

Yet he adds: 'While I am not conscious of blame, that gives me no food for self-justification: my critic is the Lord' (1 Co 4<sup>8</sup>).

We need not therefore be surprised to find that the Apostle *makes his own Christian life a criterion for that of his converts*. In his recent work, *Paulus im Lichte der heutigen Heiden-Mission*, pp. 210-212, J. Warneck instructively observes that the convert newly won from heathenism requires a pattern to imitate in his daily life. The example of Jesus Christ towers high above him. He needs something nearer his own level, and he instinctively turns to the missionary who has been his spiritual father. Probably this parallel from the modern mission-field sheds real light on the attitude of Paul, and due weight must be assigned to it. It seems to fall into line with the Apostle's arresting words in 1 Co 4<sup>14ff.</sup>: 'Not by way of custom do I write this, but to admonish you as my dear children. For though you may have thousands of instructors in your Christian life, you have not many fathers, for in Christ Jesus I begat you through the gospel. I entreat you, therefore, become imitators of me.' But, after all, the crucial expression here is 'in Christ Jesus.' That is the platform from which he speaks. Indeed, his complete standpoint is disclosed in 1 Co 11<sup>1</sup>: 'Become imitators of me as I in turn am of Christ.' The conviction that he represents Christ to them in virtue of his definite vocation is presupposed in all his exhortations to copy him as their pattern (e.g. Ph 3<sup>17</sup> 4<sup>9</sup>).

I have tried to bring out by means of illustrations from the Epistles the paramount influence of Paul's consciousness of his apostleship as a direct com-

mission from Christ and an authoritative representation of Him. Perhaps these find their climax in the amazing utterance of Col 1<sup>24</sup>: 'I am suffering now on your behalf, but I rejoice in that; nay, I would make up in my own person the full sum of what Christ has to suffer on behalf of the church, his body.' But we must never lose sight of Paul's invariable emphasis on the subordination of his own position. That is revealed with special clearness when he makes a sharp distinction between injunctions of Jesus handed down in the Christian community and personal recommendations of his own. Thus, in 1 Co 7<sup>25</sup>, in reply to a question regarding virgins, he says: 'I have no commandment of the Lord to give you, but I offer my own opinion, as one whom, through the mercy of the Lord, you may trust.' Similarly, in v.<sup>10</sup>, he states the ordinance of Jesus concerning divorce; but in the case of mixed marriages, which had never been brought before Jesus, he gives his personal advice (v.<sup>12</sup>), emphasizing the fact that it does not possess the authority of the Master. Thus the man who is so confident of his own apprehension of Christ that he can pronounce an anathema on any one who dares to preach a different type of gospel (Gal 1<sup>8</sup>), confesses himself as proud to boast of his weakness, for it is in the hour of supreme helplessness that he is able fully to realize the sufficiency of the exalted Christ (2 Co 12<sup>9</sup>). And the solemn protest against further vexation with which he closes his letter to the Galatians is not based on his own unique position and gifts. His most sacred privilege is that he bears on his body 'the brand of Jesus' ownership' (Gal 6<sup>17</sup>).

## A Quotation from Judith in the Pauline Epistles.

BY RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., LL.D., LITT.D., WOODBROOKE SETTLEMENT.

SOME time since, when the controversy over the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews had been re-opened by a daring hypothesis of Professor Harnack, who maintained that the Epistle was due to the joint literary effort of Aquila and Priscilla (with Priscilla as the predominant partner), it fell to my lot to reply to an objection which had been made in some quarters, to the effect that the hypothesis of an even partial feminine authorship

was negatived by the absence of the names of certain famous women from the roll of the Heroes of Faith in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle. How was it possible that Priscilla could have inserted Barak and omitted Deborah, or that the author or authoress of a document which has so many military reminiscences and glorifies so many warrior saints, could have omitted the name of Judith? I was able to show that it was a mistake.

to suppose that Judith, at any rate, was ignored. Whatever may be the final verdict as to authorship, it was clear that Clement of Rome, who so frequently makes use of the Epistle to the Hebrews as to suggest to some people that he was himself the author, quotes Judith as the illustration of womanly weakness turned to manly strength, and speaks of her adventure in the camp of the aliens. The language was so definite that we were entitled to infer that Clement was actually using the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, and explaining in the feminine and natural sense the words about those who 'out of weakness were made strong.' His reference to Judith proved, in fact, his acquaintance both with Judith as a historical document, and with the Epistle to the Hebrews, as incorporating that document in the collection of sacred books from which the author is drawing his illustrations.

It is not necessary to repeat the arguments for this conclusion in detail, they will be found in my Angus Lectures entitled *Side Lights on New Testament Research*. Nor is it necessary to linger over the disputed question of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is not decided one way or another, even if there should be proved to be a strong 'feminine' element in the eleventh chapter. The argument for 'feminization' of a particular chapter is only one out of a group of arguments, *pro* and *con*, which have to be weighed. At present I am not watching the scales: all that I am doing is to recall what seems to be a valid proof that certain sentences in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews are best explained by the influence of the story of Judith. From this point we may go on to inquire whether, in view of the literary priority of the Book of Judith to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we ought not to expect reactions from Judith elsewhere in the New Testament.

In raising this question we may remind ourselves that it is only in recent years that the influence of apocryphal books upon New Testament writers has been registered at all. For instance, the Book of Enoch has made a broad mark on nearly all the books of the New Testament, but it is only in very recent times that texts or commentaries have found a place for marginal references from Enoch, or employed them for purposes of elucidation. Amongst New Testament critics the apocryphal books have hardly come to their own, though enough is now known as to their influence to make

it possible to write a very useful and interesting treatise on the traces of extra-canonical and uncanonical writings in the Canon of the New Testament.

To return to Judith, as a case in a group of such possible apocryphal influences, I propose to show that the book was known to St. Paul, and that it has been carefully studied by him, and has, in consequence, influenced a remarkable passage in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. If we turn to Judith (8<sup>14f.</sup>), we find the following language: 'The depth of a man's heart ye will not find out, and the reasonings of his understandings ye will not comprehend, and how then will ye explore the God who made all things, and become masters of his mind (*or* make accurate acquaintance with his mind)?'

The passage occurs in the solemn protest which Judith makes to the besieged people in the fortress of Bethulia, and to the elders who were hesitating whether to surrender the city to Holofernes. They are wanting in faith, they are tempting the Lord, they are looking at the situation too humanly. They will provoke the Lord to anger in setting time-limits for His endurance. They have no knowledge either of man or of God.

Thus Judith reasons with them, using the words which I quoted above.

Now let us turn to 1 Co 2<sup>10-16</sup>, where we read as follows:

'The Spirit explores everything, even the depths of God: for who knows what belongs to man except the human spirit? in the same way none but the Spirit of God knows what belongs to God.'

Then after an apologetic parenthesis in which the writer claims to have the Spirit, and consequently to share the knowledge of the Spirit, he breaks out in language borrowed from Isaiah:

'Who hath known the mind of the Lord, so as to constrain him: but for all that, we do possess Christ's mind.'

Now when we compare these sentences with those quoted from Judith, we cannot fail to see that there are coincidences in both language and thought. There is first of all the strange expression about the *depths of personality*, human and divine. Then there is, in each case, the reference to the *exploration of God*; and finally the allusion to the *knowledge of the mind of the Lord*. Let us look into these apparent coincidences.

The language about the depths of God and man will become clearer to us, if we now turn to the original text of Corinthians, and exhibit the parallel with Judith.

I CORINTHIANS 2<sup>10</sup>.

τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα πάντ' ἐραυνᾷ, καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ. τίς γὰρ οἶδεν τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ; οὕτως καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν, εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν Κυρίου ὡς συμβιβάσει αὐτόν;

JUDITH 8<sup>14</sup>.

Βάθος γὰρ καρδίας ἀνθρώπου οὐχ εὕρησεν, καὶ λόγους τῆς διανοίας αὐτοῦ οὐ διαλήμψασθε· καὶ πῶς τὸν Θεὸν ὃς ἐποίησεν τὰ πάντα ταῦτα ἐρευνήσετε, καὶ τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ ἐπιγνώσεσθε, καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν αὐτοῦ κατανοήσετε;

Now in the passage from the Epistle we see that τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ are to be understood particularly and inclusively, as τὰ βάθη τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ, for the 'things of God' of which the writer has been speaking, are the *depths of God*. Consequently the 'things of man' are to be understood especially as the *depths of man*; we might re-write the passage in that sense: and then the parallel with the passage in Judith will be more than one of language; indeed, it is already one of ideas. 'The Spirit explores the unknowable depths of God,' says the Epistle. 'You are unacquainted with the depths of the human heart,' says the apocryphal writer. 'How will you know the divine mind and explore the depths of

that?' The argument is on the same lines as St. Paul's. In either case, *depths of man* and *depths of God* are involved in the text, and are contrasted with one another. Both are inexorable except by the proper spiritual faculty, says St. Paul.

When, in the next place, we add to the foregoing the linguistic parallel in the use of the word *ἐρευνᾶν* [*sc. τὰ βάθη*], we can have little doubt that St. Paul had Judith in mind, and that when he goes on to make the direct parallel from Isaiah, as to the 'knowing of the Lord's mind,' he did so because the language of Judith had implicitly made the connexion for him.

The identification is not without importance in the history of N.T. exegesis: it is well known that the emphasis which St. Paul put on the *depths of God* led to a use of the term on a wider scale. It is probably this term, as misused in Gnostic circles, that gives rise to the contemptuous 'depths of Satan' in Apoc. 2<sup>24</sup>. Nor is it without interest that Clement of Rome, our earliest patristic witness for both Corinthians and Judith, reminds the Corinthian Church that they had 'peered into the depths of the Divine knowledge.'<sup>1</sup> Clement, says Lightfoot, 'uses freely those forms of expression which afterwards became the watchword of the Gnostic sects, and were doubtless frequently heard on the lips of their forerunners, his contemporaries. The Gnostic use is derived from St. Paul just as St. Paul's use is borrowed from Judith: it is not an independent development on the part of the Christian or non-Christian mystics.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Clem. *ad Cor.*, c. 40.

## In the Study.

### About Thomas.

SOME notes appeared last month about the Apostle Thomas and the interpretation of his character. Here something will be said about his interpreters. They are mostly preachers. All that the historian or the expositor can say is said easily and soon.

For our knowledge of Thomas we are indebted to the Fourth Gospel. The Synoptists tell us nothing whatever about him except the fact of his apostleship. The Fourth Gospel introduces him on four occasions and quotes a saying of his on

each occasion. That is all. But the saying is always a remarkable one, and the four sayings together are enough to furnish materials for the construction of a character of quite unusual interest. They are all in sufficient harmony to make the character seem consistent, and yet they are all required for its complete construction. The sayings are (1) 'Let us also go, that we may die with him'; (2) 'Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us'; (3) 'Except I see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and put my hand into his side,