and Latin translations, it seems unnecessary to conjecture
any other possible construction such as that of the *Acta Philippi*
(1) 142,[155] namely πᾶς ὅς ἐὰν ἐμβλέψῃ ("everyone who should
look").

5. That the Greek Didascalist employed the prepositional
phrase εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ ("on/at his neigh-
bor's wife") and not one of the more common readings in the con-
temporary Gospel traditions, e.g. the anarthrous noun in either
the dative or accusative case without either preceding preposi-
tion or following modifier).[156] That he employed the preposition

[155] Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA*, 2.2:80.12ff.

[156] So the majority of Gospel manuscripts and Justin Martyr (1/1)
*(Apologia*, 1.15.1 [Otto, *CAC* 1:46.6ff.]), Athenagoras (1/1) *(Supplicatio. pro
Christianis* 32.8 [Otto, *CAC* 7:166.7ff.]), Irenaeus (2/2) *(Adversus haereses,*
4.13.1; 4.16.5 [Rousseau, et al., *SC* 100:525.5ff.; 573.9ff.]), Clement of Alex-
andria (1/7) *(Stromata,* 3.14;94.3 [Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 52²:3.298.24f.]),
Origen (5/5) *(Contra Celsum,* 3.44. [Koetschau, *GCS* 2:1.240.7ff.], *Comm. on
John,* 20.17; 20.23 [Preuschen, *GCS* 10:4.349.33f.; 4.350.14f], *De Principiis,* 3.1.6
[Koetschau, *GCS* 22:5.202.7f.], *Selecta in Ezechiel,* 6 [Lommatzsch, *Origenis,
Opera,* 14:195]), Eusebius (1/1) *(Demonstratio Evangelica,* 3.6.4 [Heikel, *GCS*

εἰς ("on," "at") is implied by the combined testimony of the Syriac Didascalist's *b* ("on," "at") and the Latin Didascalist's *in* ("on," "at") supported by the Greek Constitutor's εἰς ("on," "at") (cf. the Arabic Constitutor's *'l'* ["on," "at"]); and that he employed the modifier τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ ("his neighbor") is implied by the combined testimony of the Syriac Didascalist's *qrybh* ("his neighbor") and the Latin Didascalist's *proximi sui* ("his neighbor"), supported by the Greek Constitutor's τοῦ πλησίον ("[his] neighbor") and the Arabic Constitutor's *qrybh* ("his friend").

6. The remaining phrases and clauses (such as ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ["but I say to you"] and πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι ["to desire"]) seem to be so probable as not to require any further discussion.

Given the above analysis and evaluation of the evidence, I conjecture that the dominical *logos* we are here discussing

---

23:132.24f.]), Basil (1/1) (Letter 46.1 [Deferrari, *LCL* 190:284.21ff.]), Cyril of Jerusalem (1/1) *(Catecheses*, 1.13.5 [Reischl and Rupp, *Cyrilli Hierosolymarum, Opera*, 2:56.6f.]), Macarius of Egypt *(Homiliai pneumatikai*, 26.13 [Dörries, *et al., PTS* 4:211.3f.]), *Acta Philippi* (1) (1/1) (Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA*, 2.2:80.12ff.), Chrysostom (6/6) *(In Matthaeum, Hom.* 17, 61.2 [Migne, *PG* 57:255.1ff.; *PG* 58:594.2ff.], *In epistolam primam ad Corinthios, Hom.* 7.7;42.3 [Migne, *PG* 61:64.64f.; 366.49f.], *Catechesis*, 1.32 [Wenger, *SC* 50: 124.30f.], 2.5 [Migne, *PG* 49:240.17f.]), Nemesius of Emesa (1/1) *(De natura hominis*, 40.86f. [Migne, *PG* 40:769.24f.]), Cyril of Alexandria (1/1) *(In Zachariam*, 768c [Pusey, *In XII Prophetas*, 2:468.17ff.]), and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (1/1) *(Graecorum affectionum curatio*, 9.57 [Canivet, *SC* 7:354.10f.]). Clement of Alexandria (5/7) omits the noun altogether.

Theophilus of Antioch (1/1) *(Ad Autolycum*, 3.13 [Bardy, *SC* 20:230. 24ff.]) has the construction γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρίαν ("another's wife") (but without the preceding preposition). Cf. Clement of Alexandria *(Stromata*, 7.13, 82.3 [Stählin and Früchtel, *GCS* 17²:3.58.28]: Μὴ ἐμβλέψῃς πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ἀλλοτρίᾳ γυναικί ["You shall not look with desire at another's wife"]).

*Acta Philippi* (2) (1/1) (Lipsius and Bonnet, *AAA* 2.2:80.26ff.) has the comparable construction, εἰς γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ ("on/at his neighbor's wife").

appeared in the following form in the original text of the Greek *Didascalia:* ὅτι ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ γέγραπται· Οὐ μοιχεύσεις· Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ (τῷ) διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, νῦν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν λέγω· Πᾶς, ὅστις ἐμβλέψει εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν, ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ    ("for it is written in the Law, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you [that is, I spoke, in the Law, through Moses, but now I myself speak to you], Everyone who shall look at his neighbor's wife, to desire her, has already committed adultery with her in his heart.").

*(To be continued)*

# THE EXEGETICAL METHODS OF SOME SIXTEENTH-CENTURY
## ANGLICAN PREACHERS: LATIMER, JEWEL, HOOKER,
## AND ANDREWES
### PART II*

ERWIN R. GANE

Pacific Union College
Angwin, California

In Part I of this series, I provided a brief overview of the preaching careers of the four Anglican preachers here under consideration—Hugh Latimer, John Jewel, Richard Hooker, and Lancelot Andrewes—plus giving brief attention to the variations in their homiletical techniques. I also analyzed their concept of the Bible, which concept is fundamental to their exegetical methods. Herein I will continue the analysis of these methods under the subheadings of "Allegory," "Typology," "Literal Exposition of Scripture," "Other Exegetical Practices," "Use of the Church Fathers," and "Attitudes to Antiquity."

### 3. Allegory

Allegory is very rare in the sermons of our four Anglican preachers, but it does occur incidentally. Latimer, e.g. preaching at Stamford in 1550, likened false doctrine to the fire of the burning bush of Moses' day and to the fiery furnace of Nebuchadnezzar. Just as the fire which Moses saw did not burn the bush and the fire of the fiery furnace did not consume the three Hebrew worthies, so the fires of false doctrine

---

*Part I was published in *A USS* 17 (1979): 23-38. The following abbreviated forms are used herein for works already cited in Part I:

Andrewes = Lancelot Andrewes, *Ninety-Six Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, Sometime Lord Bishop of Winchester* (Oxford, 1854-1871).

Ayre = John Ayre, ed., *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury* (Cambridge, Eng., 1845-1850).

Keble = John Keble, ed., *The Works of That Learned and Judicious Mr. Richard Hooker, With an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton* (Oxford, 1874).

Watkins = John Watkins, ed., *The Sermons and Life of the Right Reverend Father in God, and Constant Martyr of Jesus Christ, Hugh Latimer, Some Time Bishop of Worcester* (London, 1858).

did not destroy God's faithful people.[66] In 1552, Latimer again likened false doctrine to the fire of Nebuchadnezzar's furnace, stating that "even so is it with the popery." The nature of "false doctrine," he continued, "is to consume, to corrupt and bring to everlasting sorrow."[67] Yet he fondly hoped that his forefathers, who were adherents of Roman Catholicism, were not all damned, because they could be protected from false doctrine, even though living in the midst of it, and they could turn to know Christ just before death.

Preaching in 1553, Latimer applied allegorically the gold, frankincense, and myrrh given by the wise men to Christ. Gold, the king of metals, "signified him to be the king above all kings, and that the doctrine of him is the very true doctrine"; frankincense represented the prayers of God's faithful; and myrrh signified the sufferings of Christian believers.[68] On another occasion Latimer applied the gifts of the wise men quite differently. Gold signified Christ's kingdom, myrrh his morality, and frankincense his priesthood.[69] In the process of elucidating the story of Jesus' turning the water into wine at the wedding feast in Cana of Galilee, Latimer declared that "water signifieth all such anguishes, calamities and miseries as may happen by marriages." But just as Jesus turned the "sour water" into wine, so he sends his Spirit to sweeten the bitter experiences of married life, to comfort the heart and keep it from desperation.[70]

Jewel and Hooker very rarely resorted to allegory. Jewel made metaphorical or "spiritual" applications which were not medieval-type allegory, but rather a "literal" kind of application of the text. For instance, using the imagery employed by Christ with respect to the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood (John 6), Jewel quoted the interpretation of Chrysostom, Cyprian, Bernard, and Ambrose, which happened to agree with his own; namely, that to "eat the body of Christ, and drink his blood, is not the part of the body: it is rather a work of our mind."[71]

---

[66]Watkins, 1: 290.

[67]Ibid., 2: 197.

[68]Ibid., 2: 359.

[69]Ibid., 2: 381.

[70]Ibid., 2: 392.

[71]Ayre, 2: 1042-1043.

Hooker, quoting Hag 1:4, used the temple built after the Jews' restoration from the Babylonian captivity as a symbol of the soul temple which is indwelt by the Holy Spirit. Hooker's point is that just as the Jewish temple needed to be rebuilt for the indwelling of God, so the spiritual lives of his listeners needed to be revived.[72] That he allegorized is undoubted; yet there are NT passages to which he could have appealed, such as I Cor 3:16 and 6:19, which use temple imagery in substantially the same way.

As for Andrewes, it is quite inaccurate to assert, as does J. W. Blench, that he "favours the old allegoric method."[73] In fact, the vast majority of Andrewes's interpretations are determined by context, language, and comparison with other Bible passages. His expertise in Greek and Hebrew, as well as his overall knowledge of biblical literature, renders possible a more profound conformity to nuances of meaning which are thoroughly germane to the text. The allegorical applications which do occur are usually for the purpose of sermon illustration, rather than for doctrinal substantiation. Andrewes occasionally falls into the trap which confronts all homileticians of illustrating spiritual messages with substantially unrelated Bible examples.

For instance, Andrewes illustrates the characteristics of the three members of the Trinity by the three parts of the song sung by the angel choir at the birth of Jesus (Luke 2:14).[74] Again, he reads his two pillars of government into Ps 75:3, "The earth and all the inhabitants thereof are dissolved: but I will establish the pillars of it." In context, "the pillars" are in no way a reference to the pillars of government, but Andrewes applies them so. The two "pillars" which he identifies are (1) the worship of God, and (2) the execution of justice.[75] Thus, the text has become a convenient stepping-off place for the discussion of good secular government. The same two aspects of government Andrewes has further illustrated by the two likenesses of cherubim on either end of the ark of the covenant in the wilderness tabernacle.[76] Such allegorical

---

[72] Keble, 3: 686.

[73] J. W. Blench, *Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (New York, 1964), p. 66.

[74] Andrewes, 1: 217.

[75] Ibid., 2: 3.

[76] Ibid., 2: 32.

applications would have done justice to a fifteenth-century sermon, but
it is not characteristic of Andrewes's style. Nor was his assertion that
the three spears with which Absalom was slain represent the three
parties whom he offended; namely, God, the State, and the Church.[77]

## 4. Typology

Typology is an exegetical technique sometimes used by Latimer,
Jewel, and Andrewes. Latimer repeats John's application of the wilder-
ness brazen serpent to Christ's death on the Cross (John 3); the death
pangs endured by Christ, he illustrates by the OT sufferings of David,
Jonah, and Hezekiah; and the Pharisees are likened to the papists of
Latimer's day, whom he regarded as "enemies to Christ and his doc-
trine."[78] The last application, however, is really more allegorical than
typological.

Jewel employs typology somewhat more frequently. The rock which
gave water to the Israelites in the wilderness represented Christ, the
manna symbolized the body of Christ, the brazen serpent typified
Christ upon the cross, and the lamb offered in connection with the OT
sanctuary service pointed forward to Christ as the lamb of God (John
1:29).[79] Jericho represented the power of evil, the falsehood and dark-
ness which God overthrows "with the breath of his mouth and with
the blast of his word."[80] Joshua commanded his people to march
around Jericho without using any weapon, while the strong men of the
city manned the walls. "Thus it fareth oftentimes in spiritual warfares:
falsehood is armed; and truth goeth naked: falsehood maketh outcries;
and truth saith little: falsehood is bold; and truth is outfaced."[81] This
is typology bordering on allegory.

So also is the case with Jewel's reference to the power of ancient
Babylon and Egypt to represent the power of falsehood. Just as God
was strong to save from political enemies in ancient times, so is his
truth strong today.[82] And the restoration of true religion in David's

---

[77]Ibid., 4: 17.

[78]Watkins, 1: 71, 204, 270.

[79]Ayre, 2: 969.

[80]Ibid., 2: 970.

[81]Ibid., 2: 971.

[82]Ibid., 2: 971-973.

day was used by Jewel as a type of the success of the Gospel in Paul's day.[83] Indeed, the history of ancient Israel, Jewel indicated, has been repeated in the history of the Christian Church.[84]

Andrewes employs typological interpretation to a limited extent. The Paschal Lamb typified Christ, who was crucified at Passover season; the sour herbs eaten at Passover time represented the "fruits of repentance"; and the Passover season itself represented the Christian Easter.[85] The Paschal lamb also represented the Eucharist: "Look how soon the Paschal lamb eaten, presently the holy Eucharist instituted, to succeed in the place of it for ever."[86]

Andrewes cites John 3:14 as authority for applying the wilderness brazen serpent to Christ.[87] The exodus of the Jews from Egypt represents "spiritually" our deliverance "from the servitude and the power of darkness," and the antitypical land of promise is "Heaven itself, where is all joy and happiness for evermore."[88] To a lesser extent than in Roman Catholic sermons of the times, the typology used by these Anglican preachers merges into allegory.

## 5. *Literal Exposition of Scripture*

"Literal" or "normal" interpretation is by far the most common method used in the sermons of Latimer, Jewel, Hooker, and Andrewes. To provide an exhaustive account of the use of this mode of exegesis by our four preachers would involve some discussion of every one of their extant sermons. The plan here is to provide examples from the sermons of these preachers to illustrate their characteristic method of using the Bible text.

Our four Anglican preachers rejected, for the most part, the medieval approach to the Bible and attempted to present the message of Scripture substantially as it was written. However, we would be naive to imagine that all of their "literal" interpretations are completely sound exegetically. The preachers were influenced by their local historical environment and by those religious, social, political, and economic mores

---

[83]Ibid., 2: 1005.

[84]Ibid., 2: 1044.

[85]Andrewes, 1: 441; 2: 291-292.

[86]Ibid., 2: 299.

[87]Ibid., 2: 133.

[88]Ibid.

which they valued. Nevertheless, they attempted to be true to the text and, thereby, arrived at a world view which took them beyond the religious beliefs and practices of the Middle Ages. Whether literal exegesis of the Bible resulted in the changed historical situation within the Church of England, or the changing historical situation engendered literal exposition, is a nice question. Evidently there was an inextricable relationship between the historical setting of the preachers, the methods they adopted in Bible study, and the meanings they drew from the Scriptures.[89]

Indeed, there is an undoubted relationship between the literary methods of Renaissance humanism and the biblical exegesis of these Anglican preachers. First, they sought the most authentic ancient sources on which to build their Christian philosophy, just as the humanists resorted to classical philosophic or literary sources to provide the foundation of their novel commitments. Second, like the humanists, they saw the need to read these sources in the languages in which they were written. They were not satisfied with Latin translations. The Vulgate was recognized to be inferior to the Greek and Hebrew texts. Third, they labored to exegete their sources in a manner respectful of the writers' original meanings and intentions. This loyalty to the literary integrity of ancient documents was learned from the humanists. Fourth, they made a greater attempt than their medieval predecessors to view the original sources of the Christian faith in their historical environment. Hence, Church history, as well as secular history, became a tool for the correct interpretation of the text. This approach was also characteristic of humanism. The training of these Anglicans, particularly Jewel, Hooker, and Andrewes, was humanistic, and the result was a mode of homiletical biblical exegesis which differed sharply from that of traditional Roman Catholicism.

Latimer in his 1529 "Sermons of the Card" furnishes a splendid

---

[89]To say, e.g., that Latimer and Cranmer would have rejected transubstantiation without a new approach to the biblical material, solely in reaction to the papal Church of their era, would seem to ignore the undoubted impact of Renaissance and Reformation biblical scholarship upon them. But to argue, on the contrary, that the only influence in their rejection of transubstantiation was their study of the scriptures, in the absence of external pressures, whether religious, political, or social, would probably be to credit too much to their scholarly objectivity. Great movements of thought are usually associated with great changes in the practical world of affairs. So the biblical methods and understandings of our four Anglican preachers are not to be viewed as independent from the world of affairs in which they found themselves.

example of literal interpretation of John 1:19 with an application to meet a local spiritual need. The text as Latimer translates it reads, "And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent Priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?" First, Latimer puts the text into its context by referring to the circumstances under which the Pharisees asked John the Baptist the question. Second, the preacher gives John's answer that he was not the Christ. Third, Latimer makes a spiritual application which, however hackneyed it may seem, was quite consistent with a literal exposition of the verse: "So likewise it shall be necessary unto all men and women of this world, not to ascribe unto themselves any goodness of themselves, but all unto our Lord God."[90]

Later in the same sermon Latimer quotes Matt 5:21, 22 and divides the passage into four parts:

> You have heard what was spoken to men of the old law, "Thou shalt not kill; whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of judgment; and whosoever shall say unto his neighbour Racha – that is to say, brainless, or any other like word of rebuking, shall be in danger of a council; and whosoever shall say unto his neighbour, fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire." This card was made and spoken by Christ, as appeareth in the 5th chapter of St. Matthew.[91]

The first part of this card, says Latimer, presents one of the commandments of the "old law," which also applies to us. The following three parts are Christ's exposition of the OT commandment showing how it might be broken. A man who harbors anger against another, even though it is not expressed, is breaking the commandment and in danger of judgment. A person who expresses his anger by name-calling is "in danger of a council," and an individual who calls his brother a fool has gone one step farther and is in danger of hell-fire.[92]

Latimer next uses the three latter applications of the passage as analogous to three parts of English legal procedure. The judgment, council, and hell-fire, he says, "may be likened unto three terms which we have common and usual amongst us – that is to say, the session of inquirance or inquest, the sessions of deliverance, and the execution day."[93] In this, he is not allegorizing, but is using analogy, a method which occurs frequently in the sermons of each of the four Anglican preachers. These preachers provide a modern analogy to illustrate the

---

[90]Watkins, 1: 1-2.

[91]Ibid., 1: 7.

[92]Ibid., 1: 8-9.

[93]Ibid., 1: 10.

text, or they use a Bible story as analogous to a modern situation. In the case before us, Latimer does not say that Matt 5 refers to the three aspects of England's legal procedure, but rather that the passage refers to matters that are somewhat analogous.

The "card" which Latimer explains in his development of Matt 2:21, 22 is the positive instruction that the Christian, far from mani-festing a bitter or angry attitude to his neighbors, wins the spiritual game of life when he displays forgiveness and love.[94] The ethical and spiritual application grows naturally and consistently out of the Gospel pericope. So also does Latimer's application of the story of the feast in the house of Simon the ex-leper (Luke 7:36-50).[95] There were in Latimer's day counterparts of the proud Pharisee who was willing to condemn the penitent woman.[96]

Latimer's "Sermon of the Plough" was based on an interpretation of the parable of the sower (Mark 4:1-9, 13-20), with the seed being the word of God and the sower or ploughman being the preacher.[97] This sermon dwelt upon the great importance of preaching, and the reason for such an emphasis is obvious. In 1548, early in the reign of Edward VI, when the sermon was preached, an attempt was being made by divines with Protestant leanings to disseminate their teachings. Resistance to papal doctrine and practice could only be achieved by changing the opinions of the people in general, and preaching was an important medium through which this result was to be achieved.

The foregoing are but a few of the many examples which could be given to illustrate Latimer's method.[98] The Bible, literally applied, became a weapon for attack on the papal system as it was previously practiced in England, a tool for the erection of new ecclesiastical and State structures, and the basis for dissemination of an ethical system and doctrinal formulations acceptable to Protestantism.

Jewel's method was somewhat similar, except that each of his ser-mons followed a particular theme more consistently than did Latimer's, and his knowledge of biblical literature was more profound. His 1560 Paul's Cross sermon was based on 1 Cor 11:23, "I have received of the

---

[94] Ibid., 1: 11.

[95] Ibid., 1: 13.

[96] Ibid., 1: 14.

[97] Ibid., 1: 55-73.

[98] See also ibid., 1: 23-24, 80, 83, 85-96, 98-103, 114-116, 132-133.

Lord that thing which I also have delivered unto you; that is, that the Lord Jesus, in the night that he was betrayed, took bread, &c." Jewel began by putting the text into its Scriptural context. Paul's work among the Corinthians was designed "to instruct the people, to draw them from the follies and errors that they and their fathers had long lived in aforetime, and to lead them to the gospel of Christ." Consistent with this aim, Paul gave them "the sacrament or holy mystery of Christ's last supper, to be practised and continued amongst them, as a most certain pledge and testimony of the same." After Paul's departure from Corinth, certain false teachers, "men full of pride and vain-glory," had led the Corinthian Christians away from the Gospel and had confused them in regard to the true nature of the sacraments.[99] One reason that Paul wrote 1 Corinthians was to call these Christians back to the supper as Christ had instituted it:

> For I, saith he, being amongst you delivered you none other thing than that I had received of the Lord. That thing he thought meetest for you: and therefore with the same ought you also to be contented. Thus, whensoever any order given by God is broken or abused, the best redress thereof is to restore it again into the state that it first was in at the beginning.[100]

This concept of restoration is the basis for Jewel's overall emphasis in his sermons. His purpose is to demonstrate from the Bible the correct mode of religious belief and practice as taught by Christ and the apostles. The Fathers of the early centuries are cited to support interpretations of the Scriptures which Jewel believes to have been consistent with the teachings of the earliest Christian church. His predilection for original Christianity is neatly summarized on the title page of the 1560 edition of the Paul's Cross sermon by a quotation from Tertullian: "This is a prejudice against all heresies: that that thinge is true, whatsoever was first: that is corrupt, whatsoever came after."[101]

The sermon illustrates the principle. When the Jews defiled the Jerusalem temple, Christ "called them back again to the first erection of the temple." When questioned about divorce, Christ presented the original intention that marriage should last forever. Similarly Paul called the Corinthians back to the first institution of the Lord's Supper. Therefore, since "in this last age of the world the same holy sacrament or mystery of Christ's last supper hath been likewise stained with

---

[99] Ayre, 1: 3.

[100] Ibid., 1: 3-4.

[101] Ibid., 1: i.

divers foul abuses," Jewel is under a compelling obligation to call his contemporaries back to "the first institution of the holy sacrament." And he continues with other examples of matters wherein he felt true doctrine to have been perverted.[102]

In future sermons Jewel tended to select Bible passages which dealt with a problem or a need in either OT or NT times. The problem in the original setting was spelled out in some detail and then used as a pertinent analogy of the difficulties, whether practical or theoretical, present in the various branches of the Church of the Elizabethan era. For instance, Jewel preached a sermon based on Matt 9:37, 38, "Then said he to his disciples, Surely the harvest is great; but the labourers are few. Wherefore pray the Lord of the harvest, that he would send labourers forth into his harvest." Jewel began by explaining why Christ made the statement. The problem in the original setting was not lack of scribes and Pharisees, nor was it lack of schools or learning. The problem was the paucity of genuinely committed teachers of the will of God. Jewel's day was parallel. The lengthy explication of the problem in Christ's day is for the express purpose of exposing the need in Jewel's own day.[103]

Hooker's method is different. He looks searchingly into Bible statements to discover any possible philosophical problems and solutions which may throw light on the issues of concern for individuals and for the Church of his day. The Scripture text becomes a source of questions and answers which are designed to relate the contemporary Church to its historical tradition, and to reconcile currently divisive religious concepts and forces. Hooker's sermon "The Certainty, and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect" is a case in point. His text is Hab 1:4, "Therefore the law is slacked, and judgment doth never go forth." The question which the text poses for Hooker is "Whether the Prophet Habakkuk, by admitting this cogitation into his mind, 'The law doth fail,' did thereby shew himself an unbeliever."[104] Hooker is concerned to show that there is for the Christian an experience of legitimate doubt which in no way nullifies the genuineness of his faith. Habakkuk's remark about the apparent predominance of evil in his day reveals a doubt as to the activity of God, but it does not imply that the prophet had lost faith in God. The presupposition upon which Hooker bases his argument

---

[102] Ibid., 1: 4-6.

[103] Ibid., 2: 1016-1024.

[104] Keble, 3: 469.

he expresses as follows: "In this we know we are not deceived, neither can we deceive you, when we teach that the faith whereby ye are sanctified cannot fail; it did not in the Prophet, it shall not in you."[105]

This is not, in my view, intended to be merely another way of expressing Calvinist determinism. Hooker is not saying that, despite his doubts, Habakkuk had no choice but to be one of the elect. The point seems to be that as long as genuine faith remains in the mind of the individual, his doubts cannot be regarded as a nullification of the grace which God has given him. Intellectual, psychological, and spiritual confusion do not amount to a rejection of God by the believer, nor do they result in God's withdrawal from him. Weakness is not "utter want of faith." Lack of "sugared joy and delight" is not evidence of faithlessness. "A grieved spirit therefore is no argument of a faithless mind," nor are the presence of "the distrustful suggestions of the flesh."[106] Hooker uses Bible examples. The Galatians and Ephesians of Paul's day had problems but were not rejected. Sarah doubted in regard to the promise of a son, but still believed. The prayer of Christ for Peter, "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not," is the basis of Christian assurance, even though it does not "exclude our labour."[107] Thus, Hooker in expounding on Hab 1:4 has used a most unlikely passage of Scripture, given its literal interpretation, as the basis for his discussion of Christian assurance.

Andrewes's characteristic exegetical method may be effectively illustrated from his 1609 Christmas-day sermon.[108] This particular nativity sermon is based on the passage Gal 4:4, 5, "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent His Son, made of a woman, made under the Law. That He might redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Andrewes commences by giving in detail the four-part outline of his sermon:

1. The fullness of time. Under this heading he plans four points: (1) Time has a fullness. (2) The fullness comes by steps and degrees. (3) There is a specific time when this fullness comes. (4) The specific time is when God sent the Son. At this point Andrewes reminds his

---

[105] Ibid., 3: 473.

[106] Ibid., 3: 474-475.

[107] Ibid., 3: 476-477, 480. For other examples from Hooker's sermons, see 3: 483-484, 502-504.

[108] Andrewes, 1: 45-63.

audience that there are such texts that "the right way to consider them is to take them in pieces, and this is of that kind."[109]

2. Of that wherewith the time is filled. In this part he takes the text phrase by phrase: (1) God sent. (2) Sent His Son. (3) His Son who was made. (4) The Son was twice made; the second time made of a woman. (5) The Son was made under the law. (6) The double benefit: (i) redemption, and (ii) translation of believers into "the state of adopted children of God."

3. There is a double fullness: God sends as much as he can and man receives as much as he desires.

4. Man receives from God "the fulness of his bounty" and God receives from man "the fulness of our duty."

At this point the sermon proper begins.[110] "First there is a fulness in time." God has made the measure of time, and there is a point which may be regarded as the fullness of it. By degrees time passes "till at last it come to the brim." There is a specific time when the fullness comes: "As in the day, when the sun cometh to the meridian line; in the month, when it cometh to the point of opposition with the moon."[111] Under Moses and the prophets there were certain important times of the year, but time was not full "till God sent That than Which a more full could not be sent." With the coming of Christ "time was at the top, that was the *quando venit*, then it was *plenitudo temporis* indeed."[112] There are seven degrees, Andrewes says, by which the fullness of the time is filled, and he proceeds to explicate them.[113]

This sermon is representative of the vast majority of Andrewes's sermons. For the most part, he chose topics which were of central concern to the Christian faith, and his sermons were rarely controversial. He dissected his texts phrase by phrase or word by word, even though that meant dwelling on obvious and apparently unimportant issues which were not essential to the conveyance of his spiritual message. He made considerable use of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin. His sermons were usually introduced by a lengthy breakdown of the points to be covered, in which the English construction was pithy, abbreviated, and anything

---

[109]Ibid., 1: 46.

[110]Ibid., 1: 47.

[111]Ibid., 1: 47-48.

[112]Ibid., 1: 49.

[113]Ibid., 1: 51-61.

but attractive. The substance of the sermon was characterized by a diffuse, pedantic style which, nevertheless, adequately expounded the literal meaning of the Bible text. Wordplay, suggested by the words of the text, was quite common in Andrewes's sermons. This habit resulted in the presentation of ideas which were not contained in the passage he was discussing, but which could be substantiated from other passages of Scripture.

The biblical languages, Greek and Hebrew, were quite commonly used by Andrewes. In contrast, there was little or no use of these languages in the sermons of Latimer, Jewel, and Hooker, even though the latter two preachers were very competent to use them, and undoubtedly did so in their private Bible study. Like his predecessors, Andrewes made considerable use of the Latin Vulgate too, but he often gave the Greek and Hebrew words with their exact English meanings when he was seeking further insight into a particular passage. An example or two may be given.

Preaching on the resurrection of Christ in 1606, Andrewes made the point that although Christ raised himself from the dead, the Father was active in calling him forth from the grave: "The Apostle's word ἐγερθείς, in the native force doth more properly signify, 'raised by another,' than risen by himself, and is so used, to shew it was done, not only by the power of the Son, but by the will, consent, and co-operation of the Father."[114] Andrewes's use of ἐγερθείς was quite correct. The word is a first aorist, passive participle of ἐγείρω, which in the passive may have the sense of "raised" by another, or "to stir or raise oneself."[115]

Also correct was Andrewes's use of Greek meanings in a sermon preached in 1609; "And when we have thus passed ourselves away, by this 'selling ourselves under sin,' the Law seizeth on us, and under it we are συγκεκλεισμένοι, even 'locked up' as it were in a dungeon, 'tied fast with the cords of our sins.'"[116] The phrase "selling ourselves under sin" is a literal translation of the phrase in Rom 7:14, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. The word συγκεκλεισμένοι comes from Gal 3:23. It is a perfect participle from συγκλείω which means "to close up to-

---

[114] Ibid., 2: 197.

[115] See "ἐγείρω" in W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1957), and in *TDNT*.

[116] Andrewes, 1: 57.

gether," "hem in," "enclose," "confine," "imprison."[117] Even though modern textual criticism prefers the form συγκλειόμενοι in Gal 3:23, Andrewes's understanding of the word, as it occurred in the Greek text available to him, was quite correct.[118]

There are literally dozens of such examples in Andrewes's sermons, demonstrating his accurate knowledge of the Greek NT. And he did not hesitate to use the LXX, as in reference to the Persian king's chamberlains in the time of Esther.[119] He also quite frequently cited the Hebrew of the OT.[120]

### 6. Other Exegetical Practices

Any other approaches to the Bible text by our four Anglican preachers, apart from those already described, are purely incidental. There are, e.g., a few examples of redaction or homiletical embellishment. Commenting on the case of incest in the Corinthian Church of Paul's day, Latimer explains:

> In the city of Corinth one had married his step-mother, his father's wife; and he was a jolly fellow, a great rich man, an alderman of the city, and therefore they winked at, they would not meddle in the matter, they had nothing to do with it; and he was one of the head men, of such rule and authority, that they durst not, many of them.[121]

There is nothing in the Pauline account about the wealth, position, or authority of the guilty party. Latimer's additions are obviously homiletical embellishment.

Jewel, in his discussion of the woman of Samaria (John 4), said: "When the woman of Samaria saw the miracles that Christ had done, and heard some men doubt whether he were Messias or no: 'Why (quoth she), when Messias shall come, shall he do more signs than this man hath shewed?'"[122] The words which Jewel put into the mouth of the woman of Samaria occur in John 7:31 and have no relationship to the John 4 account. The words that the woman actually spoke were,

---

[117]See, e.g., "συγκλείω" in Arndt and Gingrich.

[118]See Gal 3:23 in *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 25th ed., edited by Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, and Kurt Aland (Stuttgart, 1963).

[119]Andrewes, 4: 136.

[120]Cf., e.g., ibid., 1: 354; 4: 6, 135, 140.

[121]Watkins, 1: 240.

[122]Ayre, 2: 992.

"Come, see a man, which told me all things that ever I did: is not this the Christ?" (John 4:29, KJV). This kind of incidental error could hardly be regarded as intentional.

Miracle-stories were not used by these preachers as an extension of the Bible account, but were told as fables for the purpose of sermon illustration. Latimer occasionally used such a story. Wishing to illustrate the idea "that worldly prosperity maketh us to forget God," he told the story of a bishop who came to a rich man's house where he found lack of nothing. The bishop, thinking that God could not be in such a place, left the house. "When he came a little far off from the house, he sendeth his man back again to fetch a book, which was forgotten behind; when the servant came, the house was sunk."[123]

Illustrating the virtue of humility, Jewel told a story of St. Anthony which he introduced as follows: "There is a story, or rather a fable, written of St. Anthony—whether you take it as a story or a fable I much reckon not, but it serveth well for this purpose."[124] Clearly, Jewel was not concerned that his hearers should believe such a miracle-story. His obvious intent was to illustrate a point in his sermon. In any case, such stories are very rare in these sermons.

## 7. Use of the Fathers

Latimer accepted or rejected the interpretations of the Fathers, depending on whether or not he judged them to be consistent with Scripture. Commenting in 1549 on the statement that Christ "began to be sorrowful and very heavy" (Matt 26:37), Latimer said, "I like not Origen's playing with this word *coepit*; it was a perfect heaviness: it was such a one as was never seen the greater, it was not merely the beginning of a sorrow."[125] This led him to make a brief digression for the purpose of explaining his attitude to the Fathers generally:

> These Doctors, we have great cause to thank God for them, but yet I would not have them always to be allowed. They have handled many points of our faith very godly; and we may have a great stay in them in many things; we might not well lack them: but yet I would not have men to be sworn to them; and so addict, as to take hand over head whatsoever they say: it were a great inconvenience to do so.[126]

---

[123]Watkins, 2: 155; cf. pp. 376-377.

[124]Ayre, 2: 1094.

[125]Watkins, 1: 201.

[126]Ibid.

The Fathers were treated as mere commentators whose word was tested by the Bible account. They were in no sense inspired by God, and their concepts were not necessarily representative of the official teaching of the Church. This attitude placed tradition, insofar as it emerged from the Fathers, in a decidedly subordinate position. Tradition could now be tested by the Bible-centered faith, and rejected if it failed the test. Nevertheless, as Latimer pointed out in 1552, the school doctors, "as bad as they were," had some good things to say.[127] He often quoted them, especially Augustine and Chrysostom.[128]

As explained above, Jewel's attitude to the Fathers of the first six Christian centuries was somewhat more positive. He did not treat them as inspired authors, nor did he allow them equal status with the Bible in matters of religious authority, but he did consider that they represented a tradition which was consistent with Bible teaching. On the question of holy communion, he lumped together Christ, Paul, Gregory, Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Leo I, Dionysius, Anacletus, and Sixtus.[129] He challenged his hearers to demonstrate the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Mass from the Bible, or any of the Fathers who wrote "for the space of six hundred years after Christ."[130] He maintained that he taught nothing "but that hath been taught before by Christ himself, set abroad by his apostles, continued in the primitive church, and maintained by the old and ancient doctors."[131] Hence, Jewel's Roman Catholic contemporaries, he argued, were out of line with the Church of the first six or seven centuries. The Anglican Church was truly Catholic because of its basic conformity to the Scriptures and the early Fathers.[132]

Hooker's sermons quote the Fathers relatively frequently, but not with any suggestion that their authority equals that of the Bible in religious issues. When he finds the Fathers disagreeing with Scripture as he understands it, he opposes their interpretation. He rejects, e.g., Origen's idea that mercy will be extended "unto devils and damned

[127]Ibid., 2: 93.

[128]Ibid., 1: 92, 144, 162, 184, 186, 192, 234, 250, 277; 2: 13, 38, 60, 64, 135, 152, 159, 174, 186, 209, 376, 392, 397.

[129]Ayre, 1: 20.

[130]Ibid.

[131]Ibid., 2: 1030.

[132]Ibid., 2: 1029-1031.

spirits."[133] In fact, Hooker freely acknowledges that the Fathers, like other mortals, were subject to error. He takes to task "the ancient Fathers of the Church" who "have had their sundry perilous opinions; and among sundry of their opinions this, that they hoped to make God some part of amends for their sins, by the voluntary punishments which they laid upon themselves."[134] But when he finds a Father who supports his particular emphasis, Hooker quotes him.[135]

Andrewes recognized first the authority of the Bible, secondly that of the councils, and thirdly that of the Fathers. Stressing the concept that the paternal rulership function of patriarchs was bestowed upon the kings who followed them, he said:

> Now, that as in other things, so in this term of *Christi Domini*, Kings do succeed the Patriarchs, we have, first, our warrant from the Holy Ghost applying this term here, after, to Saul, to David, to Solomon, to Hezekiah, to Josiah, to Cyrus: Kings all. Secondly, from the Councils: the third general Council of Ephesus; the great Council of Toledo, the fourth; the great western Council of Frankfort. Thirdly, from the consent of Fathers.[136]

The "warrant from the Holy Ghost" refers to the evidence from the Bible. Ecclesiastical tradition, whether determined from councils or Fathers, is corroborative evidence, but not primarily authoritative. It is when the Fathers agree that they are especially credible to Andrewes. He first presents Bible evidence and then turns to the consensus of the Fathers. If we judge by the number of references to Augustine, he is Andrewes's favorite Father.[137]

## 8. *Attitudes to Antiquity*

Latimer's sermons make little use of the literature and history of antiquity, aside from Scripture. What references and allusions there are do not reveal any real concern to revive the mores and literary methods of the ancient world. Latimer's interest is NT-type Christianity. Where a story from antiquity can be effectively inserted to illustrate a point, Latimer uses it. In his third sermon before Edward VI in 1549, he compares the king to the Persian emperor Cambyses who punished the

---

[133] Keble, 3: 500.

[134] Ibid., 3: 540.

[135] E.g., ibid., 3: 607-608, 484, 533, 536, 609, 612.

[136] Andrewes, 4: 49.

[137] See ibid., 1: 350, 427, 430-431; 2: 3, 27, 37.

unjust judge Sisamnes. Latimer has obviously forgotten some of the details of the story, and virtually admits as much when he says, "It is a great while ago since I read the history."[138] But the point is well-illustrated, that the responsibility of the king is to maintain justice in the land. This kind of sermon illustration from antiquity occurs very occasionally in Latimer's sermons.[139]

Of our four Anglican preachers, Jewel makes the most frequent references to the history of antiquity. Occasionally he tells a story by way of sermon illustration. In one sermon he briefly describes the siege of Cyzicum by Mithridates of Pontus. When Lucullus arrived with an army to raise the siege, Mithridates released the false report to the town's people that the new contingent of soldiers had come to support him. But the citizens held out and Lucullus was successful in raising the siege. Jewel uses the story as an allegory thus:

> Even so, good people, is there now a siege laid to your walls: an army of doctors and councils shew themselves upon an hill: the adversary, that would have you yield, beareth you in hand that they are their soldiers, and stand on their side. But keep you hold: the doctors and old catholic fathers, in the points that I have spoken of, are yours: ye shall see the siege raised, ye shall see your adversaries discomfited and put to flight.[140]

This one example illustrates Jewel's characteristic manner of using the history of antiquity in his sermons.[141] Very occasionally Hooker uses it likewise. He illustrates by reference to the senators of Rome in one sermon, Heteroclites in another, and to the Grecian practice of disposing of tyrants in a third; and once he quotes Plotinus.[142] Andrewes makes little use of antiquity. In passing, he mentions Augustus' peace; and he cites Socrates and Josephus.[143] Despite his great learning, his concern is the message of the Bible, not the lessons to be learned from other ancient sources.

### 9. Summary and Conclusion

We are now in a position to summarize the findings of our analysis regarding the exegetical methods of Latimer, Jewel, Hooker and An-

---

[138]Watkins, 1: 131-132.

[139]Ibid., 2: 24, 129, 300-301, 357.

[140]Ayre, 1: 22.

[141]For further examples, see Ibid., 2: 976-978, 996, 1028, 1031, 1089, 1094.

[142]Hooker, 3: 48, 605, 621, 636.

[143]Andrewes, 1: 222; 4: 16, 247.

drewes. All of these preachers regarded the Bible as the ultimate author-ity in religious matters. None of them took the view that the preferred interpretation was that of the Church or the ancient Fathers. Scripture, according to them, is to be interpreted by Scripture and by the Holy Spirit. The Fathers are to be used as secondary sources, but not treated as authorities in any way on the same level with Bible writers. Even Jewel, who saw the church of the first six or seven centuries as consis-tent with the teachings of the NT, did not attempt to give to the early Fathers any recognition as being primary authorities. He accepted them because of their apparent consistency with the Bible. And Andrewes used evidence from the early Councils and the Fathers to corroborate his Bible applications.

Allegory as an exegetical method is very rare in these Anglican sermons; but it is present, nevertheless, to a limited extent. It is not correct to say, however, that Andrewes favored the allegorical method. Typology was sometimes used by these preachers, being more frequent in Jewel than Latimer, and was occasionally used by Hooker and Andrewes. The most common method of interpretation was the "literal" or "normal," by which the preacher attempted to represent the true meaning of the literature. The analogical method, which is sometimes mistaken for allegory, is very much in evidence in the sermons.

Latimer only very occasionally used stories from antiquity for illustrative purposes, and Hooker and Andrewes did not use many classical allusions. Jewel made more frequent reference to ancient sources and stories, but he did so usually only in the form of sermon illustra-tions. None of these preachers used philosophy or other classical literature for the purpose of throwing greater light on the Scripture passages themselves.

Although it has not been our primary purpose to deal with the subject matter or content of the sermons (rather we have treated the exegetical methods of the preachers), it will be appropriate here, in closing, to make at least brief mention of this matter.[144] For instance, in respect to the concept of the Church, all four preachers attacked papal ecclesiastical primacy and papal claims to secular dominance. They reinterpreted the Bible texts used by Catholic theologians to

---

[144]Some points have already appeared in our previous discussion. It will not be possible here to furnish documentation for, or a comprehensive review of, these and other items that will be noted below, but I hope in the future to elaborate more fully this aspect of the sermons of our four Anglican preachers.

establish the primacy of Peter, and even applied Bible prophecies regarding antichrist, the man of sin, etc., to the papal system. All four preachers accepted or condoned the episcopal system of church polity and the monarch's supreme governorship of the church. They did not consider the bishops or the monarch as authoritative in terms of doctrine; all men, whatever their status, were to be guided by the doctrines and laws of Scripture. However, they deplored the lack of hierarchical levels of ecclesiastical control in the Anabaptist and Puritan systems. Furthermore, they did not see a contradiction between a confessional church, in which membership is on the basis of belief and commitment, and an episcopal church governed by bishops and the monarch. They wanted both. Their sermons were full of injunctions to faith and personal Christian life, while at the same time enjoining loyalty to the monarchical and episcopal leadership of the church.

Regarding the structure of society, all four preachers were reconciled to monarchical government of the kind which existed in England. The monarch was to be armed with both "swords," the civil and the religious. As for ethics, these preachers applied Bible teaching to the practical situations in the lives of their hearers and attempted to eliminate immorality in the broad sense. Religion, they felt, was to govern every area of human life. Doctrinally, these preachers opposed much of the papal system: the doctrine of the immaculate conception and Mariology, the sacrament of penance and the idea of meritorious works on which it depended, the doctrine of transubstantiation and the concept of the Mass as a sacrifice, the celebration of private Masses, the celibacy of the priesthood, and the doctrine of purgatory. In fact, the concept of the Church held by these preachers and their doctrinal differences with Rome involved a complete transformation of the Church in England.

Our analysis has led us to the conclusion that these preachers were not humanists, although they were influenced by humanistic interests and literary and philological methods. Their whole world view was biblically oriented. The church, society, ethics, and doctrine were to be determined by the Scriptures. They were not willing to acknowledge other sources of primary authority whether they be tradition, the Fathers, or the Pope. Their exegesis and their world-view amounted to a revolution in thought which was bound to result in calamity for them when those in authority held to the medieval tradition, and in a drastically altered society when the monarch chose to see things their way.

# JEWELRY OF BIBLE TIMES
# AND THE CATALOG OF ISA 3:18-23
# PART II*

ELIZABETH ELLEN PLATT

Rutgers College, The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

In Part I of this series, I discussed sixteen of the twenty-one terms in the catalog of jewelry in Isa 3 and noted the evidence that the catalog represents both men's and women's jewelry. The point at issue in Isa 3 is not a criticism of the so-called fickleness of women's fashions but a denouncement of persons in high office for their social injustice. Before we proceed to an analysis of the final five more obscure terms in the list, it will be well to review some of the reasons for, and history of, the general misconception that Isa 3 represents an attack on women's "fickle fashions."

## 4. *Translation Difficulties and Culturally Oriented Interpretation*

A major difficulty which modern readers have with Isa 3 is that translators have not used consistently in various parts of the Bible the same English word for the original Hebrew term. Even more confusion arises, however, when a rare ancient word is given meaning by the fashions of the translator's own milieu. The latter is perhaps the major translation difficulty responsible for bringing confusion to the reader of English translations of Isa 3.

---

* Part I was published in *AUSS* 17 (1979): 71-84.' The following abbreviated forms are used herein for works already cited in Part I:
  BDB = Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1952).
  Guy and Engberg = P. L. O. Guy and Robert M. Engberg, *Megiddo Tombs*, OIP, vol. 32 (Chicago, 1938).
  Hayes = William C. Hayes, *The Scepter of Egypt*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass., 1959).

Indeed, the lists used in translations of Isa 3:18-23 are known to mirror the dress styles of the major eras of Bible translations. E.g., *The Holy Scriptures* of Miles Coverdale, 1535,[13] speaks of *spanges, cheynes, partlettes, hooves,* "*ye goodly floured, wyde and brodered raymet,*" *brusshes, glasses, smocks, bonettes,* and *taches;* and the Geneva Bible, 1560,[14] refers to *slippers, sweet balls, sloppes, tablets, flaunes,* and *stomachers.* A number of the same designations are also used by the KJV, 1611, with the memorable *cauls,* "*round tires like the moon,*" *mufflers, wimples* and *crisping pinnes.* The ASV, 1901, mentions *headtires, ankle chains, sashes, nose jewels, mantles,* and *satchels;* the Moffatt Bible, 1922, modernizes with *tiaras, necklaces, scent-bottles, purses, gauze,* and *wrappers;* and J. B. Phillips, 1963,[15] has *party dresses, stoles,* and *handbags.* The JB, 1966, has identified *mantillas* in the list. The NEB OT, 1970, has *coronets, lockets* and *flounced skirts,* while the Jewish Publication Society of America's Isaiah, 1973,[16] includes *lace gowns, linen vests,* and an *apron.* Reading translations like these with the aid of a contemporary dictionary (and especially for the older versions, the Oxford English Dictionary) yields intriguing information for the history of costume and reveals the translator as a zealous prophet who persevered with the task of trying to make God's Holy Word understandable to his generation.

But there are problems, too, with this approach to difficult Hebrew words. In some societies jewelry and apparel do not particularly carry associations of leadership and special office, but rather have become the property of one group or even one sex. One example is the limited definition that Americans may think of for "mantilla"—the lace headscarf worn by Latin-American/Spanish women immigrants to conservative Catholic

[13] *The Holy Scriptures,* trans. Miles Coverdale (1535; 2d modern ed., London, 1847).
[14] *The Geneva Bible* (1560; reprint ed., London, 1599).
[15] J. B. Phillips, *Four Prophets* (New York: Macmillan, 1963).
[16] H. L. Ginsberg, *The Book of Isaiah* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1973).

churches as required head covering at Sunday mass. The danger with overly contemporizing translations of Isa 3 is that they tend to define this particular catalog in terms relating to fairly ordinary women's dress, irrespective of the fact that such rendition goes contrary to the meaning and intent of the original.

Indeed, this passage has tended to become the *locus classicus* for the religious denunciation of feminine accouterment and the accompanying deprecation of feminine personality and womanhood itself as characteristically consumed with the superficiality of dress and jewelry. To cite one prominent example, R. B. Y. Scott in his exegetical treatment in the prestigious *IB*, used so often by Protestant clergy, assumes that the catalog in Isa 3 refers to belongings peculiar to women. Even though he does hint at the larger context including the denunciation of the men of the society in the early chapters of the book, he equates jewelry and ostentatious dress as the domain of women alone:

> The pride of men showed itself in the building of great towers and tall ships, in the arrogance which sought to master the world in forgetfulness of God (cf. 2:15-17). The same pride showed itself in the luxury and ostentation which had become the sole objective and standard of fashionable women, contemptuous of others and indifferent to the human cost of the privileges they enjoyed.[17]

In the *IB* homiletical section on the same chapter, G. C. D. Kilpatrick goes even further by making application to the sinfulness peculiarly characteristic of womanhood and to its far-reaching devastating consequences:

> . . . degenerate womanhood can corrupt a nation.
> . . . the moral quality of womanhood determines the character of society. These are the mothers of men, they set the ideals of men, and by what they are, either inspire or corrupt their sons.
> . . . the womanhood of a nation, more than any other single agency, determines the character and destiny of men.
> . . . the hand that rocks the cradle . . . rules the world.[18]

---

[17] *IB* 5: 191.
[18] *IB* 5: 191-193.

It seems obvious that the interpretation which Kilpatrick felt was the most relevant for contemporary preaching was to keep women from being morally degenerate by their use of jewelry and ostentatious apparel lest they corrupt the *true* people of the society, the men, bearers of high ideals and prime movers in the tide of empires! We can easily envision the sermon that has chosen for its text the excerpted section of Isa 3:16-24 and whose aim would be to draw out in vivid castigation—by means of a contemporary catalog of women's dress—the sinfulness character-istic of womanhood consistent in its propensity for moral degen-eracy from Isaiah's day till now!

Another example of the seriousness with which this passage has been read as a denunciation of women is reflected in *The Woman's Bible,* 1898.[19] Of all the passages of magnificent litera-ture in the sixty-six chapters of the book of Isaiah, feminist Elizabeth Cady Stanton has chosen only Isa 3:16-23 for comment. This choice in itself says something regarding the catalog's importance in the culture of her time. But even more interesting is the fact that this great women's-rights leader has accepted fully the interpretation of her contemporary church (though no doubt her witness to it is from a different stance):

> The Prophet in the above texts reproves and warns the daugh-ters of Zion and tells them of their faults. He does not like their style of walking, which from the description must have been much like the mincing gait of some women today.
>
> The prophet expressly vouches God's authority for what he said concerning their manners and elaborate ornamentation, lest they should be offended with his criticisms. If the Prophets could visit our stores and see all the fashions there are to tempt the daughters of today, they would declaim against our frivolities on the very doorsteps, and in view of the Easter bonnets, at the entrance to our churches. The badges which our young women wear as members of societies, pinned in rows on broad ribbons, the earrings, the bangles, the big sleeves, the bonnets trimmed

---

[19] Elizabeth Cady Stanton, *The Woman's Bible,* Part II (New York: Euro-pean Publishing Co., 1898; reprint ed., Seattle: Coalition Task Force on Women and Religion, 1974).

with osprey feathers, answer to the crisping pins, the wimples,
the nose jewels, the tablets, the chains, the bracelets, the mufflers,
the veils, the glasses and the girdles of the daughters of Zion.
If the Prophets, instead of the French milliners and dressmakers,
could supervise the toilets of our women they would dress in far
better taste.[20]

Evidently, in order for Stanton's voice to be heard, in order
for her to gain attention long enough to be able to make any
contribution, she must affirm that for which the rest of her society
had some kind of affinity. Curiously, nevertheless, in her quotation
of Isa 3:16-23, she omitted vs. 17 which includes "the Lord will
lay bare their secret parts." Apparently Stanton could not preach
a gospel in which God told male prophets that the humiliating
punishment of women would result in such a dehumanizing
action as "laying bare their secret parts." But she could affirm the
denunciation of the superficiality of dress which was ultimately
based on pleasing men because it gave women at least one
entry into that society. She could affirm this because she was
presenting an understanding of the free woman who could vote
and make substantial contributions to the body politic on many
more levels.

The translations noted above and the comments of Scott,
Kilpatrick, and Stanton to which attention has been called are
but samples of a very common misconception of the intent of
the catalog in Isa 3.

A remedy for the situation would, of course, be to have a
more accurate translation of the catalog in the light of usages in
other parts of the biblical literature and on the basis of a review
of the general context of Isa 3 itself. The central point of the
passage is not the condemnation of women for superficiality in
their preference for jewelry and ostentatious apparel. On the
contrary, the point is that the *leaders* of the society, *both men
and women* who wear the symbols of their offices, have corrupted
that society by misuse of leadership at the expense of the poor.

[20] Ibid., p. 102.

## 5. *New Suggestions Regarding the Isa 3 Catalog*

Finally, with regard to jewelry study and our task of discerning the specific ancient pieces to illustrate biblical passages, there are a few new suggestions for the Isa 3 catalog. These will deal primarily with the five obscure items that have not already been elucidated in Part I of this series.

The second item in the Isa 3 catalog is *haśśᵉḫisîm,* and this instance is the only time in the Hebrew Bible that the word (and root) occurs. The RSV has translated "headbands"; the KJV and other early English Bibles prefer "cauls," which the Oxford English Dictionary describes as the networks (often richly ornamented) at the back of a kind of close-fitting woman's cap. The Moffatt translation has "tiaras," one of the *IB* suggestions is "buckles," and the Jewish Publication Society has "fillets."

A number of basic scholarly publications make the most interesting suggestion from the standpoint of Semitic linguistics, and this fits well with archaeological jewelry evidence. The revered Hebrew grammar reference text, Gesenius-Kautzsch, comments when discussing diminutives formed by inserting a "y" after the second radical that in this case it is "as though [we have] a foreign dialectical form for *šumais, little sun.*"[21] The BDB Hebrew *Lexicon* notes the suggestion of a sun and adds "small glass neck ornament."[22] Scott in *IB* suggests objects "with circular faces of bright metal, 'little suns'" and mentions Shapash, the female sun divinity of the Ugaritic texts, as having some relationship.[23] George Buchanan Gray, in *ICC,* prefers "net bands," no doubt following the reasoning of the English translators who used "caul."[24] Gray claims that in the Hebrew of the Mishnah *šbys* "was the ornamental band that passed from ear to ear over the *sbkh,* a net covering and enclos-

[21] *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar,* ed. E. Kautzsch; 2d Eng. ed., edited by A. E. Cowley (Oxford: Univ. Press, 1910), p. 240, §86g, n. 1.
[22] BDB, p. 987.
[23] *IB,* 5: 192.
[24] *ICC, The Book of Isaiah 1-39,* 1: 72.

ing the hair."[25] He also allows for the possibility of "a little sun"
due to the interchanging of *b* and *m*, and hence Isaiah could
have meant a pendant worn around the neck together with the
following item in the catalog, the crescents.

Table 2. Partial List of the Jewelry Catalog of Isa 3:18-23[*]

| RSV | Hebrew | Suggestions |
|---|---|---|
| Isa 3: | | |
| vs. 18 In that day the Lord will take away | | |
| . . . . . . . . | | |
| (2) the headbands | *weḥaššeḇisim* | and the sun- or star-disks, |
| (3) and the crescents; | *weḥaśśahᵃrōnim* | and the crescents, |
| vs. 19 (4) the pendants | *hanneṭipôṭ* | the drop pendants, |
| (5) the bracelets, | *weḥaššérôṭ* | and the necklace cords, |
| (6) and the scarfs; | *weḥᵃreʿālôṭ* | and the beads, |
| vs. 20 . . . . . . . . | | |
| (10) the perfume boxes, | *ûḇāṭê hannepeš* | and the tubular "soul" cases, |
| vs. 22 . . . . . . . . | | |
| (15) the mantles, | *weḥammaʿᵃṭāpôṭ* | and the enveloping capes, |
| vs. 23 (18) the garments of gauze | *weḥagilyōnim* | and the thin garments, |

* The complete list of twenty-one items is given in Part I, Table 1, *AUSS*
17 (1979): 72.

In the preceding part of this article, I have reviewed the
evidence for translating item (3) as "crescents," meaning moon-
like pendants which can be suspended from a cord with droplet
beads of various shapes, item (4).[26] One remarkable piece of
jewelry that illustrates brilliantly this kind of neckwear is the
fabulous Dilbat Necklace, dated to the first half of the second
millennium and now in the New York Metropolitan Museum of
Art.[27] It has two strands of beads in front with six pendants

[25] Ibid.

[26] See Part I, pp. 73-74.

[27] K. R. Maxwell-Hyslop, *Western Asiatic Jewellery* (London: Methuen,
1971), pp. 88-90. Hereinafter cited as *WAJ*.

suspended at intervals from the lower strand. Among the pendants is a truly exquisite crescent moon, two "rosettes," and a central "star disk." Comparable neck jewelry is depicted in Assyrian stone reliefs of a thousand years later, so surely this kind of necklace arrangement was not forgotten. A relief of Ashurnaṣirpal II (884-859 B.C.) shows his head and beard turned sideways to his right revealing a cord necklace with four pendants including an obvious crescent and a star disk.[28] Rosettes were found in gold, bronze, and bone in Palestinian Iron Age excavations at Bethshan, Gezer, Bethshemesh, and Megiddo; and star disks occurred in silver, gold, ivory, and bone at Megiddo, Gezer, Beth-shan, and Hazor. Although the number of individual specimens is very limited, it is important to know that star disks, crescents, and rosettes were used in the time of Isaiah, who as a highly skilled political officer of the Kingdom of Judah prophesied during the second half of the eighth century concerning the Assyrian menace. Obviously, from the Mesopotamian evidence and the assemblages of valuable jewelry in which the objects were found at Israelite sites, these pendants could be significant symbols of high office.

The usual way that rosettes are distinguished from the star disks is by the rounded petals of the former. Western Asiatic jewelry authority K. R. Maxwell-Hyslop believes that the rosette, which occurs ubiquitously in the art of this part of the world, is essentially an emblem of the goddess Inanna-Ishtar and that the pointed-ray star is representative of a sun divinity.[29] But it is true that the two types appear to merge under the various craftsmen so that it can be difficult to perceive the difference between rosettes and star disks. Maxwell-Hyslop formally discusses the star pendants in her treatment of the jewelry of Syria-Palestine ca. 1550-1300 B.C.[30] She discerns two basic types: first, the circle with the star in repoussé plus a central boss and, customarily,

[28] Ibid., Pl. 220.
[29] Ibid., pp. 141-142.
[30] Ibid., pp. 140-151.

smaller bosses between each ray near the outside edge; and the
second, the type with the cut-out rays extending from the central
boss. These stars occur with four, six, or eight points. She refers
to Claude F. A. Schaeffer's work at Ugarit and says that "either
the six- or the four-pointed star pendants (or probably both)
should be regarded as sun-pendants and symbols of the Ugaritic
sun goddess, Shapash."[31] The eight-pointed star, however, is a
symbol of Ishtar:

> In Babylonia, Ishtar as goddess of love and war was mani-
> fested in the form of the morning and evening star and her dual
> aspect had an astral character linked to the planet Venus. Often
> the eight-pointed star was inscribed on a disc and there was very
> little difference between conventionalized rendering of the star
> and the rosette, which was also used from the earliest times as
> a symbol of the goddess Inanna-Ishtar.[32]

A third type of disk is the pointed star with wavy lines or
curved rays between each point. Both Maxwell-Hyslop and H.
Frankfort, a renowned authority in Mesopotamian art,[33] agree
that this is a symbol of the sun god—Babylonian Shamash and
Sumerian Utu. However, Maxwell-Hyslop does mention that an
argument can be made for the curved rays with the four-pointed
star representing the thunderbolts of Adad or another storm
divinity.[34] The motif is clearly seen on a gold medallion found
from the Early Iron Age in the Megiddo Tombs with a four-
pointed star and the addition of two pairs of wavy lines set
between the points.[35] The medallion design compares favorably
with gold circular star pendants having rolled-over suspension
loops, known from Late-Bronze Shechem and shown by Maxwell-
Hyslop with crescent pendants.[36]

My suggestion is that *haśśeḇisîm* (2) of the Isaiah catalog

[31] Ibid., p. 141.

[32] Ibid., p. 142.

[33] H. Frankfort, *Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient* (Harmonds-
worth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1963), pp. 106-107.

[34] *WAJ*, p. 157.

[35] Guy and Engberg, p. 162, Fig. 169.

[36] *WAJ*, Pl. 115.

are the sun-disk pendants worn on necklaces somewhat like the
Mesopotamian Dilbat example and the relief of Ashurnaṣirpal II.
The words grouped at this point in the catalog suggest other
familiar necklace elements such as crescents (3), drop pendants
or beads (4), suspension cords (5), and finally, yet another kind
of bead or suspended ornament, *hārᵉʿālôṭ* (6), is taken to be from
a root *rʿl* meaning "to quiver, shake, reel" and even the highly
suitable "dangle." The attractive droplet beads in shapes of seeds,
blossoms, flower parts, etc., would be fine candidates as they
occur with crescents and star disks/rosettes on jewelry molds.

The most intriguing possibility for an obscure item in the
Isaiah catalog was suggested in personal communication with
Prof. Alix Wilkinson, regarding item (10).[37] For this enigmatic
item, *bātê hannepeš*, usually translated in modern versions as
"perfume boxes" or sometimes more literally "soul houses," she
calls attention to the tubular cases of Egyptian jewelry. These
are amulets which look like slim cylinders and came into fashion
during the Middle Kingdom.[38] With their caps and rings for
suspension they ranged in size from 3.3 cm. long to 6.8 cm.,
were made of metal (most frequently gold and silver) and were
decorated with semi-precious stones. She notes that although
one of the pendants found is usually attributed to a man's grave,
several others are from women's burials. She refers to Petrie's
designation of them as "charm-cases" and cites bronze specimens
that contained papyrus rolls with spells written on them.

William C. Hayes discusses four examples in gold and
silver from the treasures of the three wives of Thutmose III and
two in the "Murch collection," all acquired by the Metropolitan
Museum of Art.[39] For the latter he comments that they "were
evidently intended to hold charms written on small rolls of

[37] A. Wilkinson, personal communication from St. George's College, Jeru-
salem, July, 1974.
[38] The following information is from A. Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptian
Jewellery* (London: Methuen, 1971), p. 55.
[39] Hayes, 2: 133, 180.

papyrus."[40] The aspect of written messages has called forth Wilkinson's exciting suggestion of amulets related to *tephillin,* phylacteries worn in modern custom at the weekday morning service by Jewish males of thirteen years and over.[41] The observance is based particularly on Deut 6:4-9, where reference is made to binding "these words" as "a sign upon your hands" and as "frontlets between your eyes."

The English word "frontlets" reminds us of the headbands worn low on the forehead and tied at the back of the head which occur in Iron-Age excavations in gold foil and are a kind of crown. The Hebrew word *tōtāpōt* occurs here and in Exod 13:16 and Deut 11:18, but the verbal root is not used in the Bible and its meaning is dubious. In the Deut 11:18 passage, the same word for "soul" (*nepeš*) is found that occurs also in our Isa 3 catalog, as literally "houses of the soul."

Modern *tephillin* are leather cases with a strap that encircles the head so that "the front edge of the case lies just above the spot where the hair begins to grow and directly above the space between the eyes," with the fastening knot positioned at the nape of the neck.[42] A second case is worn on the muscle of the inner side of the left forearm with the strap going around the arm seven times and three times around the middle finger. The link between these and the Egyptian tubular amulets, which must have been worn as a necklace pendant, is that inside is placed a written message. Four paragraphs (Deut 6:4-9, 11:13-21, Exod 13:1, and 13:11-16) written on parchment go into the cases, and the purpose is, of course, to direct the wearer's thoughts to God as a result of knowing these key passages of the law. The Reform Movement in Judaism dropped the tradition of wearing *tephillin* because Abraham Geiger (1810-1874), the spiritual leader of

[40] Ibid., 2: 180.

[41] R. J. Zwi Werblosky and G. Wigoder, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Jewish Religion* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), p. 380.

[42] Ibid.

Reform Judaism in Germany, "maintained that they were origi-
nally pagan amulets."[43]

Two other items in the catalog remain difficult to determine.
Article (15) in the list, *hamma'ᵃṭāpôṯ*, usually translated "mantles,"
may be related to the verb meaning "envelop"—with the idea of
an enveloping cape. Article (18), *hagilyōnîm*, could be related
to the verb "reveal," hence the preferred translation "garments
of gauze," which suggests some form of the delicate textiles worn
by New Kingdom royalty in Egypt. Alternatively, polished metal
mirrors have been proposed, of the kind known in the shaving
sets from the New Kingdom,[44] although in our Isaiah passage
the surrounding items would favor garments or apparel.

## 6. *Conclusion*

With new linguistic and archaeological information for identi-
fying the terms in the Isa 3 catalog, we can continue the study
of the enigmatic items. We are now free to work with the
possibility that the articles were those worn by both men and
women as signs of high office. The passage context would affirm
that the wearing of beautiful apparel such as jewelry is not in
itself what is being condemned, but that the lesson is on the
misuse of the authority of office for which that apparel stands.

This theme fits well with the function of jewelry in other
parts of the Bible. Genesis patriarch Joseph is praised as Prime
Minister, and one sign of his authority is the seal ring; Haman
in the Esther saga misuses that office and his wearing of the
ring is to be condemned. The queen and bride in Song of Songs
is praised for her jewelry and fine raiment, but the harlot in
Ezekiel has misused her finery. Rebecca, as the chosen bride of
Isaac and generous leader of her people, is heralded by her gold
ornaments, but the aristocratic women of Samaria in Amos'
time have become indolent "cows." The High Priest of the
Exodus tabernacle and Solomonic temple was honored by his

[43] Ibid.
[44] Hayes, 2: 64.

turban and breastpiece, yet the prophet Hosea says that because
of extravagant sin "the children of Israel shall dwell many days
without king or prince, without sacrifice or pillar, without
ephod or teraphim" (Hos 3:4). Isaiah's noble daughters of
Jerusalem have characteristically jangled their anklets and
stepped on the poor, but in prophetic proclamations of the future,
envisioning the new day, Israel will be a bride again: "In that
day . . . I will betroth you to me forever . . . in righteousness and
in justice, in steadfast love and in mercy" (Hos 2:16, 19). The
NT book of Revelation depicts this new queen as "the holy city
Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as
a bride adorned for her husband," wearing a crown of gold with
jasper, agate, emerald, chrysolite, amethyst, topaz—"having the
glory of God, its radiance like a most rare jewel" (Rev 21:2,
12-21).

## BRIEF NOTE

## LUKE 3:22-38 IN CODEX BEZAE: THE MESSIANIC KING

GEORGE E. RICE
Andrews University

The work of the textual critic has long centered in the task of col-
lating manuscripts, counting variants, and computing the results for the
purpose of placing manuscripts in their proper text-types. This process
is essential for building a critical text. However, as important as this
work may be, dealing statistically with variant readings can result in a
neglect of the contribution the variants make to the meaning of the text.
The contribution of a variant reading can be fully appreciated only
when the degree of difference it brings to the text is evaluated. As K.
W. Clark says:

> Counting words is a meaningless measure of textual variation, and all such
> estimates fail to convey the theological significance of variable readings.
> Rather it is required to evaluate the thought rather than to compute the ver-
> biage. How shall we measure the theological clarification derived from textual
> emendation where a single word altered affects the major concept in a passage?
> . . . By calculating words it is impossible to appreciate the spiritual insights that
> depend upon the words.[1]

It is only when one realizes that many variant readings resulted
from theological biases that textual criticism becomes exciting. The
textual critic then finds himself discontented with collating three or four
scattered chapters of a book for purposes of placing a manuscript in its
proper text-type. Three or four chapters of one of the gospels, e.g., are
not sufficient to isolate a pattern of theological biases that may lie
behind variant readings. The entire book must be collated, and then
whatever patterns exist can be seen.

Westcott and Hort believed that alterations of the text were not
motivated by theological interests,[2] but this view has now been recog-
nized as fallacious.[3] Frederic Kenyon, e.g., points out that anyone who

---

[1] K. W. Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variations in Current Criticism
of the Greek New Testament," *JBL* 85 (1966): 4-5.

[2] Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *Introduction, Appendix*, vol. 2
of *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (London and New York: Macmillan, 1896),
p. 282.

[3] Cf. Friedrich Blass, *Philology of the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1898), p. 89; Clark,
pp. 4-7; Eldon Jay Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in
Acts* (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), pp. 1-3; Albertus Frederik Johannes Klijn, *A
Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Utrecht: Kemink,
1949), pp. 163-164; Kirsopp Lake, *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of*

compares the text of Codex D with Codex B will see that no theory of accident will account for the omissions and additions which become apparent.[4]

One advantage of collating an entire book is the opportunity thereby provided for observing the contributions made to a developing pattern by less obvious variants. Although the more obvious variants may be seen quickly, the total picture cannot be appreciated until all variants are evaluated. Indeed, it is sometimes the minor changes that place the more obvious variants in their proper perspective within the developing theological pattern. K. Lake says that a "small amount of evidence is sufficient to establish the claim to consideration of readings which are likely to have been obnoxious to early doctrine."[5] And Clark comments that the "amount of textual change that involves theological alteration is a small proportion but it is a nugget of essential importance for interpretation."[6]

### 1. *The Variant in Codex Bezae and Jesus' Baptism*

Codex Bezae Cantabrigiens (D) is a manuscript that makes this type of study rewarding. The unique readings of this manuscript have long been recognized by textual scholars. E. J. Epp's work, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*, has shown the existence of definite biases lying behind the variant readings in Acts.[7] A similar study of Luke indicates that theological biases promoted variant readings in this book as well.[8]

By an examination of the variant readings that relate to Jesus and his ministry throughout Luke, we can see that D works for a magnification of Jesus. In the present study we will examine two of these variants that strengthen the identification of Jesus as the Messianic King. They stand side by side in Luke 3:22 and Luke 3:23-38: the heavenly voice that was heard at Jesus' baptism, and the genealogy of Jesus, respectively.

The alteration made in the words of the heavenly voice has occasioned a lively discussion by almost every commentator and scholar

the *New Testament* (Oxford: University Press, 1904), pp. 10-11; C. S. C. Williams, *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951), pp. 5-6.

[4]Frederic Kenyon, "The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts," *The Proceedings of the British Academy* 24 (1938): 307.

[5]Lake, pp. 10-11.

[6]Clark, p. 15.

[7]See n. 3, above.

[8]George E. Rice, *The Alteration of Luke's Tradition by the Textual Variants in Codex Bezae* (Ph. D. dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1974).

interested in the textual problems of the NT.  In addition, the dif-
ferences between the genealogies found in the normal text of Matthew
and Luke have stirred their share of interest.  D's alterations add still
another dimension to this discussion.

The three Synoptics present an almost identical account of the
words spoken by the heavenly voice at Jesus' baptism.  D makes the
following alteration in Luke's account:

<div align="center">Luke 3:22</div>

| Codex B[9] | Codex D |
|---|---|
| χαι φωνην εξ ουϱανου<br>γενεσθαι συ ει ο υιος μου<br>ο αγαπητος εν σοι ευδοχησα | χαι φωνην εχ του ουϱανου<br>γενεσθαι υιος μου ει συ<br>εγω σημεϱον γεγεννηχα σε |
| "And a voice came from<br>heaven, You are my beloved<br>son, in you I am pleased." | "And a voice came from<br>heaven, You are my<br>son, Today I have begotten you."[10] |

This reading in D is supported by Old Latin manuscripts and a number
of church fathers.  The presence of this reading in D and Old Latin
manuscripts indicates that it is a part of the Western Text.

There are various opinions as to the import of the words in this
alteration.  B. H. Streeter considers the reading of the Western Text as
the original,[11] as did A. Harnack,[12] who thought that the B reading in
Luke was assimilated from the reading of Matthew and Mark because
the Western reading was open to doctrinal objections.[13]  B. S. Easton
says that this reading may "represent the original (pre-Markan) form of
the words, transmitted by oral or non-canonical written tradition."[14]
Friedrich Blass favors the idea that the Western reading is original
because it fits in logically with the genealogy that immediately follows in
the normal text.[15]

[9]The ideal standard would be the original text which Luke himself wrote, but since this
is obviously not extant, some other standard for comparison must be chosen.  I have
selected a real text, B, rather than using a critical edition (which, of course, gives a text
which never existed in manuscript form).

[10]The variant, εγω σημεϱον γεγεννηχα σε, is attested by D it^(a·)b,c,d,ff²,1,r¹, Justin,
Origen, Diognetus, Gospel of the Ebionites, (Clement), Didascalia, Methodius, Juvencus,
(Ambrosiaster), Hilary, Apostolic Constitutions, Faustinus, (Tyconius), Augustine.

[11]Burnett Hillman Streeter, The Four Gospels (London: Macmillan, 1961), p. 143.

[12]Adolf Harnack, The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St.
Luke, trans. J. R. Wilkinson (London: Williams and Norgate, 1908), pp. 310-314.

[13]It is of interest to note that D makes this alteration in Luke's text alone; the normal
readings in Matthew and Mark remain unchanged.

[14]Burton Scott Easton, The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical
Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), pp. 43-44.

[15]Blass, pp. 169-170.

F. Godet, W. H. P. Hatch, and C. S. C. Williams are among those who do not accept this reading as original.[16] Commenting on Luke 3:22 in the Western text, C. G. Montefiore says; "If this, as some think, is the true original reading, it would show that Luke, in its original form, knew nothing of the miraculous birth. To the divine Son the Baptism could bring no new, special relation to God."[17]

However, there are those, such as Easton, who disagree with Montefiore's conclusion:  "The theological difficulty caused by this reading is quite needless; Messiahship (equals "sonship" here) was an office of Christ's humanity and was by no means necessarily involved in the Incarnation."[18]

Michael Mees thinks that the Western reading grew out of the catechetical instruction of the early church.  Luke, he feels, has applied Ps 2:7 (from which "You are my son, today I have begotten you" is taken) to the resurrection (Acts 13:33), and because the heavenly voice at the baptism suggested Ps 2:7, the church saw "the redemption as a powerful Epiphany of God upon earth, which manifested itself by the baptism for the first time and has been surpassed in the resurrection."[19]

The normal reaction is to view the expression "You are my son, today I have begotten you" as an Adoptionist reading.  Streeter, e.g., suggests that the Western text gave an original Adoptionist account of the baptism.[20]  Lake favored this theory of a primitive Adoptionism.[21] Such a reaction to the Western reading can be readily understood, for it appears in the Gospel of the Ebionites:  και φωνη εκ του ουρανου λεγουσα· συ μου ει ο υιος αγαπητος, εν σοι ηυδοκησα, και παλιν εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε[22] ("and a voice from heaven saying, You are my beloved son, in you I am pleased, and again, Today I have begotten you").

Justin Martyr uses this reading in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (88.8). However, Williams says that when Justin used it he knew that he was

[16]F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*, trans. E. W. Shalders (New York: I. K. Funk, 1881), p. 126; William Henry Paine Hatch, *The "Western" Text of the Gospels* (Evanston: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1937), pp. 24-25; Williams, pp. 45-46.
[17]C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 2d ed., 2 (London: Macmillan, 1927): 143.
[18]Easton, pp. 43-44.
[19]Michael Mees, "Sinn und Bedeutung literarischer Formen für die Textgestalt des Codex Bezae in Lukas 10-11," *Vetera Christianorum* 7 (1970): 66-67.
[20]Streeter, p. 143.
[21]Kirsopp Lake, *Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity* (London: Macmillan, 1920), p. 120.
[22]Kurt Aland, *Synopsis Quatuor Evangeliorum*, 4th ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt Stuttgart, 1968), p. 27.

quoting Ps 2:7, and that he loved to combine the OT with the NT. Williams then concludes, following M.-J. Lagrange, that Justin may have originated this reading and that Tatian borrowed it from Justin.[23] If so, "Justin and possibly Tatian could have popularized the variant, so that it passed on to Clement of Alexandria and to Origen: from them Methodius of Olympus, Hilary and Augustine may have derived their knowledge of it.[24]

### 2. *The Variant in Codex Bezae and the Genealogy of Jesus*

The main points of this discussion which revolve around the Western variant do not, however, answer the immediate question with which we are concerned, What was the thinking behind D's use of this variant? To settle this question properly we must first look at the variant presented by D alone in the next several verses.

Beginning with vs. 23, Luke presents his version of Jesus' genealogy. There has been a greal deal of debate over whether the genealogy belongs to Joseph or to Mary. It is possible, as we shall see, that D saw in the genealogy a convenient vehicle through which he could express his theological bias.

Space prohibits a comparison of the text of Codex B and D at this point. All that needs to be said is that D sets aside the genealogy of the normal tradition of Luke between Joseph and David and incorporates Matthew's kingly line with some corrections. Matthew says that Uzziah was the son of Joram. D corrects this by adding three names, Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah, making the list agree with the OT accounts. (The first chapter of Matthew in D is lost, so we do not know if D made these corrections there as well.) Other than noting what D has done to Luke's genealogy, very little is said by scholars as to possible reasons for this change.[25]

What follows is a suggested solution to the variants in Luke 3: 22-38. D received the variant reading at Luke 3:22 (the heavenly voice) from his Western source so that this verse was now a direct quote of Ps 2:7, "You are my son, today I have begotten you." Since this Psalm is a royal Psalm of a king of Judah, it was logical for D in the development of his theological bias to supply Jesus with the royal line (borrowed from Matthew) in Luke's genealogy. Concerning Ps 2, E. W. Heaton says

[23]Williams, pp. 46-47.
[24]Ibid.
[25]Charles Cutler Torrey (*Documents of the Primitive Church* [New York: Harper, 1941], pp. 129-131) does propose, however, that D is a Greek translation of an Aramaic version in which the genealogical corrections were made for the benefit of Aramaic-speaking Jews.

that this psalm "was composed, like Psalm 110, for the coronation of a Davidic king in Jerusalem" and that it "probably continued to be used on the official anniversary of the king's accession throughout the period of the monarchy and subsequently it was reinterpreted as a prophecy of the coming Messiah."[26]

At the anointing of the king, he was admitted to a unique relationship with God, which is described as an adoption.[27] According to *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, "the anointing of the king made him Meshiah YHWH, placed him in a special relationship to God, and established him as the one chosen by God to represent His rulership in Israel and to bear witness to His glory before the nations."[28]

Christians, of course, saw in this Psalm a prophecy pointing to Jesus, and used it as such in their discussion with Jews (Justin Martyr is a case in point). Although Jews themselves once saw Messianic implications in this Psalm, their views changed, probably as a reaction to the Christian use of the Psalm: "'Meshiah' (anointed one of God) in Psalms ii. 7, which was formerly thought to have messianic reference, is now taken as referring either to a Hasmonean king or to Israel. The latter interpretation is that prevailing in the Midrash."[29]

### 3. *Summary*

In summary, then, the process which led to D's distinctive use of these variant readings was probably as follows: D received the variant reading at Luke 3:22 (the heavenly voice) from his Western source. Because of the royal significance of Ps 2, and because the Church saw in this Psalm a prophecy of the Messiah, D quite naturally sees Messianic implications for Jesus. Because this variant appears in connection with the baptism of Jesus, D views this baptism as the anointing of Jesus as the Messianic King.

Thus Ps 2:7, indicating that the newly anointed king of Judah now becomes God's son in a unique way, which he was not previous to the anointing, is applied to God's Son as he takes upon himself a phase of this sonship he had not previously occupied, i.e. the role of the "Messiah" King. D logically alters the adjoining genealogy to support this position and ascribes to the newly anointed King the royal line of David.

[26]E. W. Heaton, *The Hebrew Kingdoms* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 151.

[27]Cf. Heaton, p. 152; Charles Augustus and Emilie Grace Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, 1 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927): 15-16; and H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of the Psalms* (Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1959), pp. 50-51.

[28]Isidore Singer, ed., *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 8 (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1904): 505.

[29]Ibid., p. 506.

# BOOK REVIEWS

Albanese, Catherine L. *Sons of the Fathers: The Civil Religion of the American Revolution*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976. 274 pp. $15.00.

Ever since Robert N. Bellah began publishing his sociological essays on civil religion the subject has caught the attention of scholars in many disciplines. The recent bicentennial has turned this interest to the American Revolution. One of a number of writers looking at the religious aspects of this era, Catherine L. Albanese, Associate Professor of Religion at Wright State University, uses a history-of-religions methodology to study the origins of the American civil religion. Assuming that the perceived religion of a people is a smaller component of the "real" religion, Albanese argues that the Revolution was in itself a religious experience that provided the fundamental basis for the American civil religion. The patriots lived out an inner myth that symbolized this religious experience. Regarding themselves as analogous with both ancient Israel and their Puritan fathers, they saw the present as in peril of decline. Moving forward to arrest this decline, they more and more made America a transcendent object of religion and came to supplant their ancestral fathers as its creators.

This religious experience revealed itself in a number of ways. Rituals developed that dramatized the myth of newness. In the process of creating such symbolic forms as the liberty tree the patriots discovered that they were their own men, the makers of history. Although at the beginning of the war they talked much about the Lord of Battles intervening on their behalf, by the conflict's end the patriots were placing more emphasis upon their own involvement with liberty and their own virtues as the basis of their freedom. God increasingly departed their universe as an active force, becoming instead the "Great Governor" and "Architect," one who found his home in the church of Freemasonry. During the early republic the legend of Washington grew until he became a divine man, unifying elements from America's classical and Christian past. At the same time the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution developed into sacred documents that cemented the unity of the nation. In the Revolutionary experience, Albanese concludes, Americans found an invisible religion in which they, rather than God or even their ancestors, were at the center.

To support this argument Albanese has drawn from a wide range of sources: broadsides, pamphlets, sermons, songs, histories, and private correspondence, among others, all of which appear in the footnotes. Typically and probably unavoidably, New England and the Middle States contribute the most evidence (although the author does draw upon some Southern material), and thereby may slant the argument toward the religious concerns of those areas.

While the research is thorough, one wishes that the theoretical framework were more clear, at least for those readers unacquainted with the history of religious methodology. The author's definition of religion as a way of orientation to the world and institutions needs further amplification and justification. One is tempted to think that in these terms everything becomes religious, and thereby the word loses any useful meaning. Also, the author's use of the concept of paradox to explain American culture, drawn from historian Michael Kammen, is often unclear, as when she states, "The language of right and reason was enticing the patriots to the affirmation of a new two-in-one, for it was suggesting to sinners that their persons contained a divinity which corresponded to the divinity in the nature of things." Statements such as this may well be true, but they need further explanation and support. As they

209

appear here they often have an air of abstractness that requires clarification by a closer tie to historical evidence.

Despite these problems, Catherine Albanese has given us a book that necessitates a new way of thinking about the Revolutionary era. Beyond this it leads to questions about the relationship between this religion of America where man is the chief actor and the various religions in America whose sometimes peculiar qualities often puzzle foreigners. That there is an American civil religion seems clear; its effect upon the theological understanding of American churches needs exploration.

Andrews University                                                    GARY LAND

Andreasen, Niels-Erik A. *The Christian Use of Time*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1978. 128 pp. Paperback, $3.95.

The author is an associate professor of OT at Loma Linda University and known through several scholarly studies on the Sabbath. According to the preface, *The Christian Use of Time* is neither a doctrinal nor a technical book. It proceeds "from a decidedly Christian premise, namely that every person, Christian and non-Christian alike, is created with the potential to lead a meaningful life" (p. 9). To assist man in reaching this potential, Andreasen suggests that the biblical day of rest, by whatever name it may be known, should once again be given the most careful attention. Hence *The Christian Use of Time* is a series of ten reflections upon the insights and benefits that the weekly day of rest may bring. In some ways it will remind the reader of Abraham Joshua Heschel's *The Sabbath: The Meaning for Modern Man* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1952).

The reflections are of a theological and philosophical nature and integrated around the subject of time. The chapters are entitled: (1) "Finding Time," (2) "Setting Time Aside," (3) "Time for Work," (4) "Time for Rest," (5) "Time for Being Free," (6) "Time for Recreation," (7) "Time for Worship," (8) "Time for Meditation," (9) Time for Others," and (10) "Time for the Future."

Andreasen submits that rather than filling *time* with a spree of activities one should learn to appreciate its value. In this the biblical concept of a weekly day of rest may guide man into a creative use of both "empty (free) time and full (actively engaged) time" (p. 19).

Israel's seventh day was filled with worship, celebration, and joy like her other festivals, yet it differed in that the Sabbath was not demarcated by astronomical and seasonal conditions. The Sabbath of the creation story is a "Time for Rest," when all work reaches its goal. The writer defines rest as a symbol for meaning. The rest day frees man from his preoccupation with "having" and "doing" and makes provisions for "being" and "becoming." Recreation, afforded by the sacred day, implies activity designed to restore our energies and therefore is distinct from leisure and entertainment (which are ends in themselves) and from rest (which implies cessation).

Walter J. Harrelson has defined worship as "an ordered response to the appearance of the Holy" (*From Fertility Cult to Worship* [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1969], p. 19), and the day of rest is time which supplies the Holy with the occasion to appear. Andreasen adds, "Without time, holiness is mute and worship ceases" (p. 81).

The biblical day of rest is a remarkable and radical solution to our need of stillness —one of those basic human needs threatened with extinction. This day provides time to be alone; and being alone, the author proposes in existential language, means to be a person because one may discover oneself. The day of rest is a retreat in time, when stepping aside, man may catch a glimpse of his goals, methods, motives, and himself.

This day helps us to find time for others —another almost forgotten art. Yet, the day of rest also takes man beyond the past and present, for it invites one to have "an audience with the future" (p. 119).

This book offers profound insights, but it is written in a deceptively simple style. It is enhanced by its felicity of expression and sobriety of judgment and will be a wholesome complement to the more technical and occasionally less skillfully executed polemical treatments regarding the day of rest. *The Christian Use of Time* is sprinkled with refreshing aphorisms and metaphors (e.g., the Sabbath "comes like an unexpected surprise, like a bouquet of flowers when there is no anniversary, birthday, or Mother's Day" [p. 28], or again, "It is like a traffic island in the rush of time" [p. 39]).

The work appears to be free from errors in typography and content and comes complete with endnotes and a bibliographical list for further reading. I recommend these reflections to laymen and [especially?] scholars.

Andrews University                                                      ARTHUR J. FERCH

Damsteegt, P. Gerard. *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1977. xv + 348 pp. Paperback, $7.95.

This book was P. Gerard Damsteegt's dissertation for the Doctor of Theology degree at the Free University of Amsterdam. It traces the development of a Seventh-day Adventist theology of mission from the movement's Millerite origins in the 1840s until the sending of its first overseas missionary in 1874. After the Great Disappointment had shattered Millerism and left the bewildered Adventists strewn about the northern United States, a Sabbatarian Adventist minority rallied itself around two affirmations: first, that the Adventist experience in 1844, including the fateful day in October, had been spiritually valid and meaningful; and second, that certain neglected doctrines —especially the seventh-day Sabbath —required restoration in order for the Lord to come.

For Sabbatarian Adventists October 22, 1844, had not been miscalculated, as most Millerites believed in retrospect, but *misinterpreted*. With a typological use of the biblical sanctuary, these Adventists found an explanation for the delayed Parousia which shut the door of salvation on the "wicked world" that had rejected Millerism. Assuming this anti-mission posture, Sabbatarian Adventists only hoped to keep their own "garments spotless" as Christ performed the high priestly functions in an antitypical heavenly sanctuary. The post-Disappointment years ended in the 1850s when Adventists acknowledged the "shut-door" of salvation was open after all, allowing missionary efforts to begin. Damsteegt finds that the Adventist prophetess, Ellen G. White, inspired missionary activity, and he differs with two recent historians (Ingemar Lindén and Ronald Numbers) who see her earliest role in this regard as equivocal. In the period that Damsteegt covers, the missionary outreach of Adventists was at first limited to the United States and later included no more than European "Christendom."

For those familiar with the work of LeRoy Froom, Francis D. Nichol, and Everett Dick, this young Adventist historian of theology offers nothing substantially new. What he might have contributed, but did not, was an interpretive thesis which accounts for the development of Seventh-day Adventism from an anti-mission to a missionary movement. Lacking a thesis, Damsteegt does "scissors-and-paste" history based on an exhaustive survey of early Adventist tracts, pamphlets, and books, which amounts to the summary of an historical period rather than the analysis of a problem. In the spirit of interconfessional dialogue, he asks the early Adventists to speak for themselves (if that is really possible) through extensive quotations and paraphrases of the docu-

ments. Unfortunately, he never cross-examines his sources, or establishes any critical distance from them. Damsteegt does well to depart from Froom's providentialist history but argues no alternative historical explanations. He deems virtually anything in early Adventist thought germane to his topic — apocalypticism and soteriology, ecclesiology and ecumenism, revelation and hermeneutics — until the mission motif at times almost drops from view. The hermeneutics of an arcane biblical apocalypticism becomes entirely too much of a preoccupation in the volume. It raises the question for me of whether early Adventists can be attributed a "method" of interpreting Scripture when their biblical literalism seemed to preclude, for the most part, the need for a hermeneutic.

The volume is well organized, and a careful reading of it, though tedious, does not go unrewarded. I think, e.g., of the point (on p. 37) that a Millerite emphasis on the definite time for Christ's return was defended on the grounds that it produced evangelistic results. Thus, if the book is short on analysis, it will provide valuable grist for the mill of a more imaginative interpreter.

Loma Linda University                                    JONATHAN BUTLER
Riverside, California

Erb, Paul. *Bible Prophecy: Questions and Answers.* Scottdale, Pa., and Kitchener, Ont.: Herald Press, 1978. 208 pp. $5.55/$4.95.

This handy volume endeavors to answer some 90 basic questions on the general topic of "Bible Prophecy" under the following main categories: "The Meaning of Prophecy," "The Place of Christ in Prophecy," "Promise and Assurance in Salvation History," "The Church in God's Plan," "The Kingdom of Christ," "The Coming of Christ," "The Hope of the Resurrection," and "The Ultimate Judgment." The answers are necessarily quite brief, but usually represent well-thought-out solutions. They vary considerably as to the amount of biblical or other support they provide for the positions taken.

As an illustration of the kinds of questions asked, the following may be mentioned: "Is prophecy the foretelling of future events?," "Why are there so many differences among the students of prophecy?," "What is eschatology?," "What is apocalyptic literature?," "What is the chief focus of Old Testament prophecy?," "Why does prophecy center in the person and work of Jesus Christ?," "Is salvation past, present, or future?," "Was Pentecost a second coming of Christ?," "What is the kingdom of Christ?," "Are there valid reasons for believing in a future millennium?," "What is the goal of history?," "Why was the resurrection of Christ a crucial event?," "Which is it: immortality or resurrection?," "What is the purpose of the final judgment?"

In spite of my misgivings about certain aspects of this publication (some of these will be noted below), I must express deep appreciation for the balance that is generally characteristic throughout the work. Although the author recognizes that "prophecy includes a large element of prediction," he also indicates that "the prophet is primarily a spokesman for God," and that the "goal of prophecy is the holiness of God, experienced in and beyond history" (see p. 22). Indeed, later in the volume he states, "We are not looking for *something to happen.* We are looking for *Someone to come* who already has been here, and who must come again to bring God's plan of redemption to its completion" (p. 70). And he goes on to say that eschatology "is not only about last things, but about first things also. In Christ there is a unity of past, present, and future. What He will do when He comes again is not so much new things, as to bring beginnings to their purposed ends" (ibid.).

It is apparent that the interpreter is evangelical, but he is obviously opposed to dispensationalist theology. This is evident in a number of instances where dispensationalism is not specifically mentioned (e.g., in the statement on p. 57 about some "teachers of prophecy" who think of the present church age as "a mere parenthesis between the reign He [Christ] intended and the kingdom He will set up when He comes again"), as well as where dispensationalism is mentioned (as on pp. 106-109, 117, 122, 124, etc.).

Erb at times presents alternative suggestions in answer to the questions posed, and does not in every instance decide between the alternatives. Moreover, he is generally kind and fair in his presentation of other views, whether he agrees with them or not. His questions 40-45, e.g., deal specifically with various positions relating to the millennium, with a definition of "chiliasm" first, followed by discussions of "postmillennialism," "amillennialism," "premillennialism," "dispensationalism," and "transmillennialism" (pp. 100-111); and his basic fairness in relating the views is to be commended. His recognition that the antichrist of Revelation may be a system, not just a personage, is another evidence of his fairness in endeavoring to present alternatives (though he apparently himself favors the latter view); but in this case, his referring to the antichrist as a person on p. 149 and as possibly a "system of thought" on p. 153 is somewhat confusing inasmuch as adequate explanation is not furnished for the switch in concept.

The brevity of discussion for each question has imposed severe limits throughout the volume, and this brevity may at times be responsible for incongruities and ambiguities which appear. For instance, this reviewer was unable to determine from the discussion on pp. 109-111 what "transmillennialism" really means. Moreover, at times the discussion borders on inaccuracy, or may indeed be inaccurate. It is debatable, e.g., that Augustine was the father of postmillennialism (pp. 101-102); rather he should be called the father of amillennialism. Also, to refer to postmillennialism as "the system of thought of liberal Christianity" (p. 102) is questionable; for in contrast to what is generally called "liberal Christianity," postmillennialism accepts the concept of a real *literal* return of Christ.

The present reviewer wonders, too, whether the author's positions regarding the "intermediate state" (pp. 179-180) and regarding "hades" and "gehenna" (pp. 195-196) have not failed to take into account an adequate exegesis of texts referred to, as well as overlooking certain historical backgrounds essential to the discussion. And at times the author makes historical allusions without adequate grounds, as in the statement that J. N. Darby "got the idea of a 'rapture' [pretribulation "secret" rapture] of true believers from Margaret Macdonald, a Scotch [sic] woman who claimed it as a revelation" (p. 107). Obviously Erb here bases his conclusions on sources brought to light by Dave MacPherson, but the presentation by MacPherson is not at all decisive as to whether or not Darby really did borrow the "secret-rapture" hypothesis from Margaret Macdonald (see my review of two of MacPherson's books in *AUSS* 13 [1975]: 86-87 and *AUSS* 15 [1977]: 238-239). Erb has missed, both here and in his bibliography, a much more substantial and basic source on Darby and the early Plymouth Brethren: namely, Clarence Bass, *Backgrounds to Dispensationalism* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1950).

Also unfortunate, in my opinion, is the fact that frequently when reference is made to the work of other scholars or writers, no footnote or other kind of specific source citation is given; e.g., for Ladd and Manley on p. 83, for Sampey on p. 94, for Augustine on p. 151, etc. In some instances authors and works are not even listed in the bibliography though referred to in the main text; e.g., D. T. Niles on p. 175 (no title is given), C. S. Lewis on p. 196, and Wilkerson and Biederwolf on p. 33. But the omission of some of these may not be as glaring as that of Hal Lindsey's *The Late*

*Great Planet Earth*, referred to on p. 33 (Lindsey's *The Terminal Generation* is listed in the bibliography, however, on p. 203). Incidentally, Lindsey's name is misspelled "Lindsay" in each of several occurrences in the book (pp. 33, 155, 203).

On the whole Erb's presentation provides a useful tool for the lay person in providing brief answers to many of the varied questions relating to "Bible Prophecy." It is generally balanced, as already noted; but caution must be exercised to recognize where there is actual scriptural and historical support for the positions taken and where the matter is one merely of the author's own interpretation.

Andrews University                                    KENNETH A. STRAND

Harvey, A. E. *Jesus on Trial: A Study of the Fourth Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1977. vii + 140 pp. $6.95.

The thesis of this interesting work on the Fourth Gospel is that it is "a presentation of the claims of Jesus in the form of an extended trial" (p. 17). Harvey sets forth his case by first pointing out the problem caused by the condemnation of Jesus. One might question the verdict of a Roman court, but Jesus was also tried before a Jewish court and in the eyes of the Jews the presumption would be that the latter was correct. The Synoptics imply that the Jewish court was corrupt rather than that Jesus was guilty. But John instead lets the reader decide for himself by setting forth before him the charges of the accusers and the defense of the accused in a series of different situations.

To support his contention, the author first attempts to show that the Gospel writer deliberately used legal terms in pointing to judicial witnesses necessary for a legal procedure. Since the important thing was not the facts as such but the credibility of the witnesses, these last had to be chosen with the view of their being trusted by the readers. Thus John the Baptist is the first witness. John is not only a credible but early witness. The Fourth Gospel is distinctive in not identifying John with Elijah but simply identifying him as a voice, according to Harvey, "a speaker giving evidence" (p. 28).

The early disciples are also witnesses. Among them is Nathanael, who is specifically called an Israelite (not a Jew), and one without guile – "and this, of course, is precisely what is required of a reliable witness" (p. 36). Judas is called a *diabolos* which really refers to a slanderer, an adversary, i.e., one who gives a negative witness. The statement in John 18:5, "Judas who betrayed him stood with them," is compared with Zech 3:1, with emphasis upon "standing." Harvey's conclusion is that "here Judas, by 'standing' with Jesus' enemies, identifies himself again as *diabolos*" (p. 38). The witnesses of beings from another world also are added to these in their witness of Jesus as "the Holy One."

In regard to legal procedures, the author mentions three. The first is that a trial does not need to take place before a formally constituted court, the second that the line between witness and judge was not always clear and that the chief concern was not the facts themselves but the reliability of the witness, and third that there could be in some cases only one witness. Harvey intends to show by these procedures that what takes place in the Gospel of John is not just a dispute between Jesus and his adversaries but indeed, in a full sense of the word, a legal procedure since all three factors mentioned above apply to the situations described in John. Especially emphasized is the third of the factors, in that Jesus claims the Father as witness that he is unique and authoritative. Such a claim would be considered blasphemous if false; but if true, it would lead to condemnation of those who would reject it, so that those

who were judging Jesus would themselves be judged. Harvey also reviews the trial scenes in the Synoptics, pointing out differences and similarities, but is obviously more interested in the latter. While not explicit, what he wants to show is that the Synoptics agree with John. We are not forced to conclude, he says, that they depict a formally constituted Jewish trial, but the issues are the same: healing on the Sabbath and the claims of Jesus.

He finds the charges in John, however, to be more specific. In the Synoptics, what Jesus does on the Sabbath is controversial but nothing that could have been specifically brought before a court; in John they are acts that are explicitly prohibited by the Mishnah: carrying a bed and making a paste. Regarding the charge of blasphemy, the Synoptics mention this only at the trial at the end, but John mentions no fewer than five incidents where this charge is directed toward Jesus.

Jesus' defense to these charges was that he was acting in God's name. He was God's Son and had authority to serve as God's agent. He could also support his case by the miracles, which are considered signs. A difference from the Synoptics is the fact that in John miracles evoke belief while in the Synoptics miracle is the result of belief.

The verdict of the Jewish and Roman court regarding Jesus was guilty; but John, unlike the Synoptics who imply that the verdict was wrong because the procedures were wrong, seeks to show that the procedures were correct but the verdict was wrong. John has already shown how this was so, but another way in which the reader can also be shown this is by the evidence of Jesus' followers. Up to this point, John has presented the case of Jesus publicly, but beginning with chap. 13 he shows that those who received Jesus would be his witnesses. As Jesus was the Father's agent, so now the disciples must become Jesus' agents. But in this work they would have the assistance of a *paraclete*. There was no place for such a one in Jewish legal procedure, but the idea is taken from an imagined trial and judgment before God. Good deeds or angels or perfectly righteous people could serve as advocates. An advocate refers to a person "who would appear in court to lend the weight of his influence and prestige to the case of his friend, to convince the judges of his probity, and to seek to secure a favourable verdict" (p. 109). Not Jesus Christ in heaven as in 1 John 2:1, but the Holy Spirit on earth, is the advocate here. The Spirit will come to the aid of the witness of Jesus and counter-accuse those who accuse him.

After presenting the foregoing thesis, Harvey seeks in his last chapter to bring out some of the implications of this study on critical problems regarding the Gospel.

The question at issue in regard to the thesis of this book is not whether the accounts in John are set forth to lead the reader to believe in Jesus or whether they are set forth in the format of controversy and dispute with charges, counter-charges, and defense. Rather, the question is whether John has actually, deliberately, and specifically used a legal model in the form of actual trials. The arguments in Harvey's chapter on witnesses appear forced, especially what is said concerning Nathanael and Judas. The chapter dealing with the verdict does not make a convincing case that the reader must also hear the evidence of Jesus' followers, since their evidence as such is not provided in the last chapters of the Gospel. That Jesus deals and speaks more privately to his apostles is not in question; what is in question is that these chapters constitute the witness of Jesus' followers.

The verdict of this reviewer is that the author has not proved his case, though there is much of interest and profit that can be derived from the book, especially information regarding Jewish legal procedures.

Walla Walla College                                   Sakae Kubo
College Place, Washington

Hatch, Nathan O. *The Sacred Cause of Liberty: Republican Thought and the Millennium in Revolutionary New England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977. 197 pp. $12.50.

This slim volume makes a significant contribution to the rapidly growing literature on American millennialism and civil religion. By examining the sermons of New England ministers between 1740 and 1800 Nathan O. Hatch, who teaches history at Notre Dame University, helps us see continuity between Puritanism and the early republic where previous historians have seen largely discontinuity.

Hatch argues that the convergence of millennial and Republican thought is a central theme of the period and provided a new foundation "for the tottering structures of Puritan collective identity." The conflict with France, beginning with the capture of Ft. Louisbourg in 1745, shifted apocalyptic hope from viewing the millennium as a time of vital religion to seeing it as a period of liberty. In opposing papal France, England was aligned with the cosmic forces of good against the antichrist. But with the passage of the Stamp Act in 1765 New Englanders saw that the battle between Protestants and Catholics was but part of the larger conflict between liberty and tyranny. In reinterpreting the millennium as political, however, these ministers had not shed their religious assumptions about the moral nature of society. As a result, with the emergence of the free republic they called for a balanced freedom that threw the weight of restraint against the forces of anarchy. Thus their Federalism of the 1780s is continuous with their previous political and religious thought. Nevertheless, they had concluded that because liberty must precede the kingdom and the American republic was the seat of liberty, their nation was therefore God's primary agent in history.

The author has presented a tightly knit argument that cannot be faulted. The main questions arising out of it are problems of how the evidence from ministers, primarily Congregational, in a small section of the country relates to evidence more widespread both socially and geographically. In a closing note on the sermons Hatch argues forcefully that those sermons that were printed were done so mostly by popular demand and therefore reflect a considerable popular opinion. He recognizes, however, that New England may have been a more distinctive than typical culture. Its Federalism, for instance, held decidedly little appeal elsewhere. As a result, this book suggests the need for examining millennialism and republicanism in other geographical and denominational contexts.

Hatch's volume also holds interest as a case study in the secularization of the ministry. These ministers took seriously the need to relate their theology to the political issues of their day, but in time these issues dominated and shaped their theology. It was not to be the last example of politicized religion in American history.

Well written and nicely produced, *The Sacred Cause of Liberty* is necessary reading for all scholars interested in the revolutionary era and in American religious history. It teaches us, furthermore, that if we ignore the intersection of religion and politics we are neglecting a vital area of American life.

Andrews University                                              GARY LAND

Hick, John. *Death and Eternal Life*. New York: Harper and Row, 1976. 495 pp. $15.00.

The objective of this book is to formulate what its author defines as "a global theology of death," that is, an interpretation of human destiny which draws upon the

full range of philosophical and religious concepts of death and afterlife, rather than developing the view of only one particular tradition. Accordingly, the major portion of the book is devoted to analyzing an enormous range of attitudes toward, and conceptions of, life after death, including such topics as parapsychology and spiritualism, as well as the more obviously relevant concepts of reincarnation and resurrection. No mere survey, however, the book also undertakes to examine the relative plausibility of these different views, and in its final, and most provocative, section, to integrate their major insights into a coherent, though tentative, conception of human destiny.

Hick's own argument for life after death takes the form of a response to the problem of suffering. If human existence is meaningful, he maintains, then suffering requires moral justification. However, such justification is adequate only if the individual himself participates in the ultimate good to which his suffering contributes, rather than, say, merely passing on the benefits to subsequent generations. The moral justification of suffering thus requires the individual survival of bodily death.

Behind this argument lies a view of human existence which largely determines the outcome of Hick's attempt to formulate an interpretation of human destiny. Developed extensively in his earlier work, *Evil and the God of Love*, it is a view whose roots he attributes to the Irenaean, as opposed to the more prevalent Augustinian, interpretation of human history within the Christian tradition. The latter accounts for human suffering in terms of a primal fall from an ideal state, regarding it as more or less accidental. In contrast, the Irenaean view regards suffering as integral to the eventual achievement of God's purpose for human life; it plays an essential role in the long process of soul-, or person-, making.

The principal bearing of this view upon the question of immortality has to do with the phase of this process that extends beyond the present life. Hick observes that in this world hardly anyone approaches, let alone attains, the goal of human life, which is fellowship with God, with the exception of a few saints and buddhas. So he postulates the further development toward this objective in a succession of numerous future lives, lived in "other times and other spaces." Unlike the traditional Christian view, one does not immediately enter his ultimate state when he dies, but continues toward it beyond death. And unlike the classical conception of reincarnation the succession of future lives takes place, not on this earth, but in other spheres of existence.

Hick's understanding of eternal life thus includes two central elements: an eschatology proper, which describes the ultimate goal of human life, and a "parescha-tology," which describes the course of human development between this life and the eventual achievement of the ultimate goal. The "possible pareschatology" to which the major religious traditions point, according to Hick, is "a series of lives, each bounded by something analogous to birth and death, lived in other worlds in spaces other than that in which we now are" (p. 456). And the central idea in the "possible eschatology" he proposes is that of an intimate corporate unity of humanity in which perfected human beings have become so open with others that each represents "a personality with egoity." This "wholeness of ultimately perfected humanity beyond the existence of separate egos," exists in a state which is "probably not embodied and probably not in time" (p. 464).

On the whole, this work exhibits rather vividly the major strengths and weaknesses with which readers of Hick's other works are familiar. On the positive side, the discussion here is both well informed and exceedingly informative. Hick certainly "covers the territory," and those currently interested in the question of immortality will be hard-pressed to find a more comprehensive review of this topic. In addition, the exposition is clear and careful, with just the right attention to detail. Hick's

analyses are never simplistic, yet the reader is never overburdened with unnecessarily involved explanations. And the study is filled with insights, as when e.g., Hick dispels the popular opinion that belief in afterlife represents the product of wishful thinking.

On the negative side, there are numerous points at which Hick's observations and conclusions invite criticism. For instance, his effort to show that the affirmation of divine love is incompatible with any view other than universal salvation, neglects the possibility that God genuinely wills something, such as universal reconciliation, but does not succeed. However, the principal defect of the project as a whole lies in the level at which Hick is characteristically content to let the argument rest, namely, that of "possibility," as in a *"possible* pareschatology," or a *"possible* eschatology." Admittedly, any portrayal of life after death must of necessity remain highly speculative. And admittedly too, any attempt to synthesize elements in the major religious traditions of East and West is bound to strike some as merely contrived. Nevertheless, Hick's repeated appeals to what is "not logically impossible" does not suffice to establish his conclusions, and in the final analysis he offers little to support the truth of his claims. So, in spite of the impressive scope of topics treated and the helpful insights accumulated along the way, his constructive proposal fails to do more than show that its author is entitled to his opinion.

Loma Linda University                                          RICHARD RICE
Riverside, California

Kasper, Walter. *Jesus the Christ.* London: Burnes and Oates; New York: Paulist, 1977. 289 pp. Paperback, $5.95.

This volume was originally published in German in 1974. An English translation appeared in hardback in 1976 and this present volume is the paperback edition. The author is a Catholic theologian teaching at Tübingen and is indebted to the Catholic Tübingen School represented by Karl Adam and Joseph R. Geiselmann. These theologians not only emphasize the biblical but also the ecclesiastical tradition, although the latter as something living in confrontation with the current issues of the time. Influenced by these men, Kasper calls for "an unrelentingly profound and systematic reflection on the principal themes of tradition and of novel contemporary approaches; a study and investigation of these themes; and an attempt at a new, systematic treatment which responsibly confronts modern thought with the riches of tradition and the results of the ongoing debate" (p. 10). What he calls for he admirably succeeds in doing.

Most books on Jesus have been written by NT scholars and emphasize historical aspects and methods while Kasper, a theologian, comes to his subject from a philosophical and theological orientation. He is thoroughly familiar with the literature on the subject though he generally neglects literature in English. While usually arriving at relatively conservative positions, by his careful logic and reasoning he makes these positions respectable. He has a way of setting forth the issues so that one is confronted with the ultimate questions and can see that the more liberal positions do not suit the real essence of Christianity.

The first part of the book he entitles "Jesus Christ Today." Under this heading he has three chapters dealing with "The Problematics of Contemporary Christianity," "The Historical Quest for Jesus Christ," and "The Religious Quest for Jesus Christ." In these first chapters, the author shows the need for an appropriate Christology for this age, discusses the basic approaches of Christology, the limits of the old and new quest of the historical Jesus, and the weaknesses of secular thought which pervades modern thinking with its emphasis on subjectivity and freedom. The author argues

that ultimately man can find real freedom only through God, who is true Freedom, and in Jesus Christ and His salvation. He emphasizes throughout this first section the necessity of taking more than the historical Jesus as the content of faith —that one must also include the Resurrection and the imparting of the Spirit.

The next and main section of the book deals with the "History and Destiny of Jesus Christ." This section is divided into two parts, one covering the earthly Jesus and the other the resurrected and exalted Lord. Especially good are the chapters dealing with the message of Jesus, the miracles, and the resurrection. The central message of Jesus is the Kingdom of God or God's Lordship, and this consists of the sovereignty of his love. The salvation of this Kingdom is "the coming to power in and through human beings of the self-communicating love of God" (p. 86). The problem of miracles has to do with the whole of reality and its meaning, and thus natural science cannot settle the question. It goes beyond the mere observable to the metaphysical. Jesus' miracles are signs of the coming Kingdom. It means the end of Satan's power and the restoration to normality. Thus bodies are healed, demons are exorcised, and the dead are raised. The resurrection is not first of all faith in the empty tomb, but faith in the risen Lord. "Easter is not a fact to be cited as evidence for believers; Easter is itself an object of faith." Kasper is definitely opposed to Rudolf Bultmann and others who say that "faith in the Resurrection is nothing other than faith in the cross as an act of salvation," and thus deny the resurrection as a separate event. Easter is what happens to the believers, but not to Jesus Christ. For Kasper, "Faith did not establish the reality of the Resurrection, but the reality of the Resurrected Christ obtruding in spirit upon the disciples' established faith. For this reason it is essential to distinguish between the emergence of the Easter faith and the basis of that faith, the Resurrection of Jesus Himself" (pp. 140).

Kasper's last section deals with "The Mystery of Jesus Christ" and has chapters on Jesus Christ as Son of God, Son of Man, and Mediator. Here the author seeks to take up the results of NT scholarship in order to develop a modern understanding of Christology. In this section the orientation is much more theological and philosophical and the presentation is not as clear as in the previous sections. One keeps asking, "What does he really mean?" But perhaps there are no simple ways to explain such themes as preexistence, incarnation, trinity, etc.

The book is full of insightful statements. Though it contains heavy reading at times, the reader will be rewarded for his labor. The author has done well in synthesizing biblical, philosophical, and traditional material into an understanding of Jesus Christ that is respectable in the light of modern thinking.

Walla Walla College                                        SAKAE KUBO
College Place, Washington


Kubo, Sakae. *God Meets Man: A Theology of the Sabbath and Second Advent.* Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1978. Paperback, 160 pp. $7.95.

Sakae Kubo, Dean of the School of Theology of Walla Walla College and for many years Professor of NT at Andrews University, is already well known for scholarly articles in NT textual studies; for his outstanding tool for students in NT Greek, *A Reader's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (some five or six eds. and printings since 1967); for co-authorship with Walter F. Specht of the helpful analysis of modern Bible versions entitled *So Many Versions?* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1975); and for several more popular theological studies. The book presently being reviewed

falls into the last-mentioned category, though its approach has a high degree of sophistication. Indeed, the volume belongs to a series which the publishers describe on the copyright page as intended "to push back the frontiers of Adventist thought, to stimulate constructive reevaluation of traditional thought patterns, and to catalyze fresh ideas."

In harmony with this purpose, Kubo brings his wide background in biblical and theological studies to bear on the task of providing theological perspectives regarding the seventh-day Sabbath and the Second Advent, two key focal points in Seventh-day Adventist theology. Too often, Christians have a tendency to believe doctrines and to observe practices simply on a traditional basis. This book should stimulate fresh thought, and it will hopefully also lead to new experience, regarding the Sabbath and the Second Advent, as their *meaning* is grasped within the overall context of a soteriological concern — a relationship which Kubo aptly brings out.

The book contains two main parts with subsections: Part I, "The Meaning of the Sabbath," has sections on "The Sabbath and Creation," "The Sabbath as Redemption," and "The Sabbath as Future Rest." Part II, "The Meaning of the Second Advent," has sections on "The Advent and the Present Life" and "The Advent and Future Events." Each of the sections contains, in turn, several chapters (except the section on "The Sabbath as Future Rest," which is comprised of only one chapter, " 'There Remains a Sabbath Rest' ").

Under the section on "The Sabbath and Creation" the chapters are devoted to the topics of "The Sign of God's Rest," "Holiness in Time," and "The Fellowship of the Sabbath," respectively. One recognizes here (especially in the chapter on "Holiness in Time") the influence of Abraham Heschel, but Kubo also draws on excellent concepts and statements from various other authors, as well as providing a synthesis of his own.

It is particularly refreshing to find the emphasis which Kubo places on the relationship of the Sabbath to redemption, the theme of the second section in Part I. Here there are five chapters, including one that deals with "The Sabbath and Justification" and another that treats "The Sabbath and Sanctification."

Part II of the volume contains discussion of the following topics, indicated by the chapter titles in its two subdivisions: "The Blessed Hope," "His Glorious Appearing," "The Future is Present," "The Problem of Delay," "Eschatology and Ethics," "The Rapture and the Millennium," "Universalism?," "The Resurrection of the Dead," "The Final Judgment," and "The New Earth." No major aspect of the subject has been overlooked.

Throughout, Kubo's presentation is balanced in treatment of both the Sabbath and the second Advent. Perhaps the best way to give an indication of the thrust and tone of the book is to present a few quotations:

Regarding "The Sabbath and Justification," Kubo tells us: "When man ceases from his works, he must come to realize that they are not so important and that even though he stops them, the world still moves on without him or his works. What he does is not indispensable. Although God's creative work has ceased, His sustaining activity goes on. It is God and what He does that are vital" (p. 40). "The Sabbath understood as that which strips us of our works and our autonomy before God provides no opportunity for self-justification. Its nature militates against its use in such a way. The Sabbath is truly the sign of God's grace and sovereignty, and of man's reception and dependence" (p. 43).

In dealing with the Sabbath as "The Sign of Redemption," Kubo states that "the Sabbath has no meaning at all unless creative power accomplishes its results in the life of the one who observes the day. Holiness of being must match holiness of time" (p. 49). And when dealing with the topic of "The Sabbath and Sanctification," Kubo

makes statements such as the following: "We witness today all too frequently a spineless Christianity where a great gulf separates its living from its profession. Much of this results from the fact that Christianity has lost sight of the Sabbath as requiring serious obedience to God. The emphasis has centered on justification without sanctification, a spurious faith without obedience, confession without love, and love without cost" (p. 54). "In our present world the Sabbath confronts us as God's challenge to our seriousness in accepting Christ. Since a large part of the world structures its life and business around Sunday as its rest day, observance of the seventh-day Sabbath today demands a radical, conscious, deliberate decision to follow Christ. Some such demand is always present in Christian conversion" (ibid.). "The priority of justification is fundamental. We must ever keep in mind that man alone and in his own strength cannot do anything for his salvation. No amount of good works on his part can produce it. Yet it is just as important that we do not think of the Christian simply as lifeless matter on whom and for whom God does everything. God's initiative is basic. But unless man responds in faith, he has no salvation. And the life of loving obedience must follow the response" (pp. 55-56).

In the second major part of his work, Kubo handles in a balanced way the "tension" between Christ's first and second comings. The basic importance of Christ's first advent is given full recognition, but Kubo recognizes too that redemption "remains incomplete without the Parousia" (p. 89). He states further that "the cross, the resurrection, and the ascension of Jesus make the coming of Christ an absolute certainty" (p. 99).

It is significant, also, that the matter of ethical concern and activity is given prominence by the author. Unlike various Christian writers who stress Christ's second advent in a context that leaves social concern virtually out of the picture, Kubo points out that "paradoxically the eschatological motive with its implication that there exists a righteous loving God in control of all things" intensifies the Christian's desire "to act in the way of his Lord Jesus Christ, who gave Himself not only for His friends but for His enemies" (p. 108). He states further: "Another way in which the eschatological orientation affects the Christian is by helping him to see what things are really important. Knowing that the end is certain, some things become more vital than others. The amassing of possessions and an attachment to the things of a passing world grow less important to him. The eschatological Christian has time only for the things of the Lord. His life must be dedicated to Him in service for others. The parable of the sheep and goats occurs in an eschatological setting, and the Christian knows that he must serve Christ now in the person of the poor, needy, naked, and miserable" (p. 109).

The second major part of Kubo's book seems (to the present reviewer, at least) to be somewhat more descriptive in nature and less theologically oriented than Part I, although it is not by any means devoid of theological perspective and emphasis. For instance, the chapter on "The Rapture and the Millennium" deals primarily with description of several points of view regarding millennialism, including the Seventh-day Adventist stance on this subject. The presentation is certainly most helpful. But might it not have been made even more helpful if the theological implications had been drawn out? How, e.g., do the different views described (amillennialism, pretribulationism, the Seventh-day Adventist position, and others) relate to soteriology, ecclesiology, etc.?

A further place where the present reviewer would have been interested in theological elaboration is where Kubo makes the intriguing observation that the "resurrection of the dead is not an individual but a community affair. The righteous dead all rise up together, and those alive receive translation at the same time. We die individually, but we rise up together. All enjoy the blessings of eternity together" (p. 136). How-

ever, the discussion in the chapter in which this statement occurs ("The Resurrection of the Dead," pp. 129-137) is most helpful indeed in its treatment of the backgrounds, rationales, and implications of the contrasting Greek "immortality·of-the-soul" concept and biblical "resurrection-of·the-body" doctrine, and in bringing out theological dimensions relating to both bodily resurrection and eternal life.

All in all, this volume constitutes a well-thought-out, well-organized, eminently readable, and thought-provoking treatise. It not only is essential reading for Seventh-day Adventists, to whom it is obviously primarily addressed, but it will also prove beneficial to other Christians — scholars and lay alike — who have an interest academically and/or practically in the two important biblical themes treated.

Andrews University                                             KENNETH A. STRAND

Laberge, Léo, O.M.I. *La Septante d'Isaïe 28-33; Etude de tradition textuelle*. Ottawa, Ont., Canada: Chez l'auteur, 175 Main — K1S 1C3, 1978. vi + 130 pp. $5.00.

This "work published with the collaboration of the Centre de Recherche de l'Université Saint-Paul (Ottawa, Canada)" consists of an Avant-propos, an Introduction, six chapters (one each on Isa 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33), and a Conclusion. It lifts out part of the author's doctoral dissertation (1968). His entire work was published in microfiches in 1977 with the title: *Isaïe 28-33. Etude de tradition textuelle, d'après la Pesïtto, le texte de Qumrân, la Septante et le texte massorétique*, which is available at Mary Nash Information Services, 188 Ave. Dagmar, Vanier, Ontario, K1L 5T2, Canada. The present work includes only the LXX part of the entire study, with modification of the references to the missing parts of the whole in order to make them understandable in this part.

Laberge builds on the works of Fischer, Seeligmann and Ziegler (cited in his first footnote, which gives the main bibliography on this subject). His method is a comparison of the MT with the other texts and versions in order better to understand the MT. To summarize briefly the points he makes in the Introduction: (1) he believes the Greek text of Isaiah is a unity, without uniformity of the translation (not translating words always with the same words), which is often free; (2) he accepts Fischer's dating, 250-201 B.C., without trying to take a precise position; (3) he is less generous than Fischer in accepting a good proportion of influence from Aramaic and Syriac in the translation of the text; (4) he believes that from the LXX it is impossible to reconstruct a unique Hebrew text, for one must take account of the method of translation used in the LXX as well as the methods of interpretation influenced by oral explanations or even other Hebrew texts, and one cannot recover a unique *Vorlage* of the Hebrew text; (5) he considers that each case of additions and variants must be examined for itself, and that these additions and variants are not all attributable to the imagination of the translators; (6) he considers it very possible that "double translations" are attributable to the translator himself; (7) he concludes that where the LXX translates freely it is normal that the vocabulary reflects the Egyptian origin of the translation; and lastly, (8) he notes that the LXX of Isaiah utilizes the LXX of the Pentateuch and a partial translation of the Psalms, also perhaps of Jeremiah and even of Ezekiel, though perhaps in the latter two cases the parallels were already in the Hebrew text.

After presenting his detailed analyses of the variants in the six chapters, Laberge's Conclusion summarizes the characteristics of the LXX in seven groups: (1) error of translation; (2) double translation of the same Hebrew text; (3) free translation of the Hebrew text; (4) Greek translation obtained by comparison with other biblical

passages; (5) presence of a gloss in the LXX text; (6) probable gloss in the MT and absence of this gloss in the LXX; (7) important passages for exegesis, whether the LXX presupposes a different Hebrew text, or whether the LXX witnesses to an enrichment of the primitive text. The author restrains himself from dogmatic assertions; in (5) he says that too many accidents could have happened in the transmission of the texts and their Greek translation to be able to make categorical pronouncements. In (6) he states that the MT does not manifest any gloss or reinterpretation that was not already known from the text found at Qumrân. The text of Isaiah already enjoyed incontestable authority by that time. In (7), a miscellaneous grouping of variants that do not fit into the preceding categories, he mentions a group of readings based on the MT; a group accounted for by the LXX's avoidance of anthropomorphisms; a tendency in another group to amplify certain ideas, thus showing a more advanced theological reflection; a group manifesting reinterpretations that depart from the Hebrew text; and other passages, which he examines individually, as their differences merit such treatment.

His final general conclusion mentions that his examination of Isa 28 to 33 has not produced any sensational results for exegesis. No verse of the MT was completely absent from the LXX, and vice versa. "It is therefore possible to recover in certain cases elements to retain in order to advance the exegesis. This perhaps offers the disadvantage of restricting the field of 'corrections' and modern conjectures made only on the Hebrew text of the Massoretic tradition, but certainly permits us to approach the tenor of the original text, and that according to a textual base that is much more assured. More important still, by a serious study of the LXX as well as the other ancient versions and the Qumrân text, we are provided with recovered items that permit a better appreciation of the original, on the plane of textual criticism itself, a factor which in our opinion is too much neglected . . . . Even if the work presented here contains too much analysis, we believe we have sufficiently demonstrated, by the results already gained, that it puts into operation a method of work that, applied to the whole book of Isaiah, will bring us agreeable surprises" (p. 129).

The author has done a good, detailed study using excellent guiding principles and methodology.

Andrews University                                          LEONA GLIDDEN RUNNING

Ladd, George Eldon. *The Last Things: An Eschatology for Laymen.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1978. 119 pp. Paperback, $2.95.

*The Last Things* is a brief popular treatment of central issues relating to eschatology that the author has for the most part dealt with in more detailed fashion elsewhere — especially in his books *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1952), *The Blessed Hope* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1956), *The Presence of the Future* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1974), and *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1974). Once again he shows balance coupled with keen exegetical skill in treating the biblical texts. The subtitle indicates the intent of this work for "laymen," and the author has indeed kept his objective well in mind. The scope of the publication is revealed by its chapter titles: "How to Interpret the Prophetic Scriptures" (pp. 7-18); "What About Israel?" (pp. 19-28); "The Intermediate State" (pp. 29-39); "The Second Coming of Christ" (pp. 40-48); "The Language of the Second Advent" (pp. 49-57); "The Antichrist and the Great Tribulation" (pp. 58-72); "The Resurrection and the Rapture" (pp. 73-86); "Judgment" (pp. 87-102); and "The Kingdom of God" (pp. 103-119).

It becomes immediately obvious that a major thrust of this publication is the rebuttal of dispensationalist positions. Especially is this emphasis evident in the chapters "What About Israel?," "The Language of the Second Advent," and "The Antichrist and the Great Tribulation," and to some extent too in the chapter entitled "The Kingdom of God." Ladd reiterates certain of his basic arguments against dispensationalism, repeating, e.g., what he has discussed more fully in *The Blessed Hope* and *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God* relative to the language of the Second Advent (NT use of the terms *parousia, epiphaneia,* and *apokalypsis*) and to the unwarranted dispensationalist distinction between the terminology "kingdom of heaven" and "kingdom of God" (see pp. 49-57 and 104-105).

The author's Christological hermeneutic, or reinterpretation of "the Old Testament prophecies in light of Jesus' person and mission" (p. 17) is a welcome departure from extreme views on either side, but one wonders whether or not Ladd's effort to counteract dispensationalist emphasis on literal fulfillment of OT prophecy has not led him to minimize the theological value of the OT in its own right. In any event, it would seem that a chapter dealing with the question of "How to Interpret the Prophetic Scriptures" should be much more comprehensive than what Ladd presents, even in the limited space devoted to this subject. What guidelines, e.g., should be applied in attempting to understand apocalyptic symbolism? how are literary type and literary structure related to interpretation? what relationship do literary and historical context and backgrounds have to a sound hermeneutic? what differences are to be noted between apocalyptic and general prophecy? These and other questions surely deserve —indeed demand —at least passing attention, in addition to the Christological hermeneutic that is elaborated.

The author, though polemical toward dispensationalism in a good portion of this volume, nonetheless displays a candor and fairness which also distinguishes his other writings. Indeed, his sense of fairness leads him at times to present in favorable light certain alternative evangelical views (not dispensationalist views, however) —such as exegesis of the parable of the sheep and goats (pp. 98-102).

A word should perhaps be said about Ladd's chapter on "The Intermediate State" as being one of the most perceptive presented by an evangelical scholar. Ladd treats a number of the so-called "problem" texts, but recognizes that the language must be understood in the context, not of disembodied spirits, but of resurrection of the body. He gives full weight to the fact that the biblical point of view is in opposition to the Greek concept of dualism, and in fact states explicitly that the Hebrew concept is "not dualistic" (p. 31). On the "notoriously difficult passage" in 1 Pet 3:19-20, he indicates that he can "do little more than mention the three major interpretations": the patristic view that "Christ in the spirit went and preached the gospel to the spirits of dead men imprisoned in Hades who lived either in the days of Noah or in the time before Christ"; the view of Augustine and many Reformers that "Christ in his preexistent state of being preached the gospel through Noah to Noah's living contemporaries"; and the view " most widely accepted today" that " in the intermediate state Christ proclaimed the victory of the gospel to fallen angels imprisoned in Hades" (p. 38). He does not opt for a position other than to indicate that Jude 6 may support the third alternative (p. 39).

As for his treatment of another difficult passage, 2 Cor 5:1-9, he rightly concludes that a disembodied state is not the thrust of the passage, but that the emphasis is on the importance of the resurrection body (see pp. 35-37). He indicates that Paul in Phil 3:20-21 expects the transformation to take place at the *parousia* of Christ (p. 36), but nevertheless surprisingly concludes his discussion of the passage in 2 Cor 5 with a statement that "even so death holds no fear, for the dead will be with Christ while they await the resurrection" (p. 37). Just preceding this statement he

Solberg, Winton U. *Redeem the Time: The Puritan Sabbath in Early America*.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1977. Pp. xii + 406. $18.50.

One of the unexplained gaps in American historiography has concerned the Sab-
bath. As an institution dating back to America's founding and one that has remained
to the present a source of both inspiration and conflict in American culture, it
deserves more consideration than it has received. Thus Winton Solberg's effort at
repairing the breach is to be applauded.

Solberg first briefly traces the Sabbath's development from its OT origins to the
dawn of the Reformation. With the Reformation the Sabbath (reference is now to
Sunday) took on a renewed theological importance, and the author carefully outlines
its place in Reformed theology. Among the Puritan reformers in England, above all,
the Sabbath came to occupy a revered place. Under the early Stuarts the Sabbath
was accepted by a growing number of middle-class Englishmen, and Parliament
passed several bills for the preservation of "the Lord's Day." Solberg does a com-
mendable job of setting the English background of the American Sabbath.

In America, Sabbath legislation had become a feature of every colony (with the
exception of Georgia) by 1740, the book's terminal date, and Solberg recounts the
history of the Sabbath in each. Of course, it was in New England that the Lord's
Day achieved its greatest theoretical elaboration and its most extensive legislative
enactment. Although the Puritan émigrés brought a tradition of Sabbath observance
with them to Massachusetts Bay, Puritan divines such as Thomas Shepard elaborated
on the doctrine. The Massachusetts General Court provided secular enforcement of
the doctrine by passing a series of laws dealing with the Sabbath in the mid-seventeenth
century, requiring attendance at public worship and proscribing Sabbath-breaking
activities. Connecticut modeled its strict Sabbatarian laws after those of Massachusetts.

Not all of the colonies went as far as the New England Puritan enclaves did in
stipulating attendance at worship. In colonies such as New York, Maryland, New
Jersey, and Pennsylvania, where a diversity of religions required toleration, Sabbath
laws were generally limited to prohibiting common labor, travel, and festive activities
that might disturb the devout. Of all the colonies, Solberg reports, North Carolina
appeared to have had the most lax Sabbath observance, though it had a complete
panoply of legislation.

Solberg does not neglect Seventh-day Sabbatarianism, treating its origins in
England and also in America, where the Seventh-day Baptists established a foothold
in Rhode Island in 1672. The conflicts between Saturday and Sunday Sabbatarians,
which have never been resolved, had an early start in several colonies.

Solberg is at his best in cataloging the laws and outlining the theological formula-
tions of the Sabbath, which makes his book of encyclopedic value to historians.
Unfortunately, it will not be of much value beyond that. While the ubiquity of
Sabbath legislation makes it clear that the doctrine was an important feature of
colonial life, the author fails to satisfactorily relate it to its social setting. Solberg
marshals an admirable amount of information, but he does not appear to have
thought it through carefully. At the most interesting junctures he is satisfied with
simple assertions rather than complex explorations. E.g., while quantification of cases
involving Sabbath enforcement may not have been feasible, the anecdotal use of
evidence leaves an unanswered question: Did the relatively few number of Sabbath
prosecutions in New England mean a high degree of faithfulness, or was the situation
one simply of a laxity of enforcement? Also, in an interesting bit of revisionism,
Solberg repeatedly asserts that Sabbatarianism had a beneficial effect on America
by promoting high moral standards and tempering the drive to labor. But in chal-
lenging the traditional liberal animus against blue laws, he fails actually to weigh the

Sabbath's impact on the culture. Where Bernard Bailyn made colonial political tracts a living embodiment of New England society, Winton Solberg's Sabbath laws remain bloodless abstractions.

Finally, one wonders whether Harvard University Press felt that no editor was needed for Solberg's manuscript. The prose is lifeless, repetitive, and sometimes hard to follow. It quickly becomes an effort to continue turning the pages. Perhaps his style was influenced by extensive readings of Puritan theological tracts. At any rate, one hopes that as Solberg continues his study into the nineteenth century, he will consider the wider implications of the Sabbath, for the later period could hold an even more interesting tale.

University of Chicago                                                    BENJAMIN MCARTHUR

Thiele, Edwin R. *A Chronology of the Hebrew Kings.* Contemporary Evangelical Perspectives. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1977. 93 pp. Paperback, $2.95.

Edwin R. Thiele's outstanding contributions to biblical chronology are well known to OT scholarship, and his reconstruction for the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah as presented first in *JNES* 3 (1944): 137-186 and then in more detail in *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* (Chicago, 1951; rev. ed., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1965) has justly been recognized as a "breakthrough"; and he has, of course, amplified those treatments with articles in various scholarly journals.

The present volume covers in a more popular style the same general ground as does the larger *Mysterious Numbers*, whose revised edition was reviewed by Siegfried H. Horn in *AUSS* 5 (1967): 213-214. The first chapter of this new book illustrates the kinds of problems that have long baffled scholars concerning the chronology of the Divided Monarchy, and seven succeeding chapters are devoted to the solutions of such problems.

It is noteworthy that four chapters (chaps. 4 through 7) deal with questions relating to *dual dating* — a matter of utmost importance, for the "single greatest cause for misunderstandings concerning the chronological data of the Books of Kings has been the failure, both in ancient and modern times, to recognize the employment of what may be termed 'dual dating' in connection with the regnal data in certain coregencies and overlapping reigns" (p. 33). Moving from the earliest and relatively simple instance of this type of dating — involving Omri and Tibni —, Thiele considers several other cases, clearing up three major problem areas in the very confusing period from 798 to 723 B.C. It should be observed that the complicated situation relating to the reign of Pekah in Israel and the subsequent history of both Israel to the fall of Samaria and Judah to the reign of Hezekiah has been presented in a simplified fashion, with the confusing data explained under the rubrics of "Pattern 752" and "Pattern 740" (the Patterns "Two-Seventeen" [or "752-686"] and "Twelve-Twenty" [or "740-686"] of the second edition of *Mysterious Numbers*).

The volume is enhanced throughout with many diagrams to illustrate various points of chronology discussed in the text. These are most illuminating; and in the opinion of this reviewer, they are much more helpful for this particular type of publication than would have been the inclusion of the extensive chronological chart that was inserted as a foldout in the first edition of *Mysterious Numbers*, or even the more abundant (and more complicated) tables, charts, and diagrams amplifying the text in the second edition of that more detailed work.

Several appendices will be useful to scholars and laymen alike: Appendix A (p. 75) gives the complete list of dates of the rulers of Judah and Israel; Appendix B

(pp. 76-79) provides a list of data concerning the rulers, together with Scripture references and dates; and Appendix C (pp. 80-85) furnishes coordinations between ancient astronomically established years and the dates of the Hebrew kings.

There is a short glossary of terms (pp. 87-89), which is obviously a useful inclusion in a book of this sort. A general index is lacking, but the Scripture index (pp. 91-93) will in any event prove more helpful for locating the type of information desired from this kind of publication.

Although this particular volume is much shorter than Thiele's *Mysterious Numbers*, it covers the essentials of the subject very well. In fact, it is truly amazing that so complex and extensive a subject could be treated in such a clear and effective manner in a book of fewer than 100 pages!

Andrews University                                                          KENNETH A. STRAND

Wogaman, J. Philip. *A Christian Method of Moral Judgment*. Philadelphia: West-
    minster, 1976. xi + 270 pp. $12.50/$6.95.

According to J. Philip Wogaman, we have entered an age of moral uncertainty. In this book, the Dean of Wesley Theological Seminary claims that the modern loss of confidence is world-wide, affecting both Christians and non-Christians. In the past, Christians may have relied uncritically on the Bible, the Church, natural law, or simply on custom. But such absolute trust no longer seems tenable. The net effect has been to increase uncertainty at a time when moral dilemmas have increased in complexity. But in spite of the uncertainties, Wogaman argues that Christian faith must be capable of guiding our moral decisions, or else such faith is surely nonsense. The question is: What method of moral judgment can be consistent with a whole-hearted commitment to the values of the Christian faith while realistically taking into account the inevitable uncertainties of all human decision-making?

Wogaman believes that the method he offers has such a capacity. Moreover, he believes that his approach avoids the deficiencies of situation ethics on the one hand and of a more rule-oriented ethic on the other. Situation ethics, because it is basically intuitive, is inadequate and can bring but little precision to our moral decision-making. The anti-situationalists, on the other hand, have failed to provide a convincing method of judgment which properly takes into account the "margin of uncertainty" which must be considered in the application of any moral decision.

Wogaman calls his own approach one of "methodological presumption." A moral presumption is a considered *prejudgment*. It is a strong bias in favor of a moral value or course of moral action. Wogaman's analogy is the Anglo-American legal system's presumption of innocence for the accused. Such presumptions are not exceptionless, but any exception must meet stiff criteria. As Wogaman puts it, the exception must "bear the burden of proof." E.g., one exception-making criterion is that an action contrary to a moral presumption will likely produce more good in the long run. But if after consideration of the exception doubt still remains, then the moral presumption stands.

Can such moral presumptions be derived from the Christian faith? Wogaman thinks so. He offers as examples four positive and two negative moral presumptions. On the positive side, he claims that Christian faith presumes (1) the goodness of created existence, (2) the value of individual life, (3) the unity of all humanity, and (4) the equality of each person. And on the negative side, Christianity teaches that humans are (1) finite and (2) sinful. Wogaman also discusses several other kinds of presumptions supposedly derived from the Christian faith, including presumptions of human

authority (e.g., the church has presumptive moral authority) and presumptions of ideology (e.g., fascism and anarchism are presumed to be wrong).

No reader is likely to agree with all of Wogaman's conclusions. But his crisp and highly readable style, his frequent use of apt illustrations, and his willingness to tackle difficult methodological issues without heavy reliance on technical language have combined to produce a work which should be interesting to professionals in the field and yet understandable for college undergraduates. In terms of its range of topics and general purpose, Wogaman's work might be compared to Edward LeRoy Long's *A Survey of Christian Ethics* (New York, 1967). But Long's book is unquestionably more technical and detailed in its presentation, a fact which may lead to the fairly safe conclusion that Wogaman's publication will gain a far wider usage.

The book is not dazzling in its originality. Nor is it likely to generate as much commotion as J. F. Fletcher's *Situation Ethics: The New Morality* (Philadelphia, 1966). But to this reviewer the method of stating and defending general principles and setting forth exception-making criteria is far more plausible than Fletcher's approach. Wogaman criticizes anti-situationalists like Paul Ramsey and John C. Bennett early in the book. But on balance, Wogaman's method seems far closer to these two thinkers than to either the situationalists or to those Wogaman dubs "evangelical perfectionists," such as John Howard Yoder and Jacques Ellul.

The similarities are especially conspicuous when Wogaman is compared with Bennett. Indeed, though differing in scope, the one recent book in Christian ethics which seems closest to Wogaman's in methodology and general spirit is Bennett's *The Radical Imperative* (Philadelphia, 1975). Both Bennett and Wogaman concern themselves primarily with the application of Christian faith to the problems of contemporary social ethics. Both find the approach of situation ethics less than adequate. Both tend to state general principles such as human unity and human equality. And both emphasize that exceptions to generally valid moral principles must bear a heavy burden of proof. (In fact, even the phraseology is sometimes similar, with Bennett also using the expression "burden of proof.") Although they both wish to maintain the importance of Christian faith for the construction of an ethical system, neither Wogaman nor Bennett believes that Christians have a monopoly on morality or that non-Christians do not share many of the same moral insights. Both take sin seriously and recognize the ambiguities of many moral decisions. Considering these and other areas of agreement, it is probably not surprising that their conclusions on a variety of social ethical questions are remarkably similar.

There are, of course, notable differences. And one of those differences reveals a fairly obvious weakness of Wogaman's book. Bennett devotes an entire chapter to the way in which ethical guidance is derived from biblical sources. But Wogaman leaves the reader with little explicit information about how he uses the Bible to aid in the establishment of Christian moral presumptions. Early in the book he tells his readers that the moral authority of the Bible has been weakened by the realization that the biblical writers were "flesh-and-blood human beings writing in quite human circumstances" (p. 6). Later he says that the Bible contains a variety of materials with different levels of meaning. But even though he spends one whole chapter on the moral presumptions of human authority, nowhere does he establish in what sense the Bible may retain moral authority.

Nevertheless, Wogaman clearly believes that his moral presumptions have biblical bases. And from observing the way he uses the biblical material, perhaps one may draw some conclusions about the methodology he considers appropriate. But occasionally he argues that some biblical teachings *counter* the moral presumptions of the Christian faith. E.g., he considers that the apostle Paul may unfortunately have conveyed a negative view of sex. But the moral presumption of the goodness of

created existence implies that sexual life is good. Thus, the moral presumption apparently may be used to evaluate the Pauline message. The trouble is that Wogaman does not develop a methodology which would allow some biblical passages to be used to support moral presumptions, which presumptions may in turn be used to evaluate the moral worth of other biblical passages. Yet, in spite of this lack of methodological clarity, Wogaman does not hesitate to reassure the reader that a particular moral presumption is "solidly biblical."

On this point, Wogaman's work would surely have been strengthened by some timely advice from two of his colleagues at Wesley Theological Seminary, Bruce Birch and Larry Rasmussen. In their provocative book, *Bible and Ethics in the Christian Life* (Minneapolis, 1976), they discuss the problem of relating the field of biblical scholarship to contemporary Christian ethics. "It is time," they say, "to make the connections between these fields and to assist in the functional relating of Bible and ethics in the Christian life" (p. 12). For all of its admirable clarity and thoroughness, Wogaman's book needs strengthening in this area. No method of moral judgment called Christian is likely to be deemed plausible so long as the role of the Bible is not clarified.

Walla Walla College                                      GERALD R. WINSLOW
College Place, Washington

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Joel and Amos.* Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977. xxiv + 392 pp. $22.95.

This is the second OT volume to appear in the new Hermeneia commentary series, the preceding volume, *Hosea,* also being written by Wolff. This new volume was originally published in German as vol. 14/2 of the Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament (of which Wolff is the editor), and three North American scholars co-operated in its translation. Wolff has also published another study on Amos, *Amos the Prophet* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973 [originally *Amos' geistige Heimat,* 1964]), which deals largely with matters of introduction and form criticism.

The present volume begins with eighty pages on Joel and concludes with 270 pages on Amos. It includes an updated bibliography and indexes of biblical citations, ancient sources, modern authors, Hebrew words, and topics treated. Each passage of text proceeds through a fourfold treatment: translation with notes, form-critical observations, interpretation or exegesis, and aim or theology. This format was also followed in Wolff's work on Hosea, and it seems to provide a useful layout of information with which to study these prophets.

As far as content is concerned, most of my remarks will deal with Amos, but brief mention should be made of Joel. Wolff has argued forcefully for the unity of Joel, and he has summarized succinctly the important theme of the Day of Yahweh. The date of Joel is a controversial point in OT circles, and one can find almost any date imaginable suggested for it. Even for so controversial a subject, however, Wolff's date in the first half of the fourth century seems too late to me.

Wolff holds that Amos' career was relatively short but not ultrashort, a conclusion with which I concur. He also holds that Amos may have prophesied in several centers of the northern kingdom, but I would prefer to see this prophet's ministry restricted to Bethel. The richness of Amos' language and poetic style have been explored well by Wolff in his introduction. Chiasm could be added to the catalogue of poetic techniques of which Amos was fond, for I count more than thirty chiastic bicola in his work. As far as the final form of the book is concerned, Wolff sees this as the end product of a long history of literary growth, a natural deduction from Wolff's form

critical work on Amos, which emphasizes the individual units in the text. I see much more of a structural design to the book than Wolff does and would therefore put considerably greater emphasis upon that structure as having originated with Amos.

As an example of this type of structuralism, it should be noted that the foreign oracles of judgment at the beginning of the book are balanced by the foreign oracles of promise at the end of the book. Attention to this correspondence would have avoided the common pitfall, followed by Wolff, of separating the final prophecy of promise to Israel from the rest of the book and disrupting this structural correspondence. As another example of such a correspondence we may note that the five past judgments in Chap. 7 are balanced by the five visions of future judgment in the last two chapters. Moreover, the three Creator Hymns are evenly spaced throughout the book, etc. An examination of the structure of Amos requires a separate study which I hope to present on some future occasion. My disagreements here do not detract from the general overall worth and usefulness of Wolff's commentary on Amos. Scattered throughout its pages there are many valuable form-critical, exegetical, and theological insights with which the careful reader will be rewarded.

Andrews University                                        WILLIAM H. SHEA

# TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW AND ARAMAIC

## CONSONANTS

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| א | = ʾ | ד | = $\underline{d}$ | י | = y | ס | = s | ר | = r |
| ב | = b | ה | = h | כ | = k | ע | = ʿ | ט | = ś |
| ב | = $\underline{b}$ | ו | = w | כ | = $\underline{k}$ | פ | = p | שׂ | = ś |
| ג | = g | ז | = z | ל | = l | פ | = $\underline{p}$ | ת | = t |
| ג | = $\underline{g}$ | ח | = ḥ | מ | = m | צ | = ṣ | ת | = $\underline{t}$ |
| ד | = $\underline{d}$ | ט | = ṭ | נ | = n | ק | = q | | |

## MASORETIC VOWEL POINTINGS

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ֲ = a | ֱ , ְ (vocal shewa) = e | | = $\bar{o}$ |
| ֽ = $\bar{a}$ | ֳ , ֳ = $\hat{e}$ | | = o |
| ֲ = a | ֲ = i | | = $\hat{o}$ |
| ֳ = e | ֲ = $\hat{\imath}$ | | = u |
| ֵ = $\bar{e}$ | ֳ = o | | = $\hat{u}$ |

(Dāgēš Forte is indicated by doubling the consonant.)

## ABBREVIATIONS OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *AASOR* | Annual, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res. | *BT* | The Bible Translator |
| AB | Anchor Bible | *BTB* | Biblical Theology Bulletin |
| *AcOr* | Acta orientalia | *BZ* | Biblische Zeitschrift |
| ACW | Ancient Christian Writers | BZAW | Beihefte zur ZAW |
| *ADAJ* | Annual, Dep. of Ant. of Jordan | BZNW | Beihefte zur ZNW |
| *AER* | American Ecclesiastical Review | *CAD* | Chicago Assyrian Dictionary |
| *AfO* | Archiv für Orientforschung | *CBQ* | Catholic Biblical Quarterly |
| *AHR* | American Historical Review | CC | Christian Century |
| *AHW* | Von Soden, Akkad. Handwörterb. | CH | Church History |
| *AJA* | Am. Journal of Archaeology | *CHR* | Catholic Historical Review |
| *AJBA* | Austr. Journ. of Bibl. Arch. | CIG | Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum |
| *AJSL* | Am. Jrl., Sem. Lang. and Lit. | CIJ | Corp. Inscript. Judaicarum |
| *AJT* | American Journal of Theology | CIL | Corp. Inscript. Latinarum |
| *ANEP* | Anc. Near East in Pictures, | CIS | Corp. Inscript. Semiticarum |
| | Pritchard, ed. | *CJT* | Canadian Journal of Theology |
| *ANESTP* | Anc. Near East: Suppl. Texts and | CQ | Church Quarterly |
| | Pictures, Pritchard, ed. | *CQR* | Church Quarterly Review |
| *ANET* | Ancient Near Eastern Texts, | CR | Corpus Reformatorum |
| | Pritchard, ed. | CT | Christianity Today |
| ANF | The Ante-Nicene Fathers | *CTM* | Concordia Theological Monthly |
| AnOr | Analecta Orientalia | *CurTM* | Currents in Theol. and Mission |
| AOS | American Oriental Series | *DACL* | Dict. d'archéol. chrét. et de lit. |
| *APOT* | Apocr. and Pseud. of OT, Charles, ed. | *DOTT* | Docs. from OT Times, Thomas, ed. |
| *ARG* | Archiv für Reformationsgesch. | *DTC* | Dict. de théol. cath. |
| *ARM* | Archives royales de Mari | *EKL* | Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon |
| *ArOr* | Archiv Orientální | *EncIsl* | Encyclopedia of Islam |
| *ARW* | Archiv für Religionswissenschaft | *EncJud* | Encyclopedia judaica (1971) |
| ASV | American Standard Version | ER | Ecumenical Review |
| *ATR* | Anglican Theological Review | *EvQ* | Evangelical Quarterly |
| AUM | Andrews Univ. Monographs | *EvT* | Evangelische Theologie |
| *AusBR* | Australian Biblical Review | *ExpTim* | Expository Times |
| *AUSS* | Andrews Univ. Sem. Studies | FC | Fathers of the Church |
| *BA* | Biblical Archaeologist | *GRBS* | Greek, Roman, and Byz. Studies |
| *BAR* | Biblical Archaeologist Reader | *HeyJ* | Heythrop Journal |
| *BARev* | Biblical Archaeology Review | *HibJ* | Hibbert Journal |
| *BASOR* | Bulletin, Amer. Sch. of Or. Res. | *HR* | History of Religions |
| *BCSR* | Bull. of Council on Study of Rel. | HSM | Harvard Semitic Monographs |
| *Bib* | Biblica | *HTR* | Harvard Theological Review |
| BibB | Biblische Beiträge | HTS | Harvard Theological Studies |
| BibOr | Biblica et Orientalia | *HUCA* | Hebrew Union College Annual |
| *BIES* | Bull. of Isr. Explor. Society | *IB* | Interpreter's Bible |
| *BJRL* | Bulletin, John Rylands Library | ICC | International Critical Commentary |
| *BK* | Bibel und Kirche | *IDB* | Interpreter's Dict. of Bible |
| *BO* | Bibliotheca Orientalis | *IEJ* | Israel Exploration Journal |
| *BQR* | Baptist Quarterly Review | *Int* | Interpretation |
| *BR* | Biblical Research | *ITQ* | Irish Theological Quarterly |
| *BSac* | Bibliotheca Sacra | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| JAAR | Journ., Amer. Acad. of Rel. |
| JAC | Jahrb. für Ant. und Christentum |
| JAOS | Journ. of the Amer. Or. Soc. |
| JAS | Journal of Asian Studies |
| JB | Jerusalem Bible, Jones, ed. |
| JBL | Journal of Biblical Literature |
| JBR | Journal of Bible and Religion |
| JCS | Journal of Cuneiform Studies |
| JEA | Journal of Egyptian Archaeology |
| JEH | Journal of Ecclesiastical Hist. |
| JEOL | Jaarbericht, Ex Oriente Lux |
| JES | Journal of Ecumenical Studies |
| JHS | Journal of Hellenic Studies |
| JJS | Journal of Jewish Studies |
| JMeH | Journal of Medieval History |
| JMES | Journal of Middle Eastern Studies |
| JMH | Journal of Modern History |
| JNES | Journal of Near Eastern Studies |
| JPOS | Journ., Palest. Or. Soc. |
| JQR | Jewish Quarterly Review |
| JR | Journal of Religion |
| JRAS | Journal of Royal Asiatic Society |
| JRE | Journal of Religious Ethics |
| JRelS | Journal of Religious Studies |
| JRH | Journal of Religious History |
| JRS | Journal of Roman Studies |
| JRT | Journal of Religious Thought |
| JSJ | Journal for the Study of Judaism |
| JSOT | Journal for the Study of OT |
| JSS | Journal of Semitic Studies |
| JSSR | Journ., Scient. Study of Religion |
| JTC | Journal for Theol. and Church |
| JTS | Journal of Theol. Studies |
| KJV | King James Version |
| LCC | Library of Christian Classics |
| LCL | Loeb Classical Library |
| LQ | Lutheran Quarterly |
| LTK | Lexikon für Theol. und Kirche |
| LW | Lutheran World |
| McCQ | McCormick Quarterly |
| MLB | Modern Language Bible |
| MQR | Mennonite Quarterly Review |
| NAB | New American Bible |
| NASB | New American Standard Bible |
| NCB | New Century Bible |
| NEB | New English Bible |
| Neot | Neotestamentica |
| NHS | Nag Hammadi Studies |
| NICNT | New International Commentary, NT |
| NICOT | New International Commentary, OT |
| NIV | New International Version |
| NKZ | Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift |
| NovT | Novum Testamentum |
| NPNF | Nicene and Post. Nic. Fathers |
| NRT | Nouvelle revue théologique |
| NTA | New Testament Abstracts |
| NTS | New Testament Studies |
| NTTS | NT Tools and Studies |
| ODCC | Oxford Dict. of Christian Church |
| OIP | Oriental Institute Publications |
| OLZ | Orientalistische Literaturzeitung |
| Or | Orientalia |
| OrChr | Oriens Christianus |
| OTS | Oudtestamentische Studiën |
| PEFQS | Pal. Expl. Fund, Quart. Statem. |
| PEQ | Palestine Exploration Quarterly |
| PG | Patrologia graeca, Migne, ed. |
| PJ | Palästina-Jahrbuch |
| PL | Patrologia latina, Migne, ed. |
| PW | Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyl. |
| QDAP | Quarterly, Dep. of Ant. in Pal. |
| RA | Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéol. |
| RAC | Reallexikon für Antike und Chr. |
| RArch | Revue archéologique |
| RB | Revue biblique |
| RechBib | Recherches bibliques |
| RechSR | Recherches de science religieuse |
| REg | Revue d'égyptologie |
| RelS | Religious Studies |
| RelSoc | Religion and Society |
| RelSRev | Religious Studies Review |

| | |
|---|---|
| RenQ | Renaissance Quarterly |
| RevExp | Review and Expositor |
| RevQ | Revue de Qumrân |
| RevScRel | Revue des sciences religieuses |
| RevSém | Revue sémitique |
| RHE | Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique |
| RHPR | Revue d'hist. et de philos. rel. |
| RHR | Revue de l'histoire des religions |
| RL | Religion in Life |
| RLA | Reallexikon der Assyriologie |
| RPTK | Realencykl. für prot. Th. u. Kirche |
| RR | Review of Religion |
| RRR | Review of Religious Research |
| RS | Religious Studies |
| RSPT | Revue des sc. phil. et théol. |
| RSV | Revised Standard Version |
| RTP | Revue de théol. et de phil. |
| SB | Sources bibliques |
| SBLDS | Soc. of Bibl. Lit. Dissert. Ser. |
| SBLMS | Soc. of Bibl. Lit. Monograph Ser. |
| SBLSBS | Soc. of Bibl. Lit. Sources for Bibl. Study |
| SBLTT | Soc. of Bibl. Lit. Texts and Trans. |
| SBT | Studies in Biblical Theology |
| SCJ | Sixteenth Century Journal |
| SCR | Studies in Comparative Religion |
| Sem | Semitica |
| SJT | Scottish Journal of Theology |
| SMRT | Studies in Med. and Ref. Thought |
| SOr | Studia Orientalia |
| SPB | Studia Postbiblica |
| SSS | Semitic Studies Series |
| ST | Studia Theologica |
| TAPS | Transactions of Am. Philos. Society |
| TD | Theology Digest |
| TDNT | Theol. Dict. of NT, Kittel and Friedrich, eds. |
| TDOT | Theol. Dict. of OT, Botterweck and Ringgren, eds. |
| TEH | Theologische Existenz Heute |
| TGl | Theologie und Glaube |
| THAT | Theol. Handwört. z. AT, Jenni and Westermann, eds. |
| TLZ | Theologische Literaturzeitung |
| TP | Theologie und Philosophie |
| TQ | Theologische Quartalschrift |
| Trad | Traditio |
| TRev | Theologische Revue |
| TRu | Theologische Rundschau |
| TS | Theological Studies |
| TT | Teologisk Tidsskrift |
| TToday | Theology Today |
| TU | Texte und Untersuchungen |
| TZ | Theologische Zeitschrift |
| UBSGNT | United Bible Societies Greek NT |
| UF | Ugarit-Forschungen |
| USQR | Union Seminary Quarterly Review |
| VC | Vigiliae Christianae |
| VT | Vetus Testamentum |
| VTSup | VT, Supplements |
| WA | Luther's Works, Weimar Ausgabe |
| WO | Die Welt des Orients |
| WTJ | Westminster Theol. Journal |
| WZKM | Wiener Zeitsch. f. d. Kunde d. Mor. |
| ZA | Zeitschrift für Assyriologie |
| ZÄS | Zeitsch. für ägyptische Sprache |
| ZAW | Zeitsch. für die alttes. Wiss. |
| ZDMG | Zeitsch. der deutsch. morgenl. Gesellschaft |
| ZDPV | Zeitsch. des deutsch. Pal.-Ver. |
| ZEE | Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik |
| ZHT | Zeitsch. für hist. Theologie |
| ZKG | Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte |
| ZKT | Zeitsch. für kath. Theologie |
| ZMR | Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft |
| ZNW | Zeitsch. für die neutes. Wiss. |
| ZRGG | Zeitsch. für Rel. u. Geistesgesch. |
| ZST | Zeitschrift für syst. Theologie |
| ZTK | Zeitsch. für Theol. und Kirche |
| ZWT | Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie |