

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

---

No. 1.—January, 1880.

---

I.

THE IDEA AND AIMS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN  
REVIEW.

THERE has been for some time a conviction, constantly widening and deepening, that a Review is needed that will adequately represent the theology and life of the Presbyterian Church. This need has been felt all the more that in former years our Church derived so much strength and advantage from the Reviews so ably conducted by Drs. Charles Hodge, Albert Barnes, Henry B. Smith, and others. Two years ago, the *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review*, which had gathered up into itself the various older Presbyterian Quarterlies, was sold out by the proprietors and editors, and the *Princeton Review* appeared in its place, devoting itself chiefly to Philosophy, Science, and Belles-Lettres, and presenting an array of scholarship and talent unprecedented in the history of periodical literature. Yet this very fact called the more attention to its defects in those very respects that made the older Reviews so important to the Presbyterian Church; consequently the desire for a representative Presbyterian Review grew to be so strong and irrepressible, that several efforts have been made during the past year, in various parts of the land, culminating in the present enterprise, which seeks to combine all the varied interests and sections of our Presbyterian Church in order to secure a Review that will truly represent it by a strong, hearty, steady, and thorough advocacy of Presbyterian principles. The managing and associate editors have been requested by a large number of theologians,

#### IV.

### THE APOLOGETICAL VALUE OF THE TESTAMENTS OF THE XII PATRIARCHS.

THEY tell a story of a botanical enthusiast, who left his English home and travelled the world over in search of a mistletoe upon an oak. Returning after his long, but unsuccessful quest, he incidentally mentioned to his agent the cause of his long absence. "Why," cried the astonished man, "*there* is the very thing you have sought—at your own door!" This incident will illustrate much that occurs in far more serious researches. How often we fail to see and make use of the facts that lie at hand, in our eager search for the same facts through more difficult mediums, or in more recondite quarters. Every branch of human inquiry will furnish examples, patristic criticism no less than the rest. Thus, while eyes were worn out deciphering the "one only extant copy" of the Epistle of Clement of Rome, and conjecture balked in the effort to elucidate its errors or lacunæ, two frequented European libraries each held an additional authority for the text. Again, while men were striving over certain readings of the Epistle of Barnabas until the world was tired of their wrangling, all the time at least two Greek manuscripts of that book, a simple glance at either of which would have forever settled all dispute, were lying hid in Eastern monasteries awaiting discovery. Even more strangely has the world dealt with the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs. It has not been hidden away in the East or in private libraries. It has been before the critical world for now near two centuries. Yet, though containing within itself no doubtful answers to several important questions, it has not been allowed to speak upon them. Its fortunes have been of the strangest. From the time of Jerome to the time of Robert Grosseteste no Western eye seems to have looked upon it. And though each of the great English universities possessed a good copy, its Greek text was not printed until 1698. Even

after printing, its perverse fate followed it; for nearly a century and three-quarters men were content to read what was virtually the inaccurate *editio princeps*. No real effort to correct Grabe's text seems to have been made until Mr. Sinker gave us in 1869 an accurate transcript of the Cambridge manuscript carefully collated with the Oxford.

The strange indifference with which the book has been regarded is evinced in more than one direction. Perhaps we have no better witness than it to the Nazarene doctrine of the person and work of Christ. And yet, while men have been twisting and trimming down and fitting together the scanty and generally second-hand fragments to be gleaned on this subject from much later church-writers, in the vain hope that the mosaic thus formed would present the lineaments of a recognizable picture; it seems to have occurred to no one simply to let an early Nazarene writer speak for himself. When the book has been appealed to, it has been approached with preconceived opinions of what its Christology should be; and although it presents a pure Nicene doctrine, some writers by the application of a sweeping theory of interpolations, have attempted to prove it Ebionitish, and others, by an unprecedented pressure of phrases, which any Trinitarian would (and properly) use, have been able to find it Patripassian. Again, there are few writings of equal value for the early history of the New Testament canon; but here also we must say that there are few early writings whose testimony on this subject has been so strangely neglected. Dr. Lightfoot almost alone seems to have recognized its importance, and treated it with its deserved respect.

Our present purpose is, confining ourselves to this one subject, to enquire into the value of this writing for the early history of the canon of the New Testament. Setting aside, then, all other questions connected with the book, whether of general or special importance, we purpose to dispose very briefly of the few preliminary questions which must be settled before the worth of a witness to the canon can be estimated, and then address ourselves to the main point: "What witness does the book bear to the canon of the New Testament?"

As its name suggests, the book is a Christian pseudepigraph purporting to give an account of the last utterances of the

twelve sons of Jacob, warning their children to avoid the sins into which they themselves had fallen, and laying bare to them the things which should come in the after-time. There is no dispute as to the object of the work : it is evidently addressed to Jews and Jewish Christians to attract them to or confirm them in Christianity, as a development of antique Judaism known, foretold, and prepared for from the beginning. Nor should there be any dispute as to the nationality or ecclesiastical connection of its author. } Ritschl, indeed, formerly contended, and Vorstman and Hilgenfeld still contend, that its author was a Pauline Christian : but Ritschl,\* led by the reasonings of Kayser, frankly retracted that view, and nearly all critics now agree that the author was a Judæo-Christian. There is no room for doubt, indeed, that he was a Jew by birth : the evidences of Jewish feeling and thought overspread the pages. The special character of his Christianity presents a nicer question ; but here also the evidence is decidedly preponderant in favor of the view of Ritschl that the author was a Nazarene. He evidently lives in an atmosphere in which Christianity is viewed not as a superseding of, but a superinducement on, the Mosaic law ; the Levitical priesthood has been, indeed, superseded, but by one who as descendant of Levi is to be eternal priest ; and in doctrine, ethics, attitude towards asceticism, etc., the author evinces that he has felt no contrast between the Old and New Testaments. The integrity of the book is also unquestionable : Vorstman has set that question finally at rest. The book is all of a piece ; and it is capable of detailed proof that the asserted interpolations are in the same style, and present all the same peculiarities as the body of the book. We can afford to overlook all charges of interpolation when the passage is contained in both MSS.

Setting these points thus aside we turn to the important question of the date of the writing. The first rough outlines of its determination may be obtained by observing the facts : first, that the book of Enoch is several times quoted in it, and secondly, that Origen quotes it by name, and Tertullian has

---

\* See Ritschl's *Entstehung*, etc., p. 172, note 1 : and on this whole section Sinker's *Testamenta xii Patt.*, pp. 188 sq., to which book the present article is greatly indebted.

twice used its thoughts and wording.\* More narrow limits are, however, attainable. Thus, on the one side it is certain that the book was written after the taking of Jerusalem by Titus (A.D. 70); and on the other, before the harrowing of the land during the revolt of Barkokaba (c. A.D. 135). We shall see subsequently that it bears evident traces of a knowledge of John's Gospel. If we assign the composition of that gospel to 98-100, then this work was not written before 100; if we hold the date of John in uncertainty, then the limit for the composition of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs is left on this side at A.D. 70. How much before 135 it was written, it is impossible to say; but it is certain that the book shows no trace of the troublous times that preceded the insurrection, and which may be said to have begun as early as 117. Taking other circumstances into consideration, it can with some confidence be affirmed that it cannot have been composed much, if any, later than 120. With these limits agree the opinions of the most considerable critics; thus Ewald dates the book 90-110, Vorstman soon after 70, Langen and De Groot at the end of the first or beginning of the second century, Wieseler 100-120, Dorner and Sinkler 100-135. We shall assume, then, that the most probable date is 100-120 A.D.

Consider now what this means. We have here a Christian writing coming from the Jewish Church, and dating from the first two decades of the second century. It belongs, then, to the same period from which we have received the Epistles of Clement of Rome (97), Barnabas (106), Ignatius (115), and Polycarp (116), together with, in all probability, that to Diognetus (117). That is, it comes to us with tidings of what was thought and what was held in the very earliest period of post-apostolic Christian history: and its testimony to our Canon is, therefore, the testimony of a time when the disciples of the Apostles were bearing personal witness to the writings of their masters. Its testimony, then, is of supreme importance: the New Testament books which were in existence when it was written and were accepted as authoritative by its author, beyond all doubt sprang from the very bosom

---

\* See *Test.*: Sim. v.; Levi x. xiv. xvi.; Jud. xviii.; Naph. iv.; Dan. v.; Zeb. iii.; Benj. ix. *Orig.*: Hom. in Jos. XV., c. 6. *Tertullian*: Adv. Marc. V. 1; Scorp. c. 13. Hilgenfeld expressly admits these references (*Einleitung*, p. 71).

of the Apostolic circle. Again, not only does this book bear contemporary witness with the Apostolical Fathers, but it strengthens their testimony by the addition of its own in a very much greater than an arithmetical proportion. It not only adds another witness, but it adds a witness from an entirely different source; and by exhibiting the fact of the exceedingly wide-spread acceptance of the New Testament books at so early a date, evinces either that they had already been in existence a considerable time, or that they had come to the Church as authoritative documents from authoritative sources, and that this authority had winged their rapid flight to every corner of the world. In either case, the Apostolical origin of the books is established. The other writers of the age represent to us the Churches of Rome, Alexandria, Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs complete the circle by bringing us tidings from the Jewish Church at Pella, and declaring to us that the books to which it witnesses were the common heritage of all of the Christian name throughout the world. Here, too, there was no difference between Greek or Jew, circumcision or uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond or free.

The importance of the subject and the inadequacy of its treatment heretofore warrant us in going somewhat dryly into details. We shall, therefore, in a somewhat full manner, but as briefly as possible, attempt to answer the question: What does this book know of our New Testament?

At the outset we must note that the form of the book forbids any very full witness to the New Testament. It purports to be spoken by the twelve sons of Jacob long before even the Old Testament was written; direct reference to either Testament was alike out of the question. The Apocalyptic form of the book, as in the case of the Shepherd of Hermas, also militated against free use of the New Testament. And the fact that it is largely composed of a detailed account of the more obscure portions of the history of the patriarchs themselves, presents still another reason why we cannot expect to glean very full witness from it to our books. We can in the nature of the case hope only for obscure and unconscious allusions, except in the case of such evangelical facts as could be readily worked into the brief Messianic passages.

It may serve to impress us with some idea of the authority ascribed to every word of Scripture in those days, and of the constant use made of it, to find, as we shall, that in the face of all these considerations we can discover sure traces of nearly all of our New Testament books in the pages of this one not voluminous writing.

The evidence by which this is evinced, is briefly as follows :

I. The character of the book is just such as we should expect from an author deeply imbued with the doctrines, ethical teaching, and even diction of the New Testament. It is catholic in its doctrine,—liberally catholic like the New Testament itself. The Gentiles are to be fellow-heirs of salvation with the Jews ; salvation is by grace through faith, and yet not divorced from works. Christ is God and man in one,—it was the Most High who died on the cross ; and yet He is distinguished from God by being His Son. The mild teaching of the New Testament has largely leavened the stern Jewish morality which the writer inherited. It is precisely the homely Christian virtues of lowliness and simplicity of heart that are most dwelt upon. Sin is represented as an inward thing—of the mind, and as existing in all its vileness and deserving harshest condemnation even when no outward action has given it expression. And love is distinctly made the fulfilling of the law. All this distinctively New Testament teaching is clothed in New Testament forms. It is not too much to say with Bishop Lightfoot that “ the language in the moral and didactic portions takes its color from the Epistle of James, and in the prophetic and apocalyptic portions from the Revelation of St. John.” We think no one can read the book simply and unsophisticatedly without feeling that its author had these writings in his mind as models. On this general point, however, we need not dwell.

II. Descending to specific details we must note, secondly, that the language of the writer is the language of the New Testament. This arises from two causes: First, like the New Testament authors, our author writes Hellenistic Greek ; but, secondly, we must add, his vocabulary has been largely affected from New Testament sources. To the first of these should be attributed the presence of the usual grammatical and syntactic peculiarities of Hellenistic Greek as well

as the general peculiarities of vocabulary. There are, however, not doubtful testimonies to the action of the second cause also. The book is remarkable both for the number of unusual non-New Testament words it contains, and for the presence in it of numerous peculiar words seemingly borrowed from New Testament sources. Of the first of these characteristics we give some sort of an example in a note :\* of the second, the following lists will furnish a sufficient exemplification.

The following rare words found in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs are in the New Testament peculiar to St. Paul, viz : (ἀγαθωσύνη), ἀγιωσύνη, (ἀγνεία), (ἀδιάλειπτως), αἰσχροκερδία (in Paul—δης), ἀμετανόητος, ἀνανεοῦσθαι, (ἀπλότης), ἀποδείξις, ἀρέσκεια, ἀρμόζειν, (ἀρβράβων), βασιλεὺς αἰώνιων, διαίρεσις, δικαιοκρισία, δυναμοῦν, ἐγκανχάομαι, ἐνάρχεσθαι, ἐνδοξάζεσθαι, (ἐνότης), ἐρεζίζω, δέλω ἐν—, ἰκανόω, ἰλαρότης, (κανών), μετασχηματίζειν, μολυσμός, [μόρφωσις], (μυκτηρίζω), (νον Θεσία), οἰκτεῖρειν, ὀλιγοψυχία (Paul—ος) ὄσφρησις, παραζήκη, [παρακαταζήκη], (παρεδρένειν), παροργίζειν, περιεργάζεσθαι, πύκτης, πλεονεκτεῖν, πορισμός, (πραότης) προκοπή, στερέωμα, σύζυγος, ὑπανθρος, ὑποτιζέσθαι, ὑστεροὶ καιροί, φνσιόω, φωτισμός, ψωμίζειν. In other words, of the words peculiar to Paul in the New Testament, this writer uses no less than fifty-one ; of which thirty-nine occur in no other Christian writer of his age. The force of this as an argument that our writer had Paul's Epistles and gained this vocabulary from them can be estimated by remembering two facts : First, that this similarity does not at all concern *general* similarity of vocabularies, but only the *peculiar* words common to the two writers. When two writers are very similar in the peculiarities of their diction, certainly some kind of connection exists between them. And, secondly, as against the thirty-nine words found only in Paul in his age, and only in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs in its, Canon Westcott cata-

\* In these lists words in parentheses are also found in Christian writings contemporary with the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs. Words enclosed in square brackets are found only in the Oxford Manuscript. The following unusual words (gleaned wholly under the letter A) are found in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, and not at all in the New Testament, viz. : ἀβλαβής, ἀγαθότης, ἀγαθύνω, ἀγίασμα, ἀδοξέω, ἀδρύνω, αἰκίζω, αἰσχροκερδία, αἰσχρορρημενεῖν, ἀκύλφος, ἀκαταμάχατος, ἀκολασία, ἄλγημα, ἄλειμμα, ἀλλοιούω, ἀμυρόω, ἀμνησικακος, ἀναίδης, ἀνάμακτος, ἀναισθητέω, ἀναισχυντιῶ, ἀνακαινοποιέω, ἀναμάρτητος (found however in Jno. 8 : 7), [ἀνασκοποῦν], ἀνάστημα, ἀνδρῶω, ἀνιάτος, ἀντίζηλος, ἀντιποιέω. ἀνυμνέω, ἀνοικητός, ἀπαγορεύω, ἀπαρτίζω, ἀπληστία, ἀπλωμα, ἀποπλάνησις, [ἀποσκηνῶ], ἀποσκοποῦν, ἀπόφασις, ἀποφνηγή, ἀπροσέγγιστος, ἀρμενίζω, ἀρχμύγειρος, ἀσέβηημα, ἀσηπτος, ἀσύγχιτος, ἀστυαθής, ἀσχολέω, ἄσματος, ἀχένες, ἀφραστος, ἠωρία.



logues only eleven, as in like manner peculiar to Paul and Clement of Rome, and only six as peculiar to Paul and Polycarp. These writers, we know, had Paul's Epistles; Polycarp alone quotes eleven of them. The greater length of the Testaments, as compared with Polycarp's letter, will hardly account for the difference between six and thirty-nine. The conclusion seems irresistible that the author of the Testaments borrowed this vocabulary from St. Paul.

The same phenomenon meets us when we compare other New Testament books. Thus, of the words peculiar in the New Testament to the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Testaments contain the following: *αἷμα διαθήκης, ἄπειρος, ἀρμός, γνόσος, εὐφότης, (ἱεροσύνη), καφαρότης, καταγωνίζεσθαι, κατασκόπος, δλοῤρεύειν, προσαγορεύειν, προσοχθίζω, (συμπαθεῖν), (χαρακτήρ), φαντάζω*. Fifteen in all, of which twelve occur in no other writer of this age.\*

The following Lucan peculiarities occur: 1. Peculiar to Luke's Gospel *ἀηδία, ἀναιδής (Luke, εια), ἀνάληψις, ἀνομολογῆσαι, ἀτεκνος, τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην, ἐξαιτεῖσθαι, (ἱερατεύω), κατασύρω, κόρος, ὄνειδος, ὀρθρίζειν, παράλως, (παρθενία), προσποιεῖν, σίκερα, συκκοφαντέω, συμπίπτω, (σωτήριον as personal designation), ὑποκρίνεσθαι, φάρανξ, φιλονεικία*. Twenty-two, of which nineteen are found in no contemporary. Then, 2. Peculiar to Acts: *(ἀλλόφυλος), ἄσιτος, δεσμοφίλαξ, δημόσιος, διαδέχομαι, διανέμειν, ἔδαφος, ελαίων (as proper name), ἐναπίζεσθαι, ἐξολοθρεύειν, ἔξυπνος, ἐπαυροῦσθαι, κατασχέσις, κοιτών, (μεταβάλλειν), ὀζόνη, σκληροτραχαλία (Acts, ος) στρήνος, ὑποβάλλειν, φαντασία, φυγαδεύειν, φυλακίζειν, (χειμάζεσθαι) (χλευάζειν)*. Twenty-four, of which twenty are found in no contemporary. Add *ἐνισχύειν*, and *συγγένεια*, which are common to Luke and Acts, and we count forty-eight Lucan peculiarities in the Testaments, of which forty-one are found in no Christian contemporary.

The following words peculiar in the New Testament to John's Gospel are found in the Testaments, viz: *(αἵματα, plural), ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀναμάρτητος John viii. 7, βαῖα, ἐξυπνίζειν, ζεοσεβής, θήκη, θρέμμα, λίτρα, μονογένης (of Christ), πενδερός*. Eleven, ten of which are found in no contemporary.

Of the words peculiar to Revelation we have: *ἄρκος,*

\* Eight more are peculiar in the New Testament to Paul and Hebrews, of which six are found in this age only in the Testaments. If Hebrews is Paul's, then we have seventy-four Pauline words in the Testaments, of which fifty-seven are peculiar to it in this age.

βύσσινος, (διάδημα), κρύσταλος, μουσικός, ὄπώρα, ποδίρης. Seven, six of which are found in no contemporary.

Of Matthew's peculiarities again we can detect in the Testaments just seven, six of which are found in this age only in the Testaments. Of Mark's, only four; of James', only two; of Peter's, there are more. Thus, of 1 Peter's we find: (ἀγαθοποιᾶ) ἀμνὸς ἄμωμος, ἀρχιποίμην, γυναικεῖος, πτότος, σπορά, six, of which five are peculiar to the Testaments in this age. Then, of 2d Peter's peculiarities we find the following, peculiar in this age to the Testaments, viz: βλέμμα, βόρβορος, ἐξακολουθεῖν, μασμός [μασμά] παρανομία, στρίγμα (μοσ in 2d Peter), seven. Add μῶμος, which is found also in Clement. Then note that the Testaments contain other rare words found in 2d Peter, but not absolutely peculiar to it, such as ἀπόφασις, εἰλικρινής, φυσικός, etc., none of which are found in the other writers of the age, and the argument that the author had 2d Peter and borrowed a vocabulary from it, seems to grow somewhat strong.

These lists may not be of very great value, but in the face of them it seems difficult to doubt that the author of the Testaments knew the writings of Paul and Luke, as well as the Epistle to the Hebrews; and some probability is raised that he knew Matthew, John, Revelation, and 1st and 2d Peter.

III. We shall find these conclusions strengthened if we will turn to the consideration of the New Testament *facts* reflected in his pages. We will throw a statement of the most prominent of them into the briefest possible form:

It was in the last days,<sup>1</sup> in the fulness of time<sup>2</sup> Heb. 1:2; 9:26.  
and according to prophecy,<sup>3</sup> that the Christ<sup>4</sup> was Mt. 1:22; Lk. 2:26.  
to come.<sup>5</sup> He was to be born of a virgin<sup>6</sup> of the Lk. 1:27; Mt. 1:25;  
tribe of Judah,<sup>7</sup> and yet was to spring also from Lk. 1:32; 3:23; Lk.  
the tribe of Levi.<sup>8</sup> His name should be Saviour.<sup>9</sup> 1:36.  
Mt. 1:21.  
A star, shining in the daytime should announce Mt. 2:2, 9.  
His coming<sup>10</sup> as a King.<sup>11</sup> While in the waters Mt. 3:16.  
the heavens should be opened to Him, and from Lk. 3:21.  
them accompanied with the Fatherly voice, Mk. 1:10.

<sup>1</sup>Z. 8. <sup>2</sup>Levi 10. <sup>3</sup>R. 6, B. 3. <sup>4</sup>R. 6. <sup>5</sup>S. 6, Jud. 22. <sup>6</sup>Jos. 19. <sup>7</sup>Jos. 19, Jud. 24.  
<sup>8</sup>R. 6. <sup>9</sup>D. 6. <sup>10</sup>L. 18. <sup>11</sup>L. 18. cf., S. 7, L. 8, etc.

should come forth upon Him the spirit of knowledge and sanctification.<sup>12</sup> He comes to be the Saviour of the world,<sup>13</sup> both of Israel<sup>14</sup> and of the Gentiles;<sup>15</sup> the salvation being graciously<sup>16</sup> bestowed on those who believe.<sup>17</sup> He comes also to bruise the Dragon's head:<sup>18</sup> which he will perform not in bruit and uproar, but in utter quietness.<sup>19</sup> His life is to be one of poverty.<sup>20</sup> In character, He shall be wholly sinless;<sup>21</sup> true,<sup>22</sup> long-suffering,<sup>23</sup> meek,<sup>24</sup> lowly,<sup>25</sup> simple<sup>26</sup> of heart, and righteous.<sup>27</sup> His life shall be such that by His very actions He shall teach God's law.<sup>28</sup> He shall know all God's will and purposes;<sup>29</sup> and shall execute judgment in truth.<sup>30</sup> He will not only found a kingdom of which He shall be eternally king,<sup>31</sup> but establish a new priesthood<sup>32</sup> after an universal type,<sup>33</sup> extending in its reference to all the Gentiles:<sup>34</sup> in which He as high-priest<sup>35</sup> shall have no successor.<sup>36</sup> As a result of His coming, heaven and earth and the angels of God shall rejoice;<sup>37</sup> the kingdom of evil will be conquered,<sup>38</sup> and men shall rule over evil spirits.<sup>39</sup> He shall put an end to the priesthood of Levi,<sup>40</sup> and renew the law.<sup>41</sup> He shall open the doors of paradise<sup>42</sup> and remove the sword that threatens mankind,<sup>43</sup> giving men to eat of the tree of life,<sup>44</sup> and by His priesthood (or sacrifice) putting an end to sin.<sup>45</sup> He will be the very fountain of life to all flesh,<sup>46</sup> the mediator of God and men,<sup>47</sup> pouring forth the spirit of grace upon men,<sup>48</sup> and rescuing the saints from Beliar, even the captivity of the sons of men.<sup>49</sup> Though in appearance a man,<sup>50</sup> walking among men,<sup>51</sup> eating and drinking with men,<sup>52</sup> though really a man,<sup>53</sup> He is God as well,<sup>54</sup>

Jno. 4:42.  
Lk. 2:11, 32.  
Acts 18:27.  
Ro. 3:24.  
Mk. 16:16.  
Ro. 16:20.

Mt. 12:15, 21.

Mt. 8:20.  
Jno. 8:46.

Mt. 22:16.  
Jno. 5:14.

Mt. 11:29.  
2 Pet. 3:15.

2 Cor. 11:3.  
Lk. 23:47.

Jno. 4:34; 5:30;  
6:38.

Mt. 11:27.  
Jno. 5:22.

Mt. 5:13; 3:2.

Lk. 1:33.

Ep. to Heb.

Heb. 5:10; 8:1; 7:24.

Lk. 2:13.

Lk. 11:21.

Lk. 9:1.

Heb. 7:15, 18.  
Mt. 5:17.

Rev. 4:1.

Rev. 2:7.

Jno. 1:29.

Rev. 21:6.

1 Tim. 2:5.  
Acts 2:17.

Heb. 10:29.  
Acts 26:18.

Eph. 4:8.

Phil. 2:8.  
Mt. 11:19.

1 Tim. 2:5.

Jno. 1:30.  
Jno. 1:18.

<sup>12</sup> L. 18, Jud. 24. <sup>13</sup> L. 14, S. 6, B. 3, L. 10. <sup>14</sup> S. 7, L. 2, N. 3, B. 3. <sup>15</sup> S. 7, L. 2, 4, A. 7, B. 3. <sup>16</sup> Jos. 19. <sup>17</sup> A. 7, D. 6. <sup>18</sup> A. 7, B. 3. <sup>19</sup> A. 7. <sup>20</sup> Dan. 5. <sup>21</sup> Jud. 24. <sup>22</sup> Dan. 6. <sup>23</sup> Dan. 6, Jud. 24. <sup>24</sup> Is. 7. <sup>25</sup> Jud. 24. <sup>26</sup> D. 6. <sup>27</sup> L. 18. <sup>28</sup> Jos. 19, R. 6, Jud. 22. <sup>29</sup> L. 8, 18. <sup>30</sup> L. 8. <sup>31</sup> R. 6, S. 7. <sup>32</sup> L. 18. <sup>33</sup> L. 18. <sup>34</sup> S. 6, L. 18. <sup>35</sup> R. 6, L. 4. <sup>36</sup> L. 16. <sup>37</sup> L. 18. <sup>38</sup> L. 18. <sup>39</sup> Jud. 24. <sup>40</sup> D. 6. <sup>41</sup> Z. 9, D. 5. <sup>42</sup> A. 7, B. 10, [S. 6, Z. 9]. <sup>43</sup> Is. 7. <sup>44</sup> S. 6. <sup>45</sup> L. 16, Jud. 24. <sup>46</sup> L. 5, 8, Jud. 22.

God and man in one.<sup>47</sup> But although the great God of Israel,<sup>48</sup> He shall be counted a deceiver<sup>49</sup> and slain by Israel,<sup>50</sup> He shall enter the Temple,<sup>51</sup> and there be outraged:<sup>51</sup> the sons of Levi shall lay hands upon Him<sup>52</sup> and crucify\* Him,<sup>53</sup> taking His blood on their heads.<sup>54</sup> Though God,<sup>55</sup> He shall die:<sup>55</sup> and that, in behalf of men.<sup>56</sup> Though innocent, His blood shall be poured out;<sup>57</sup> spotless, He shall die in behalf of the impious;<sup>58</sup> and sinless, for the wicked;<sup>58</sup> His blood being the blood of the covenant,<sup>59</sup> and the end of His death being the salvation of the world.<sup>59</sup> At His death the sun shall be quenched,<sup>60</sup> rocks split,<sup>60</sup> the grave despoiled,<sup>60</sup> and the veil of the Temple rent<sup>61</sup> as a symbol of the passage of the Spirit of God to the Gentiles.<sup>62</sup> As punishment for this great wickedness, great evils shall come upon Israel,<sup>63</sup> among which is specially named, a new dispora of contempt.<sup>64</sup> But the crucified One shall rise again from the grave<sup>65</sup> and ascend into heaven,<sup>66</sup> His glory there being proportionate to His humility here.<sup>67</sup> Israel, also, shall not always rest under her punishment;<sup>68</sup> the Lord comes a second time in pity,<sup>68</sup> and will redeem her through faith<sup>69</sup> and water<sup>68</sup> (*i. e.*, baptism). At that time comes the general resurrection,<sup>70</sup> — some rising to glory,<sup>71</sup> some to dishonor;<sup>71</sup> and the judgment,<sup>71</sup> — of some to eternal life,<sup>72</sup> of some to eternal punishment.<sup>73</sup> Eternal peace<sup>74</sup> shall be given to all them that called upon the Lord;<sup>74</sup> the saints shall rest in Eden, and the just shall rejoice over the New Jerusalem,<sup>75</sup> which shall be for the glory of God forever.<sup>75</sup>

The Spirit shall be poured out as fire;<sup>76</sup> and

Heb. 1: 8.  
Jno. 8: 58.  
Mt. 27: 63.  
Acts 2: 23.  
Mt. 21.  
Mt. 26: 50.  
Mt. 26, sq.  
Mt. 27: 25.  
Acts 20: 28.  
Lk. 22: 20.  
Jno. 6: 51.  
Jno. 10: 15, 51, 52.  
Mt. 27: 4.  
Ro. 5: 6, 7.  
1 Pet. 1: 19.  
Heb. 13: 20.  
Jno. 3: 17.  
Mt. 27: 51.  
Mt. 24.  
Lk. 21.  
Lk. 21: 20.  
Mt. 28.  
Acts 1: 9.  
Phil. 2: 9.  
Ro. 11.  
Mt. 24: 27.  
Mt. 24: 31.  
Jno. 5: 29.  
Mt. 11: 22.  
Mt. 13: 49.  
Ro. 2: 10.  
Rev. 3: 12.  
Rev. 21: 2.

\* ἀποσκολοπίσαι [Ox., ἀνασ.] Levi 4. cf. Lucian's contemptuous calling of Christ: τὸν ἐν τῇ παλαιστίῃ ἀνασκολοπισθέντα. Hesychius and Phavorinus explain ἀνασκολ, as being equivalent to ἀνασταυρίζω.

<sup>47</sup>S. 7. <sup>48</sup>S. 6. <sup>49</sup>L. 16. <sup>50</sup>L. 16, etc. <sup>51</sup>B. 9. <sup>52</sup>L. 4, 14. <sup>53</sup>L. 4. <sup>54</sup>L. 16. <sup>55</sup>L. 4. <sup>56</sup>R. 6. <sup>57</sup>L. 16. <sup>58</sup>B. 3. <sup>59</sup>B. 3. <sup>60</sup>L. 4. <sup>61</sup>L. 10, B. 9. <sup>62</sup>B. 9. <sup>63</sup>L. 4, 10, 16. <sup>64</sup>L. 10, 16. <sup>65</sup>L. 16, B. 9. <sup>66</sup>L. 18, B. 9. <sup>67</sup>B. 9. <sup>68</sup>L. 16. <sup>69</sup>L. 16, A. 7. <sup>70</sup>B. 10. Jud. 24. <sup>71</sup>B. 10. <sup>72</sup>A. 5. <sup>73</sup>Z. 10, Gad. 7. <sup>74</sup>Dan. 5. <sup>75</sup>Dan. 5. <sup>76</sup>B. 9.

a son of Benjamin in the later times is to  
 arise, beloved of the Lord, hearing His voice  
 and enlightening both Jews and Gentiles with  
 new knowledge; snatching salvation from the  
 Jews and giving it to the Gentiles.”

Acts 13: 21.

Acts 9: 4.  
Acts 9: 29.

Acts 22: 21.

Acts 13: 46.

This cento does not profess to contain every fact which the Testaments have gained from the New Testament; but it does profess to contain nothing which is not in the Testaments, and which cannot be fairly supposed to have been taken from the New Testament. Such as it is, it will give no very inadequate notion of the acquaintance of our author with the New Testament.\* We are at least prepared by such a collection of facts to estimate correctly the value of other traces of knowledge of the Christian books. The argument is cumulative, and each point made, depending, as it does, on no other for its force, adds a new probability of its own. This cento alone raises a probability that the author of the Testaments had a good part of our New Testament. The strength of that probability will increase to a certainty as our exhibition of evidence proceeds.

IV. For, we are now prepared to advance a step further. Carrying with us a sense of the results already attained, we are better fitted to judge of more direct traces of knowledge of the New Testament books. Direct citations from the New

---

\* B. II.

\* We add in a note a collection of the titles given to Christ in the course of the book. It will be of interest, both as showing the character of the Christology of the book and as exhibiting acquaintance with the New-Testament teaching on the subject. The titles in brackets are not found in the Oxford MS. Christ is called: God (S. 6, N. 8), The God of Righteousness (Jud. 22), The God of Heaven (Is. 7), [God playing the part of man], (As. 7), God and man (S. 7), [God in the form of man], (Z. 9), The Lord, the great God of Israel (S. 6), The Lord (L. 2, D. 5, etc.), The Lord himself (Z. 9), The Lord to come (L. 8), The Most High (L. 4, 5, A. 7), The Son of the Lord (L. 4), The offspring of God (Jud. 24), The angel that intercedeth for you (D. 6), The Mediator of God and men (D. 6), Man (*άνηρ* L. 16, *άνθρωπος* Jud. 24), The seed of Levi (R. 6), of Abraham (L. 8), and of Judah; King (L. 8, 18), King Eternal (R. 6), King of Heaven (B. 10), Prophet of the Most High (L. 8), The only begotten [Prophet] of the Most High (B. 9), The anointed (*χρίστος*) high-priest (R. 6), A new priest (L. 18), He who shall redeem Israel (L. 2), Spotless Lamb (Jas. 19), The Lamb of God (Jas. 19), The Lamb of God and Saviour of the World (B. 9), The Saviour of the World (L. 10, 14), Saviour (D. 6, Gad. 8), The Salvation (*τὸ σωτήριον*) of the Lord (B. 10, D. 5)—of God (S. 7)—of the Most High (B. 9)—of Israel (Jud. 22), The compassion of God (Z. 8), [—of the Lord], (N. 4), The very Fountain unto life (Jud. 24), A Star out of Jacob (Jud. 24), The Light of Righteousness (Z. 9), [The Sceptre of the Kingdom], (Jud. 24), [The Rod of Righteousness] (Jud. 24), [Jerusalem], (Z. 9), etc., etc.

Testament being out of the question, owing to the character of the book, we have now to ask: "Does the writer betray indirectly, by the adoption of phrases and by similar collocation of words—in other words, by silent and even unconscious quotation—any acquaintance with our New Testament books?" The evidence here is the most convincing of all; and we must present the strongest part of it in detail.\*

In the midst of an account of the hard straits into which he was brought by the allurements of "the Egyptian woman," Joseph evidently quotes a passage from our Matthew. We will compare the passages:

Jos. 3.

Ἐγὼ οὖν ἐμνησκόμην λόγους πατέρων  
[πατρός] μου [Ἰακώβ], καὶ εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸ  
ταμείου προσηυχόμενον κυρίῳ.

Matt. 6:6.

σὺ δὲ ὅταν προσεέλθῃ, εἰσελθε εἰς τὸ  
ταμεῖόν σου καὶ . . . . πρόσευξαι τῷ πατρὶ  
. . . .

That this is a quotation from that is evident, for (as Lardner long since saw and noted) the author betrays his consciousness that the phrase is a borrowed one, as well as his fear that it would be recognized as taken from a book much later than the assumed date of his own writing—by inventing an earlier book to which to assign it. The sentence, then, is undoubtedly a quotation. If a quotation, it cannot be seriously contended that it has come from other source than the corresponding sentence in our Matthew.

Take another case. Levi (14) is represented as saying to his children: "What shall all the Gentiles do if ye be darkened through impiety and bring a curse upon our race: in behalf of whom [which], τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου, τὸ δοθέν ἐν ὑμῖν εἰς φωτισμὸν παντὸς ἀνθρώπου. As parallel to this John viii. 12 is usually quoted; but it would seem to be rather probable that the writer had in his mind, Matt. v. 14 sq. "Ἔμεῖς ἐστὲ τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου . . . . (v. 16), Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father in heaven."

In the preceding chapter we find another exceedingly probable quotation from Matt. v. as follows:

L. 13.

Ἐάν [Οx. ὅς ἐάν] διδάχῃ ταῦτα καὶ πράττῃ,  
σύνθρόνος ἐσται βασιλείας.

Matt. 5:19.

ὅς δ' ἂν ποιήσῃ καὶ διδάχῃ οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν.

\* Words omitted in Ox. are bracketed in the citations under this head.

In Aser 7, again we meet with the following words: *καὶ αὐτός* [sc. ὕψιστος] *ἐλθὼν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων καὶ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ συντριβὼν τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ δράκοντος διῦδατος. Οὗτος σώσει τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ παντὰ τὰ ἔθνη.* These may be compared with Matt. xi. 19; xii. 15, 21, (cf. also Rom. xvi. 21.) The whole first section of Joseph's Testament is evidently modelled on Matt. xxv. 35 sq.; a passage in Levi 4 is founded on Matt. xxvii. 51, sq.; and Benj. 7, ("Abel the just") seems taken from Matt. xxiii. 35. To these we may add Dan. 6, where it is declared that He whose name in every place of Israel, and among all the Gentiles is Saviour, is *ἀληθής, καὶ μακρόθυμος, πρᾶος καὶ ταπεινός, καὶ ἐκδιδάσκων διὰ τῶν ἔργων νόμον θεοῦ*, which seems connected with Matt. 11: 29; and Reub. 2, which reflects Matt. 15: 14, (note that here D. 1 read *βόθρον*.) When we add the slighter references—those to facts, such as Levi 18 to Matt. 2: 2 (*ἄστρον*), Levi 18, Jud. 24 to Matt. 3: 16, 17 (*ἀνοίγω*), Levi 4, 14 to Matt. 26: 50, Z. 6 to Matt. 27: 4 (*τιμὴ αἵματος*), Levi 16 to Matt. 27: 25, Levi 10, B. 9 to Matt. 27: 51, and Levi 16 to Matt. 27: 63,—as well as those found in slighter word collocations such as Is. 3 (walking *ἐν ἀπλότητι ὀφθαλμῶν*) to Matt. 6: 22; Z. 10 (and the Lord shall bring upon the impious *πῦρ αἰώνιον* and destroy them forever) to Matt. 25: 41; Reub. 5 (*εἰς κόλασιν τοῦ αἰῶνος*) to Matt. 25: 46, and Levi 16 (*αἶμα ἀθῶον*) to Matt. 27: 4, etc., we think no room is left for a single doubt but that the author of the Testaments had our Gospel of Matthew before him.

On the other hand, there is no evidence of this kind that our author had our Gospel of Mark.

He certainly had, however, our Luke. In Judah (c. 25) we read *καὶ οἱ ἐν πτωχείᾳ διὰ κύριον [τελευτήσαντες] πλουτισθήσονται, καὶ οἱ ἐν πείνᾳ χορτασθήσονται . . . καὶ οἱ διὰ κύριον ἀποθανόντες ἔξυπνισθήσονται ἐν ζωῇ*, which certainly seems a reminiscence of Luke vi: 20 sq. (cf. Matt. v. 6). In the phrase: *καὶ συνετήρουν τοὺς λόγους τουτοὺς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου* we meet with the rare word *συντηρέω* which is used in the New Testament (and that in the same phrase) only in Luke ii. 19. The following parallels are also noteworthy:

L. 2. καὶ περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κηρύξεις.		Lk. 24: 21. ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ.
---	--	--

L. 18.  
καὶ δώσει [sc. the Messiah] ἔξουσίαν τοῖς  
τέκνοις αὐτοῦ [τοῦ] πατεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρὰ πνεύματα

Lk. 10 : 18 and 19 (cf. 17).  
ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν τὴν ἔξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν  
. . . ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, etc.

Gad. 6.  
Love one another from the heart.  
καὶ ἐὰν ἁμάρτη εἰς σὲ εἰπὲ αὐτῶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ . .  
. . . καὶ ἐὰν ὁμολογήσας μετανοήσῃ ἄφες αὐτῶ.

Lk. 17 : 3.  
ἐὰν ἁμάρτη ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῶ,  
καὶ ἐὰν μετανοήσῃ, ἄφες αὐτῶ.

To these we must add the frequently repeated (S. 7, D. 5, B. 9, etc.) τὸ σωτήριον used as a personal designation of the Messiah; an usage which, in the New Testament, is peculiar to Luke (ii. 19). We must also add the slighter references, such as Z. 7 and 8 (σπλάγχνα ἐλέους), to Luke i. 78 (here only in New Testament); Jud. 9 (τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην) to Luke xiv. 32 (peculiar to Luke in the New Testament and to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in this age). We should also remark that Lardner is probably right in assuming that Jos. 17 has its root in the scene and discourse recorded in Luke xxii. 24 sq.

From what has been said already, it will have been gathered that the author of the Testaments probably knew John's Gospel: corroborative evidence is by no means wanting. Thus, in Benj. 3, we read: "The prophecy of heaven shall be fulfilled *περὶ τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος τοῦ κόσμου,*" which is an evident echo of John i. 19, as is plain from the fact that a prophecy is professedly quoted, and a prophecy which could have been gotten from no other quarter than John i. 19. Compare also, here, Jos. 19. Again in Jud. 24, we read: "He is the offspring of the Most High God, *καὶ αὕτη ἡ πηγὴ εἰς ζωὴν πάσης σαρκός,*" which takes our mind back immediately to John iv. 4 (cf. also chs. vi. and vii., and Rev. xxi. 6). Still again in Benj. 9, we read, with plain reference to John 3 : 14, "*καὶ ἐπὶ ξύλον ὑψωθήσεται* [sc. *κύριος*]." And there may be, also, a reference to John in [Jud. 20].

Of our four Gospels, then, it seems evident that the author of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs had three; Matthew, Luke, and John.

He also knew the Acts of the Apostles. In the ninth chapter of Benj. we read: "*καὶ καταβήσεται* [Ox. μεταβ.] *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη, ὡς πῦρ ἐκχυνόμενον, καὶ ἀνελθῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἄδου* [Ox. χάου.] *ἔσται ἀναβαίνων* [Ox. μεταβ.] *ἀπὸ γῆς εἰς οὐρανόν.* Ἐγνώ [Ox. ὦν] *δὲ οἷός ἐσται ταπεινὸς ἐπὶ γῆς, καὶ οἷός*



ἔνδοξος ἐν οὐρανῶ.” The first sentence here seems certainly to refer to the fact recorded, Acts 2: 1 sq., while in the subsequent one, there seems a reference to Peter’s speech, Acts ii. 31 sq. Their collocation here is significant; as, also, the conjoined references to Christ’s burial, resurrection, and ascension, in connection with the pouring out of the Spirit on the Gentiles. In Benj. 11 we have a reference to the Acts which is beyond all doubt: there the writer speaks of the “works” of Paul as to be written “in the Holy Books,” by which confessedly he can mean nothing else than our book of Acts; an understanding more than justified by the fact that he has evidently Acts 9: 15 in mind in that passage.

When we turn to Paul’s epistles, we are confronted, first of all, with this same statement, for not only Paul’s “works,” but also his “words,” are said to be written “in the Holy Books.” This reference is confessedly plain, as we shall see later. Taking the epistles one by one, we note, first, that Romans was certainly known to our author. In Benj. 3 we read of ἀμνοῦ, . . . ὅτι ἄμωμος ὑπὲρ ἀνόμων παραδοθήσεται καὶ ἀναμάρτητος ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀποθανεῖται, κ. τ. λ. which seems certainly to be based on Ro. 5:6 and 7 (cf. 1 Pet. 1: 19). This combination of passages is a familiar occurrence in all early (and late) quotations. In Benj. 4 we read: “The good man has not a dark eye: for he has pity on all, even though they be sinners, even though they wish evil concerning him: οὕτως ὁ ἀγαθοποιῶν νικᾷ τὸ κακόν,” with which we may compare Ro. xii. 21: “Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink. . . . Be not overcome with evil ἀλλὰ νικά ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν.” The similarity of the context here increases the weight of the verbal resemblance. Again, the use of συντριβῶν in the passage from As. 7, given on a preceding page, echoes not doubtfully the passage from Romans there cited. We need not dwell on the list of slighter coincidences, such as L. 18 (πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης) and Ro. 1: 4 (here only in N. T.) As. 4 and Ro. 2: 13 (cf. 2 Thess. 1: 6), L. 4 (unbelieving men, ἐπιμενοῦσιν ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις) and Ro. 6: 1, Benj. 3 and Ro. 8: 28., Naph. 2 (God compared in making man to a potter) and Ro. 9: 21 (but cf. Is. 45: 9), As. 4 (Ζῆλος Θεοῦ) and Ro. 10: 2 (cf. 2 Cor. 11: 2), Dan. 6 (πατήρ ἐθνῶν) which Lardner compares with Ro. 3: 29, and Levi 3 which Canon Westcott com-

pares with Ro. 12:1. It is enough that the evidence is abundant that Romans was used by the author of this book.

We cannot speak so confidently of 1 Cor. Canon Westcott relies on the phrase *φεύγετε πορνείαν* in R. 5 and 1 Cor. 6:18. We may also compare Jud. 21: "The Lord chose Levi *ἔσθιεν τράπεζαν αὐτοῦ* and 1 Cor. x. 21; B. 3 and 1 Cor. xv. 24, use *καταργέω* alike; and Benj. 11 would be esteemed a certain quotation of 1 Cor. 16:17, were not the same phrase common elsewhere in the New Testament, e. g. 2 Cor. ix. 12, xi. 9; Phil ii. 30; Col. i. 24.

2d Cor. was, however, certainly known to our author. We may compare, for instance, a passage in Dan 5: "*Ἦ γὰρ κατὰ θεὸν ἀληθείης μετάνοια ἀναίρει τὴν ἀπίθειαν. . . . καὶ ὀδύρει τὸ διαβούλιον πρὸς σωτηρίαν*, etc., with 2 Cor. vii. 10; a striking parallel in itself, but immensely strengthened by the similarity of the subsequent contexts. The peculiar phrase "to know sin" (*καὶ οὐκ ἔγνων ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἁμαρτίαν*) of Is. 7, also strongly suggests the similar phrase of 2 Cor. 5:21.

We may make the same claim also for Ephesians. Thus (Dan. 5) we read: "Depart (*ἀπόστητε*), however, from anger and hate lying, that the Lord may dwell in you and Beliar flee from you, *ἀλήθειαν φθέγγεσθε* [Ox. *λαλῆτε*] *ἵκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ.*" (cf. R. 6, and B. 10: "Do truth, each one *μετὰ τ. π.*") This is almost certainly founded on Eph. iv. 25. Again, in Naph. 3 "*Μὴ οὖν σπουδάσετε . . . ἐν λόγοις κενοῦς ἀπατῶν τᾶς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν*, because, being silent, you will be able in purity of heart to hold fast the will of God and to cast off the will of the devil;" the similarity of both phraseology and context evinces a dependence on Eph. v. 6. Again, unless Naph. 4 is taken from the lxx (Is. 57:19), it certainly rests on Eph. ii. 17. We may compare, further, Benj. 3 (*τοῦ ἀερίου πνεύματος τοῦ βελίαρ*) with the unique New Testament passage Eph. ii. 2; and also, perhaps, Jud. 14 with Eph. v. 18.

With Philippians we adduce the following parallels. Levi 4: "Until the Lord visit all the Gentiles *ἐν σπλάγχθοις υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*" with Phil. i. 8; Benj. 10: "Worshipping the king of the heavens appearing on earth *μόρφῃ ἀνθρώπου* [*ταπεινώσεως*]" in connection with Zach. 9: [*καὶ ὄβησθε θεὸν ἐν σχήματι ἀνθρώπου*] with Phil. ii. 6-8 (cf. also S. 6, N. 8, A. 7, etc.); and Levi 14: "And ye are *οἱ φωστῆρες* of heaven" with Phil. ii. 15, where

only (except Rev. 21 : 11) this rare word occurs in the New Testament. These will suffice to prove that the author had Philippians.

For Colossians we adduce the following: In Levi 3 we find: “*Ἐν δὲ τῷ [Heaven] μετ’ αὐτὸν εἰσὶ ζῶντες καὶ ἐξουσίαι*” which can be compared only with Col. i. 16. The use of *ἀπλότης* in R. 4, S. 4, L. 13, I. 3, etc., may possibly be compared also with Col. iii. 22, and certainly reflects a Pauline usage.

The following parallel alone is enough to prove the use of 1 Thessalonians:

L. 6.

Ἐφθασε δὲ ἡ ὀργὴ κυρίου ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς εἰς τέλος.  
[Order in OX: E. δὲ αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀρ, etc.]

1 Thess. ii : 16.

Ἐφθασεν δὲ ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ [τῶν θεῶν]  
εἰς τέλος.

Compare also D. 6.

We find no trace of 2 Thessalonians, but pretty sure ones of 1 Tim. Not only do we read of *βασιλεὺς αἰώνων* in R. 6, which strongly suggests 1 Tim. i. 17, but in Dan. 6 we read: “Draw near to God, and the angel that intercedeth for you ὅτι οὗτος ἐστὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων for the peace of Israel”—a passage which irresistibly impresses one as having been drawn from 1 Tim. ii. 5.\*

To 2 Tim. we have only one possible reference, Levi 8, where the phrase *ὁ στέφανος τῆς δικαιοσύνης* is found; a phrase peculiar in the New Testament to 2 Tim. 4 : 8. To Titus and Philemon there are probably no references; cf., however, Jud. 24 and Titus 3 : 6, the striking phrase in which is found also, however, both in Acts and LXX.

For Hebrews, on the other hand, we have ample testimony. Not only is *ἀρχιερεὺς*, which, in the New Testament as a designation of the Messiah, is peculiar to Hebrews, one of the most common of all his titles in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, but we meet also with some quotations from Hebrews. Thus, in Gad 8 we read that the Lord is to spring from Judah and Levi, expressed in this peculiar language: “*ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ κύριος*”—which is duplicated in Heb. vii. 14. Compare Matt.

\* Hilgenfeld (*Einleitung*, p. 764) expressly admits this quotation: “Traces of the Pastoral Epistles are found . . . in the . . . Testaments of the XII Patriarchs Dan. 6,—cf. 1. Tim. ii. 5.”

4 : 16 from Is. 9 : 1, but note that the LXX reads *λάμψει*. Again, in Benj. 3 we read: "The prophecy shall be fulfilled concerning the Lamb of God, . . . because . . . he shall die *ἐν αἵματι διαθήμης*," etc., which peculiar phrase again is found in the New Testament only in Heb. 13 : 20. Another point of contact is found in the use of the phrase, *ἐπὶ συντελείῃ τῶν αἰωνίων* in Levi 10, and of a similar phrase in Heb. ix. 26. Canon Westcott compares also Levi 18 and Heb. vii. 22, but we cannot feel that the reference is indubitable.

In the opinion of Canon Westcott there has been no reference established to the Epistle of James. The judgment of such a scholar carries great weight, but the following parallels seem at least to render the use of that epistle by our author very probable :

B. 6.

Ἡ ἀγαθὴ διάνοια οὐκ ἔχει δύο γλώσσας, ἐν-  
λογίας καὶ κατάρας.

Jas. 3 : 9 and 10.

ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ στόματος ἐξέρχεται εὐλογία καὶ  
κατάρα. Οὐ χρὴ . . . ταῦτα οὕτως γίνεσθαι.

and Is. 7, *τὸν κύριον ἠγάπησα [ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ μου] . . . ταῦτα καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιήσατε, τέκνα μου, καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα τοῦ βείλαρ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν*, as compared with Jas. iv. 7. We also meet in Dan. 6, with the phrase, *Ἐγγίξετε δὲ τῷ θεῷ*, which parallels with the immediately following verse (Jas. iv., 8).

Perhaps somewhat less evidence exists for a dependence on 1 Peter. We compare especially 1 Peter i. 19 with Jos. 19 (*ἀμνὸς ἄμωμος*) and Benj. 3, as already quoted at Romans v. 6, 7. Naph. 4: "κατὰ τό πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος" is *verbatim* the same as in 1 Pet. i. 3. Benj. 8 seems also to depend on 1 Pet. iv. 14, but this presumption is much weakened by the fact that the most characteristic part of the phrase is also found in Numbers xi. 25 and 2 Kings 2 : 15.

We have shown already that there is some evidence that our author had 2 Peter before him, and we are to adduce now at least one very probable allusion to that book. In Benj. 8 we read: *καὶ ὁ καθαρὸς νοῦς ἐν τοῖς μiasμοῖς* [Ox. *μιάσμασι*] *τῆς γῆς συνεχόμενος κ. τ. λ.*, and, when we consider that not only is this phrase found in 2 Peter ii. 20, but that *μιάσμα* is found there only in the whole New Testament, it is hard to believe that the two passages are wholly independent of one another. In Reub. 5 *τήρειν* is used as in 2 Pet. 4 : 9 for "to keep for judgment," and we may compare also Reub. 3, *τοῦ πλάττειν*

λόγους with 2 Pet. 2, 3, πλαστοῦς λόγους. Even though, taken alone, these allusions may not seem very conclusive, yet, when taken in connection with the evidence already adduced, the use of 2 Peter by the author of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs is raised to a somewhat high degree of probability.

The following parallels with 1 John are worth noticing. In Jud. 20, we read: [Ἐπίγνωτε ὄνν, τέκνα μου, ὅτι δύο πνεύματα σχολάζουσι τῶ ἀνδρώπῳ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ τῆς πλάνης].\* Although this whole section (Jud. 20) is wanting in the Oxford manuscript, yet the proneness of that manuscript to omission leads us to judge the passage genuine. It is to be noted also that this style of phraseology is very common in the Testaments, and even if this passage were not genuine we should lose only the *collocation* here; cf. Is. 4, D. 5, etc. If genuine, it is an unmistakable echo of 1 John iv. 6. The whole pneumatology of the book, indeed, obscure as it is, is evidently borrowed from John and finds its roots in such passages as 1 John iv. 6. We may further compare R. 6 (ποιῆσειν ἀλήθειαν) and 1 John i. 6 (here and John 3: 21 only); Gad 2 (ὁμολογεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν) and 1 John 1: 9 (here only); Gad 3 (πικεῖν δικαιοσύνην) and 1 John 2: 29 (peculiar to 1 John); and Is. 7 (sin unto death) and 1 John v. 16 (this last reference is, however, more doubtful, although Canon Westcott relies upon it; cf. Ro. 6: 16, where as well as in the Testaments *εἰς* is used, while John uses *πρός*.)

We have met with no references to 2 and 3 John and Jude.

The following, however, certainly point to Revelation. In L. 18 there stands written: καί γε αὐτὸς (sc. the Messiah) ἀνοίξει τὰς θύρας τοῦ παραδείσου . . . καὶ δώσει τοῖς ἁγίοις φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ἔθλου τῆς ζωῆς, etc., which will inevitably point us to Rev. 2: 7, taken in connection with Rev. 22: 2, 14. Another passage in the same chapter (L. 18) seems also based on Revelation: the καὶ ὁ βελίαρ δεδήσεται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ recalling strongly the καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτόν of Rev. 20: 2, especially when it is further noted that all three of the names of Satan found in this passage of Revelation are found also in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs: Satan, Dan 3; Devil, N. 3; A. 3, Dragon, As. 7, and that, al-

---

\* As the brackets are meant to show, this passage is not found in the Oxford MS., but as *omissions* are characteristic of that MS., its omissions are not of much authority.

though this last is peculiar in the New Testament to Revelation. Another designatory title peculiar in the New Testament to Revelation is repeated in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, that peculiar designation of Christ in Rev. v. 5, as the Lion of the Tribe of Judah; compare Jos. 9. We may further compare the account given in Levi 5, of the opening of the *πύλας* of heaven and the sight of the Most High on His throne of glory, and of the holy *ναός* with Rev. iv. 1, and xi. 19. And once more we have the high authority of Canon Westcott for looking for the original of Dan. 5 ("The New Jerusalem") in Rev. 21:2, even though different adjectives are used (*νείας*, Testaments; *καινίη*, Rev.)

We conclude that the evidence is ample and most conclusive from this source, that our author knew the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John, the Acts of the Apostles, Ro., 2 Cor., Eph., Phil., Col., 1 Thess., 1 Tim., Heb., 1 Jno., and Rev., while an exceedingly high degree of probability exists that he knew also 1 Pet. and Jas. and some probability that he knew 2 Pet. and 1 Cor. A possible reference exists to 2 Tim., but no recognizable ones to Mark, Gal., 2 Thess., Titus, Philemon, 2 and 3 John, and Jude.

Taking all the evidence presented under the four foregoing heads together, this list must be somewhat altered. The complete evidence warrants us in saying that the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs evinces almost indubitable dependence on, and hence the prior existence of the following New Testament books: Matt., Luke, Jno., Acts, Ro., 1 Cor., Eph., Phil., Col., 1 Thess., 1 Tim., Heb., Jas., 1 Pet., 1 Jno., and Rev. Little room for doubt is left in regard to 1 Cor. and perhaps even 2 Peter. The most of the other books are witnessed to as existing, by contemporary authors: Mark, by Clement of Rome; Galatians by Polycarp and the author of the Epistle to Diognetus; 2 Thess. and 2 Tim. by Polycarp; Titus by the epistle to Diognetus, and possibly also by Clement. These, then, the author of the Testaments might have had. Who will say, not also the four remaining *mites*, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Philemon? But here, Tuebingen-like, we are building on "may-be's;" we are content to take the facts and let the "may-be's" go. The facts are, that our author witnesses to the existence before the time of his writing, that is

before the period 100-120 A.D., of by far the larger part of our New Testament.

V. We are told, however, that at this early day the New Testament books—such of them as existed at all—existed separately, and were not yet gathered into a collection or “canon.” And we are told, moreover, that they were received by their readers merely as ordinary books, and had no sort of unusual authority attributed to them. Perhaps our author has some witness to bear on this point also. If we were guessing, however, we would not make this guess. These New Testament books bear a somewhat common stamp—uncommon in that age; they would tend to “collect,” if for no other reason than just because everywhere “birds of a feather flock together.” Certainly, even though they had come to him one by one, they would not leave our author uncollected. Again, the very fact that so many allusions to them are discoverable in his writings shows that they had a peculiar power over him; he certainly valued their way of expressing thought very highly. It would even seem that they had an unique authority over him; in making his prophecies, he prophesies only what they tell him has occurred; in teaching his ethics, he cannot free himself from their phraseology; when he assigns one of their sayings, which he cannot persuade himself to forego using, even at the risk of undoing all his toil, to a fictitious source, he invents a source such as he knows will command the respect and reverence of his readers. Strange, this invincible proneness to use, this constant reverence for, books which he deems to have no authority for him. So that, we repeat, if we were guessing we would not make quite the guess that would seem to be expected of us. But we are not left to guessing. At the end of his book, this early author has left us one sentence to show us in what form he had these books, and how he esteemed them. It was difficult to work into a writing, professing to have been written so many years before, a direct statement of this kind; yet our author did work it in. And this is the way in which he did it. It is Benjamin who is speaking to his children, and revealing to them what shall be when the Lord shall reveal His salvation to all the Gentiles: “And no longer shall I be called a ravening wolf,” he says, “on account of your

plunder, but the Lord's worker, distributing food to those who work the good. And there shall arise from my seed in the latter times one called of the Lord, hearing [in the earth] His voice, [Ox. adds, 'and doing the good pleasure of His will'] enlightening with new knowledge all the Gentiles, affording the light of knowledge to Israel in salvation,\* and snatching it like a wolf from them and giving it in the synagogue of the Gentiles. [And] until the consummation of the ages [Ox., 'of the age'] He shall be in the synagogues of the Gentiles, and among their rulers as a strain of music in the mouth of all. And in the Holy Books shall He be written, both His work and word; and He shall be the chosen of God forever." The important words here are: *καὶ ἐν βίβλοις ἀγίας ἔσται ἀναγραφόμενος, καὶ τὸ ἔργον καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.*

There is no possibility of denying that the great Benjamite here described is Paul; hence no one has ever denied it.\* It is Paul's work and word, then, that shall be written *ἐν βίβλοις ἀγίας*. We have already seen that this writer possessed the Acts and most of Paul's Epistles. Can it be doubted that he means these by the writing of Paul's work and word? Now what does he mean by their being written "in the Holy Books?" There is small room for difference of opinion as to what a Jewish Christian writing for the benefit of Jews, and putting his words in the mouth of a Jewish father, could mean by *βίβλοι ἀγίας*. Note that, although anarthrous, the expression is definite; it has the value of a proper name in the eyes of this writer—an old, familiar phrase representing an object of which there was but one of the kind. The Jews had a "collection" of books with which every Jew was familiar from boyhood; and this was the well-known name of it. Into this collection the Acts and Pauline Epistles are admitted. The testimony amounts to no less, then, than that at the opening of the second century the Acts and Epistles of Paul were, in Christian estimation, a part of a holy collection of which the Old Testament also was a part;—that the same divine character and authority were attributed to them as to the Old

\* Ox. reads, "Shining with the light of knowledge in salvation to Israel."

\* Hilgenfeld, for instance (*Einleitung*, p. 71; *Der Kanon*, p. 30), expressly admits both the fact and the inference irresistibly flowing from it. "This book," he says, "reckons already the Pauline Epistles, together with the Acts, as part of the Holy Scriptures."



Testament;—in a word, that an old and a new collection stood together as part of one book, equally divine and equally authoritative throughout. The testimony of our author here, then, is: 1. That he possessed not scattered New Testament books, but a collected body of New Testament books; and 2. That they were esteemed by him as equally authoritative with the Old Testament—were, indeed, but part with it of one collection of *βιβλοι ἀγίαι*. He testifies, then, that there was a New Testament “canon” at the opening of the second century. Exactly what and how many books were contained in that “canon” perhaps we cannot venture to confidently declare. Certainly it would be preposterous to claim that only the Acts and Pauline Epistles were contained in it. In all probability all of the New Testament books which the author knew found a place in it. And as it is ridiculous to say, he probably knew no more books than in such a work he has betrayed knowledge of, it would seem safe to contend that this collection in all probability contained all those New Testament books, evidence for whose existence we can find in his contemporaries. Who will venture to declare that 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Philemon—briefest of brief writings—could not also have already gained a footing in it? The facts warrant us in stating that the major part of the New Testament was in it; the probability is certainly not against the further statement that the whole New Testament was in it.

Swayed by the peculiar character of much modern writing on the history of the New Testament canon, many readers may find this result somewhat startling: that the New Testament canon had been already practically formed at the outset of the second century. It should not, however, be startling to any one. On *a priori* grounds we should expect it; inspired or not, these books came upon the world possessing a common peculiar character—they would naturally gravitate together as such. Historically, aside from the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, it is evinced. There is not a writer of this subapostolic age who does not treat the New Testament with marked reverence; there is not one of them who can be even plausibly claimed to make any distinction between it and the Old Testament. On the other hand, they do make a distinction between the New Testament writers and them-

selves. They were writing as simple Christian men; the others with authority. Bishop Ignatius, filled with Episcopal pride, can yet see that his Episcopal\* authority is infinitely lower than that with which the apostles spoke. "Not as Peter and Paul do I command you," he writes to the Romans, "they were apostles, I one condemned." "I do not write these things," says Polycarp to the Philippians, "because I take anything on myself, but because ye have invited me to do so. For neither I nor any one like me can attain to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul." So Clement wishes only to remind the Corinthians, not enjoin, as did "the blessed apostle Paul." And Barnabas reiterates that he speaks "not as a teacher, but as one of themselves." In direct accordance with this reverence the New Testament books are recognized as Scripture: Barnabas quotes Matthew with the significant formula *ὡς γέγραπται*, and Hilgenfeld admits that this implies that the author of this epistle esteemed Matthew part of Holy Scripture.† Polycarp, in like manner, calls the Epistle to the Ephesians "Scripture." It is valid to cite 1 Tim. v. 5 here also; quoted by Polycarp, Clement, and Barnabas, as well as by the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, it is certainly an older witness than this age, and yet it quotes Luke as Scripture. If the traces of the prior existence of 2 Peter in the Testaments be deemed valid, the well-known passage concerning Paul's Epistles in it may also be quoted here corroboratively. We certainly ought not to be startled at finding the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs witnessing to our New Testament books as Scripture; and if Scripture, why not (as the Testaments witness) added to the Old Scriptures?

Nor are we left without direct testimony to their collection. Not only are the Synoptic Gospels quoted by Clement and Polycarp in such a manner as to prove that they had long been together, and had affected the text one of another in parallel

---

\* Of course these epithets are to be understood of a *pastoral*, not *diocesan* episcopacy. The passage quoted is found in the Curetonian version as well as in the Vossian Epistles; but after the investigations of Petermann and Zahn, few will care to deny the genuineness of the seven short Greek Epistles. Harnack's brilliant essay ("Die Zeit des Ignatius") has not unsettled the received date.

† *Einleitung*, p. 38 and p. 70. He himself dates Barnabas as early as 97.

passages, but we have direct testimony from Ignatius to the fact that a Christian canon already existed for him—testimony, again, convincing even to critics like Hilgenfeld, who writes: “Here we find already the two component parts of the New Testament represented as the *εὐαγγέλιον* and the *ἀπόστολοι*.”\* To feel the force of this, we must remember that even as “the Law and the Prophets” was at that time the current designation of what we call the Old Testament, so “the Gospel and the Apostles” was of what we call the New Testament. This usage lasted long in the Church; the only designation of the New Testament used by Clement of Alexandria, is τὸ τε εὐαγγέλιον ὃ τε ἀπόστολος (Strom. vii. 3, 14, varied in the last clause to ὁ’ ἀπόστολοι as in Strom. vi. 11). And even Tertullian, in the midst of a strife to substitute “Novum Instrumentum” for “Novum Testamentum” still knows this synonym: “If I shall not clear up this point,” he writes, “by investigations of the Old Scripture, I will take the proof of our interpretation from the New Testament . . . for, lo! both in the Gospels and in the Apostles, I notice, etc.” Marcion witnesses to the same title, though in the variation which substitutes “Apostolicon” for the last member. It is just so that Ignatius uses the phrase. He asks for the prayers of the Philadelphians that he may be made perfect and attain to that portion which has been allotted to him, “fleeing to the *Gospel* as to the flesh of Christ, and to the *Apostles* as to the presbytery of the Church,”—“but let us also love the *Prophets*,” he adds, “because they have preached in reference to the Gospel, and placed their hope in Him . . . in whom believing they were saved.” The juxtaposition here of the Gospel, Apostles, and Prophets is very noteworthy. In the same way the *Gospel* and *Prophets* are conjoined, Smyr. vii. And again in Phil. viii. Ignatius plainly contrasts the Old with the New Testament: “When I heard some saying,” he writes, “‘If I find it not in the *ancient*\* writings, I will not believe the Gospel’—on my saying to them, ‘It is written!’ they answered me, ‘That remains to be proved.’ But to me Christ

\* *Einleitung*, p. 72. He erroneously assigns, however, to Magnesians the passage found in Philadelphians, 5.

\* We read here ἀρχαίους with Cod. Med., Usher’s Latin vs. and the Armenian. The corrupt longer recension reads ἀρχαίους.

Jesus *is* the ancient writings." Here there is evidently a dispute with adherents of the Old Testament; Ignatius appeals to the New Testament as Scripture, but his opponents refuse to recognize the appeal. The three passages together prove, beyond question, that Ignatius knew of a collection of books consisting of "The Gospel and the Apostles," and distinguished from the Old Testament books not as less sacred, but in that they were new while the others were old.

The testimony of Ignatius and that of the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, illustrate, explain, and confirm each other; and, taken together, the inference seems irresistible that already at the opening of the second century, the mass, at least, of the New Testament books were in the hands of the Church in the form of a supplementary collection of authoritative books attached to the Old Testament, and with it constituting *βιβλοι ἁγίαι*; but distinguished from it as being made up of the New, while it was constituted of the Old books (*τὰ ἀρχαία [βιβλία]*). In other words, the "canon" of the New Testament was formed already at the close of the first century.\*

Large corroborative evidence might be brought forward—such as would put this conclusion beyond the shadow of a doubt. Dr. Lumby, for instance, has unearthed a passage from the Talmud, dating from a generation which had seen the destruction of the temple, wherein the "book" is so spoken of by the Christian speaker as to evince the fact that it contained both Old and New Testaments (*i. e.*, the books of Numbers and Matthew), and was considered equally authoritative in all its parts.† We might appeal again to the fact that one who, there is good ground to believe, was a pupil of apostles—Papias, could write an "exegesis" *λογίων κυριακῶν*. And what that means, Dr. Lightfoot has forever put in a clear light (*Contemporary Review*, 1875). And with it again we might appeal to that other fact, that on the verge of, or within, this same period of the first two decades of the second century, Basilides wrote twenty-four books on "the Gospel," which Clement of Alexandria calls *τὰ ἐξεγέτικα*. When commentaries begin, the books are not lightly esteemed. Still

\* Of course this statement is meant to be taken in accordance with the limitations as to the contents of the "canon," made under V. above.

† The passage is to be found, Talm. Babl. *Shabbath* 116a 116b. See "*Expositor*," April, 1879, p. 318.

further, we might appeal to Eusebius' statement, that the missionaries of Trajan's reign not only preached zealously to, but handed down to their hearers τὴν τῶν δευτέρων εὐαγγελίων γράφην; and to Justin's natural collocation of "the memoirs of the Apostles and the books of the Prophets" as the staple of Christian public reading, which evidently, for aught he knew (in A.D. 145), had been together read in the churches from the beginning; and to Marcion's retention, at a period earlier than Justin, of a "canon" for his own use, which absolutely proves that the Church had one previous to his, and containing more than his. Or laying aside the mass of similar notices which confront us, we might find a convincing argument upon the position which the New Testament held in the last quarter of the second century which would prove its existence as Scripture at the very opening of the first quarter.

But we may safely leave the facts, as already brought out, to fight their own battle. They alone make it abundantly plain, that they have too lightly esteemed the Apostolical Church, who have imagined that the infinite beauty of the Christian Scriptures and their convincing internal evidence that God was speaking through their human words (to say now nothing of the external circumstances under which it received them), were lost upon it. The men who constituted even that Church were sinners needing salvation. They found it in a divinely-taught doctrine which they saw written, in a more than human way, in books claiming to speak with all the authority of inspiration. How could they, being like us, help esteeming them? How help framing them into a canon? Add—what is no more than the evidence warrants—that they received these books authoritatively out of the very bosom of the apostolic circle. Which is the more surprising?—that the New Testament canon was formed on the very first knowledge of its parts?—or that men nowadays are found to doubt that this was done?

BEN. B. WARFIELD.