

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

The Apostle is only afraid lest her thoughts should be corrupted from their singleness (of aim and direction) and their chastity in regard to Him. And we may observe that two contextual points confirm our interpretation: (a) The coupling of ἀγνότης or "chastity, purity" (according to the true and received reading) with ἀπλότης. (β) The words which directly follow (ver. 4): "If he who comes preaches another Jesus whom we did not preach." Here a double or divided attraction is at once suggested, and the contingent force of "singleness, constancy," is plainly seen. The thoughts and feelings of a bride should be turned undeviatingly to her destined bridegroom and to him alone. So should the Church love Christ and repay with unwavering devotion His self-sacrificing love for her.

I would therefore suggest as an adequate rendering of the passage: "But I fear lest by some means or other, as the serpent deluded Eve by his cunning your thoughts should be corrupted from their singleness (of devotion) or constancy and their chastity toward Christ."

W. SPICER WOOD.

### *THE DIATESSARON AND THE TESTIMONY BOOK.*

WHEN Justin Martyr wrote his *Apology* to be presented to the Roman Emperor and the Senate, he based his argument for the Christian Religion to a large extent on the evidence which was furnished by the agreement between the Christian history and the ancient Hebrew prophecies. Everything that happened had been foretold and everything that had been foretold had happened. Such was the working formula of the early defenders of the Faith, and we know now that Justin's method was not his own invention, the prophecies which he quoted were not of his own collecting; he was employing before the Roman Senate the same argu-

ments that he would have employed against the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem. The text from which he was briefed was the *Testimonia adversus Judaeos*, in a form not unlike that which was employed by Tertullian and Cyprian, and which is the base of the series of Dialogues, for the most part now non-extant, in which a typical Christian and a representative Jew discuss the validity of the new faith from an Old Testament standpoint. In working over his *Testimonies* Justin finds it necessary to explain to the Court that prophecies have to be looked at from various points of view: "when you hear the utterances of the prophets spoken personally, you are not to assume that they come from the inspired men themselves, but from the inspiring divine Word; sometimes this Word speaks predictively of things that are to come to pass, but sometimes the utterance is in the person of Christ, and sometimes the prophet speaks in the person of the people who make answer to the Lord." When we read through the *Apology* of Justin, or the *Dialogue with Trypho*, in which the same methods of interpretation are applied, we find abundant illustrations of this doctrine of the variable personality of the prophet: e.g., "It was through Isaiah, speaking *in the person of the Father of all* and the Lord God, that these words were uttered,

'Wash you, make you clean, etc.'" I. *Ap.* 36.

"The Holy Spirit cries out through Isaiah, as *in the person of these*, and says,

'Return and look down from heaven,' etc." *Dial.* 25.

A number of similar cases might be quoted, and one's first temptation might be to say that this method of exegesis, even if it should be dealing with the *Testimonies* from the prophets, is Justin's own, both in invention and in application.

Closer examination, however, shows that it is characteristic of nearly all those who collect and employ testimonies from the Jewish Scriptures. It is found in most of the extant Dialogues, and certainly cannot be Justin's except by tradition, any more than the passages of Scripture which he quotes are his own collection. Of this we shall have abundant illustration. For instance, in Cyprian's *Testimonies* (II. 14) we have a section to prove that

He (sc. Christ) is the just one whom the Jews were going to kill. The proof text is then given,

In the Wisdom of Solomon :  
 "Circumveniamus justum," etc.

Now let us turn to the Dialogue known as the *Altercation of Simon and Theophilus*, which is itself descended from the lost Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus, and we find :

c. 25. "This is Christ, the Son of God, the just one, concerning whom *Solomon* prophesied in the *person of the Jews*, saying,  
 'Circumveniamus justum,' etc."

Here the community of material in Cyprian and the *Altercatio* is evident, and the only question which arises is as to the relative priority of

In Sapiientia Solomonis  
 or  
 Solomon in persona Judaeorum.

Cyprian has the Jews in his headline ; but he has a shorter sub-title.

Suppose we turn next to the *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchæus*, where the passage in Proverbs is quoted (viii. 22), which is perhaps the greatest of all the *Testimonies*. We find—

P. 13. "This is she (sc. the Divine Sophia) which speaks through Solomon and says :

'When he was preparing the heaven, I was with him,' etc."

Compare this with Gregory of Nyssa's *Testimonies* (ed. Zacagni, p. 289), where we find

“In the person of Wisdom, that is of the Son :  
 ‘When he was preparing the heaven, I was with him,’ etc.”

The two passages are equivalent, but there is a difference in the manner of expressing the Testimony ; one says,

“Sophia through Solomon” ;

the other

“Solomon, in the person of Wisdom.”

Here is another example : in the *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchæus*, par. 60 :

“That which Isaiah said (sc. lxi. 1), he said *in the person of Christ.*”

Listen therefore to his entire prophecy, that thou mayest know that the prophecy suits no one else, except Christ alone. For it says as follows :

“The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,” etc.

In the *Altercatio* this becomes merely,

“*Esaias de Christo dicit :*  
 ‘*Spiritus domini super me,*’ etc.”

The *Dialogue* seems to have the more correct form, that

“Isaiah was speaking in the person of Christ.”

It is clear that all these writings use the same method of quotation that we find in Justin, even if they do not use it always or consistently. Suppose we examine that famous anti-Judaic testimony from Isaiah, which is embedded in the Epistle to the Romans (x. 19), according to which

“Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider.” (Isaiah i. 3.)

In Justin Martyr it is introduced as follows :

“But that this also may be clear to you, these were spoken *from the person of the Father.* by Isaiah, the forementioned prophet,  
 ‘The ox knoweth his owner,’ etc.”

In Cyprian the introductory formula is simply,

“*Apud Esaiam prophetam.*”

Has Justin expanded the conventional form of introducing a *Testimony* or has Cyprian contracted it ?

As we said above, it will be easy to find many similar expressions in Justin, but we have proved that they are not limited to Justin, and that he did not invent them.

If we have clearly proved that Justin uses the method of quotation in which special emphasis is laid upon the involved personality of the speaker, and if there is some reason to believe that Justin found this method of quotation in his *Book of Testimonies*, we can now search further for similar forms of quotation elsewhere ; and especially we are entitled to ask whether it occurs in Justin's disciple Tatian, and in his disciple's great work, the Diatessaron.

Dr Plooij in his recent and valuable book, which he calls *A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron*, in which he shows that a Dutch Harmony at Liège has behind it an earlier Latin form of the Diatessaron than has yet been recovered, has followed a hint which I gave him on the method of introducing Testimonies, and writes as follows :

“ Dr. Rendel Harris drew my attention to c. 88 (of the Liège Harmony) where in Matthew xii. 17 the quotation from Isaiah is given in this remarkable way : ‘ Om de profecie te vervulne die Ysaïas wilen profeteerde van hem ende sprac aldus *in den personen des vaders.*’ The same formula is found in c. 91, Matthew xiii. 35, ‘ Omme te vervulne die prophecie die David wilen profeteerde van hem doe hi sprac *in sinen persone.*’ (Notice that here the quotation from the Psalm is given as spoken by David, not by Isaiah, as in  $\delta$  2\*,  $\delta$  48, 050, 351, and other Greek MSS., also Ps. Clem.).”

Dr. Plooij continues and observes that “ the technical use of it (sc. this method of quotation) is explained by Justin in his First Apology c. 36, where he says that sometimes the words of the prophets must be understood as

spoken, not by the inspired men themselves, but by the Divine Logos who prompts them. In that case, says Justin, the formula, *ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου τινός* is used, sometimes the future is predicted as *ἀπὸ προσώπου* of the Father, sometimes *ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου* of the Christ, sometimes *ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου* of people answering our Lord or His Father. In the following chapter Justin gives some examples of the use of the formula, and he and others use it in Matthew xii. 17; the addition is asterisked by the scribe (of the Liège MS.) as being an *addicio glose*. It belongs, beyond doubt, to the primitive form of the Latin Diatessaron, and accordingly this is one of the passages where the glosses, even when marked by the scribe as an *addicio*, belong to the original form of the text."

The foregoing is a valuable statement of an interesting problem; and the New Testament scholars who have begun to realise the importance of *Testimonies* in the early Christian tradition will be interested to examine further into the way in which the writings of the Old Covenant are employed in the propagation of the New. One or two illustrations may be welcome.

In Romans x. the Apostle Paul, who is certainly working from *Testimonies* throughout this and the neighbouring chapters, finds a prediction of the mission of the twelve Apostles in the opening verse of Isaiah liii., and in the fourth verse of Psalm xix.

The same conjunction, but in the inverse order, is in Justin, *Dial.* c. 42, where the verses are introduced by the formulæ, "David says," and

"Isaiah says, in the person of the Apostles."

These testimonies are immediately followed in Romans by an interruption on the part of a Jewish defender, who objects to a testimony from Isaiah i. 3, in which it is said that "Israel doth not know Me" (so in Justin 1 *Ap.* c. 37),

“My people doth not understand.” When we look closely at the way in which Justin introduces the quotation, we find that it is stated that “these words were spoken by the aforesaid Isaiah *in the person of the Father.*”

A few lines lower in the Epistle, St. Paul introduces a testimony from Isaiah lxxv. 2 against a disobedient and gainsaying people, an indisputable *testimonium adversus Judaeos*, and here again we find Justin in 1 *Ap.* c. 38 introducing the same passage in the words :

“When the prophetic Spirit speaks *in the person of Christ*, it voices thus, ‘I have spread out my hands all the day,’ etc.”

Many similar instances can be given, both from Justin and the writers who are in the habit of using Testimonies, and it must be admitted that the explanations as to the personality of the speakers who use the quotations are primitive or that they are a very early accretion to the collected and anti-Judaic proof-texts.

Here is another curious instance of the same kind ; the Psalm, which is quoted in Acts ii. 25–28, is undoubtedly a part of the primitive deposit of *Testimonies*. It is introduced in the Acts by the words

“David says in reference to Him” ;

but if we look at Bede’s *Retraction on the Acts*, we shall find as follows :

“*David dicit in eum, id est, in personam (read persona) ejus,*” where the same explanation of the Testimony is given that we detected in Justin and elsewhere.

We have, of course, something of the same kind in the New Testament itself, where prophecy comes *ὕπὸ τινός* and *διὰ τινος*, e.g., in Matthew i. 22.

“Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by (*ὕπὸ*) the Lord by (*διὰ*) the prophet,” and perhaps it is a similar explanation that will help to rectify the confused text in Acts iv. 25.



We may also compare Acts i. 16 ("the Holy Spirit foretold by the mouth of David concerning Judas"). It is not difficult to see the genesis of these forms of introducing a quotation. In Semitic speech, we have a poverty of prepositions as compared with Greek, which makes it necessary to resort to an expansion or periphrasis, if we are to bring out the difference in meaning between *ἐπὶ* and *διὰ*. One way is to use the instrumental term "by the hand of," but there is no trace of this in early Biblical quotations. It is common, however, to use the expression *διὰ στόματος*, as in Acts i. 16 above, or in Luke i. 70, *ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν*.

In all such cases, the formula indicates the instrument of the inspired speech. The same result would have been attained by underlining the personality of the original speaker, to whom the prophet is a sounding-board. This is what was done by the early collectors of *Testimonies*, who distinguish between primary and secondary speakers by saying, "A, in the person of B, prophesied." For example, Athanasius, when he quotes Genesis ii. 16, "of the trees in the garden, etc.," introduces it in the words, "Holy Scripture speaks in the person of God (*ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ*) and foretells, etc."

Now let us see if we can check the hypothesis which is involved in the foregoing statements. It is suggested that Tatian's original *Harmony of the Gospels* contained explanatory notes as to the persons involved in the Biblical quotations that were made, and that these notes were already, in Tatian's day, extant in the primitive collections of *Testimonia adversus Judaeos*. We may test the matter by examining Tatian's descendants, to see if they make similar explanations and expansions.

One of the great Harmonies of the Middle Ages (all of which have their parentage in Tatian) is that which bears

the name of Zacharias of Chrysopolis, (Zacharias of Besançon). Let us see how he will deal with Old Testament quotations in the New Testament. We take the prophecy of Isaiah, which is quoted in Matthew xii. 17. After transcribing the Vulgate text,

“Et praecepit eis ne manifestum eum faceret, ut adimpleretur quod dictum est per Isaiam prophetam, dicentem, Ecce puer meus, etc.”

Zachary copies some sentences from Hilary, with regard to our Lord's injunctions to secrecy, and then adds :

“Ex persona Patris dicit Isaias, Ecce puer meus.”

It is the same explanation that we found in the Liège Harmony, and elsewhere ; may we not say that it has been transferred from the original text of the Harmony to the commentary ? Here is another example, in Matthew xiii. 35 Zachary harmonises Matthew's text with Mark iv. 33 as follows :

“(Matt.) Haec omnia locutus est Jesus in parabolis ad turbas ; (Mark) et talibus multis parabolis loquebatur eis verbum, prout poterant audire.”

“(Matt.) Et sine parabolis non loquebatur eis, ut impleretur quod dictum est per Prophetam dicentem : *Aperiam in parabolis os meum, etc.*”

Now look at the commentary. After a short explanation as to the importance of parables in our Lord's teaching, we have :

“*Ex persona Domini dicitur in psalmo septuagesimo septimo : Aperiam in parabolis os meum.*”

This is parallel to the statement in the Liège Harmony, where David is said to have prophesied of him, when he spake in his person. The two statements are connected, and apparently have a common origin. The Liège Harmony shows that the explanation as to the personality of the speaker was originally a part of the text, though in Zachary it only survives in the commentary. So we register the

interpretation and credit it to the primitive Diatessaron.

At this point an objection may be made to the effect that if Zachary can be shown to have removed statements from the text of the Harmony which he was re-editing, and that these statements are contained, more or less exactly, in the Liège Harmony, we do not really add anything to the existing evidence for the readings in question, since the text on which Zachary worked may have been a duplicate of that from which the Liège Harmony was translated. We will therefore give a further specimen of the concurrence suggested, which is both instructive and illuminating.

One of the most striking readings in the whole of the Liège Harmony is in John viii. 58, where Jesus says :

“eer Abraham was so was ic” :

which the later Dutch Harmonies change to “so ben ic.” That Zachary knew the peculiar reading and discarded it, seems clear from his commentary :

“non ait, *fui*, sed, *sum*, quia divinitas tempus non habet.”

On the other hand, it is certain that the reading cannot have initiated with the Liège MS., nor its immediate Latin ancestor, for it is the reading of the Lewis Syriac, which is almost our oldest authority. The text which Zachary removes and which Liège conserves is, at the lowest estimate for antiquity, a Tatianism. It does not then seem likely, that in either the one Harmony or the other we are dealing with mediæval matter.

Here is another illustration of the way that Zachary and the Liège Harmony depend upon a common tradition. In John vii. 34 our Lord tells the Jews, who are disputing with Him, that “where I am, thither ye cannot come” (“ubi sum ego, vos non potestis venire”). Upon this, Zachary, who has the ordinary Vulgate text, remarks, in a

note by way of commentary, that the Lord did not say, "Where I *shall be*," but "Where I *am*"; and He did not say "Ye will not be able to come."

"Non dixit, *ubi ero*, sed *ubi sum* : quia sic venit divinitas ad nos, ut de caelo non recederet. . . . non dixit, *non poteritis*, ne desperarent : sed, *non potestis*, dum tales estis."

The natural suggestion arises, that Zachary has a text before him which has been emended to conformity with the Vulgate, and has conserved an explanation of the changes in his commentary. We turn now to the Liège Harmony, to see how it presents the matter. Here it is :

"daer ic syn sal daer en seldi nit mogen comen,"

with both the expressions which Zachary wishes to obliterate,  
"ubi ego ero, ibi non poteritis venire."

These instances suggest to us, that the agreement between the two Harmonies is not confined to the order in which they present the single Gospel, with occasional divergences, but that it extends to the texts which underlie them. Evidently Zachary's text and commentary will have to be scrutinised with great care for variations from the Vulgate which may be significant of antiquity.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

## NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

### ORIENTALISM AND EXPOSITION.

(a) A SIDE-LIGHT from geography, as seen by a traveller, is thrown upon the song of Deborah (Judges v. 19f.) in the pages of *Under the Syrian Sun* (vol ii. pp. 312 f.), one of Messrs. Hutchinson and Co's exquisite colour-books. It was published in 1906, the letterpress being the work of A. C. Inchbold. The traveller reached the traditional site of Sisera's stronghold, on the wild knoll of Harosheth at the base of Carmel. "The Kishon purred placidly enough now through the narrow gorge by which it passes out into the plain, but in the winter rains, or sudden