

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

expounded it in words at the Last Supper, becomes to us the word of God that overcomes our feeling of guilt. The God who comes near to us in Christ reconciles us with Himself by that death' (p. 142).

For the man to whom all this has grown experimentally true, the confession of Christ's Deity is inevitable. 'The experience itself is such that when we confess His Deity we simply give Him His right name' (p. 143). We have found God in the Man Jesus. We have become able, as Luther expresses it, to count God and Christ all one. The Deity of Christ does not mean merely that a Divine substance underlies the human life of Jesus; it means that in Jesus the personal God is actually turning to the sinful and opening His heart to them.

He sums up his answer to those who claim that all genuine Christology must move on Chalcedonian lines in the following incisive paragraph. 'The question whether we are right in speaking of the Deity of Christ when we have found God turning towards us in the disclosure of Jesus' personal life, must be decided according as we conceive God to be in His nature a substance on the one hand, or on the other hand a Personal Spirit who asserts His nature by the energy of a will directing itself towards certain ends and preserving in itself a certain disposition. If we choose the former conception of God, then certainly the proposition that there is divine substance in Christ will be chosen as the proper expression of belief in His Deity; but if, on the contrary, the latter conception be followed, which is clearly the only one represented in the sacred Scriptures, and the only one permissible in the Christian community, then it is self-evident that the Deity of Christ can only be expressed by saying that the mind and will of the Everlasting God encounters us in the historically active will of this man' (pp. 177-8).

It is because of this life-and-death emphasis on Christ as Redeemer, who brings us to God, that Herrmann becomes the irreconcilable foe of essential

Mysticism. 'We differ,' he says, 'from the mystic solely in the way in which we become aware that God is touching us'; but the difference is not one that can be adjusted. The mystic, in his specifically mystical character, is cool towards everything that can be called historical revelation; God, for him, is the Eternal in remoteness from time. This is definitely non-Christian; for to the New Testament believer God is the Eternal who draws near to us in an historical Person. Jesus Christ is God present for us, surrounding us with grace and compassion—this, and this alone, is the authentically Christian position. The mystic, besides, has little understanding of that 'faith' which is a sinner's only religion. 'But the man who has found Jesus Christ, and God in Him, can dispense with mysticism, for in the narrow experiences into which mysticism withdraws, there is no room for the life of Christian faith' (p. 199).

The exhibition of Jesus as the Person through whom God becomes revealed to us as our own God is the strain in Herrmann's *Communion* which makes it a book that has influenced our epoch. Other elements in the volume do not so much concern us now. We are less interested than he in finding chapter and verse in Luther for each of the vital positions laid down. Nor need we at the moment be engrossed by his demonstration of the ethical impulses with which faith in God is charged. The real point is that in an unequalled measure Herrmann has been able to show how the person of Jesus wins complete dominion over us in an experience which transforms our lives and makes us to be of those who, in St. Peter's phrase, 'through Him believe in God.' Quite possibly those who long for light on this point—which will always be central—may be reading Herrmann a hundred years hence. Some men help their fellows in ways that can never be obsolete; and through this timeless strain in his *Communion with God* the Marburg thinker will speak for generations.

Tobit and the New Testament.

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., D.D., BIRMINGHAM.

THE title which we have given to the present essay will seem to the uninstructed reader, and perhaps also to the Biblical expert, to involve a conjunction of matters that are necessarily disconnected; we may be asked at the outset why we

have thrown them together. Tobit is, even when judged favourably, entitled only to a secondary position in the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, and on that account not likely to be a determining factor in the text or in the ideas of the New Testa-

ment ; it is, moreover, the best example that we have in Biblical literature of what passes under the denomination of the *Arabian Nights* ; in this respect it differs entirely from almost all other Apocryphal and fictitious literature, such, for example, as we find in the Book of Enoch. Its real companion, as internal study will show, is the book that is named after *Ahikar the Wise*, the supposed vizier of Sennacherib, king of Assyria. Thus there are *a priori* objections to the suggestion of any reaction from the Book of Tobit upon the text of the New Testament.

It may be admitted, however, that objections *a priori* are to be received with caution, especially when the illustrations which we have given of possible congeners of the Apocryphal work in question are themselves taken from works which are now known to have reacted upon the New Testament. The proof of this is, no doubt, modern, but it is fairly convincing ; in the case of Ahikar it is probable, in the case of Enoch it is final and convincing : yet it is only in recent times that criticism has taken any cognizance of literary parallels furnished either by the one or the other. Even at the present day, I do not know of any edited text except the new Nestle-Testament that has added to its margin references to Enoch in the same way as it annotates allusions to Daniel ; yet Enoch is as much in evidence as Daniel, and its influence is traceable from Matthew to the Apocalypse. It is even a factor in the correction of the final form of the edited text ; one wonders whether, if Hort were to come to life again and re-edit his New Testament, he would mend the defect caused by the omission of marginal references, and whether, in so rectifying a serious lack, he would insert Enoch among his authorities or parallels. If he inserted Enoch, we should at once challenge him to justify the exclusion of Tobit.

To make the matter clearer to those who are not familiar with the results of the studies in Apocryphal literature of the last fifty years, we will turn aside for a few moments to look a little closer at the problem of the Enoch influence in the New Testament. It will easily be verified that the study of such influence began with the parallels between Enoch and Daniel, and the doctrine which both those books present of the existence of a heavenly being whom they call the Son of Man. The student of Daniel was driven to a companion study of Enoch, and the student of Daniel and Enoch was driven to study the reaction of both those works upon the Synoptic Gospels and elsewhere in the New Testament. The evidence was as clear

as when the influence of an unknown or ill-known planet is detected in the better-known orbits of the greater planets of the Solar System. It was, however, an observation of my own that the demonstration of such influence could be employed, not merely to annotate the margins of the New Testament, but also for the rectification of its text. Two cases, in particular, come to light.

The first resulted from a comparison of the first chapter of the First Epistle of Peter with the language of Enoch, whoever he was, about his own work. He poses as a patriarch, one of the most patriarchal of patriarchs, and out of the 'dark backward and abysm of time' he explains that what he was writing was not for his own generation but for a future generation. One naturally thought of the language of Peter concerning those prophets of ancient days to whom it was revealed that not unto themselves but unto us they were ministers of certain truths about Messianic sufferings and subsequent Messianic glories. So much of parallelism in ideas could be made out even when Enoch was read through the refracting medium of an Ethiopic translation ; then came, unexpectedly, what we might call a fresh Apocalypse of Enoch in the form of a Greek translation discovered in a tomb at Akhmim in Upper Egypt. On reading this Greek text, side by side with the suggested parallel in the first chapter of Peter, it was clear that Enoch said that 'I *contemplated* these things' (*διενοούμην*), not that 'I *ministered* them' (*δικιόνουν*), and that the text of Peter had to be corrected into conformity with the Greek text of Enoch. The justice of the correction was clear from the fact that, when it was made, sequence was at once disclosed with the next paragraph in the Epistle, in which we are told to 'gird up the loins of our own *contemplation* to be wide awake, etc,' where the word *διανοία* is actually employed. The key being now in the lock, it was easy to prove that Enoch was in the mind of the writer elsewhere than in the opening chapter, and that further rectification of the Petrine text was possible. Into this inquiry we need not go further at present : the results were, in the main, accepted and acceptable. We refer to the matter in order to show that the recognition of the influence of an Apocryphal writer upon the text of the New Testament will react as a factor in the final determination of the text itself. This will also occur in cases where the text is, on other grounds, suspect, and may even bring to the front for definite approval a reading of the text which has been unnoticed or rejected on the ground of insufficient attestation. For example,

to refer briefly to a particular case, the reader of the third chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians will find an allegorical explanation of the glory which shone upon Moses' face, but which St. Paul transfers from the Mosaic experience to the Christian believer: 'we all have our faces unveiled and are transfigured.' If the reader turns from the Pauline Epistle to the thirty-eighth chapter of the Book of Enoch, he will find that here also there is something of a similar allegory and of a parallel glorification of the righteous in the last days. So far the matter might have been left doubtfully in the wide domain of possible coincidences; when, however, we look more closely at Enoch, we find him using for the Supreme Being the unusual title of 'the Lord of Spirits,' and when we look at the textual evidence for v.¹⁸ of 2 Corinthians in the chapter in question, we find that Marcion read the conclusion in the form 'from glory to glory as from the *Lord of Spirits*.' We must, therefore, edit this crucial passage of the interpreters in accordance with the terms of Marcion and of Enoch.¹

Returning now to the question of Tobit and of Tobit's influence, we find that there has been a parallel situation created to that of Enoch. If we turn to the latest work on Tobit in English, that of Simpson in Charles' great edition of the Apocryphal writers, we shall find a number of suggestions, chiefly in linguistic parallels between New Testament passages and the text of Tobit; and those suggestions were most strongly in evidence in the Pastoral Epistles. This was something like what we found in the case of Enoch and Peter. Is there any possibility of using the text of Tobit to correct the text of the Pastoral Epistles? At the close of the first Epistle to Timothy, the writer (whether it be Paul or whoever it may be) exhorts believers to certain virtues by means of which they may treasure up for themselves a good foundation (*θεμέλιον καλόν*) for the future, and lay hold on eternal life. Any one can see that there is something wrong about this 'foundation'; in any school of interpretation it would be a sandy foundation. It occurred to some one (I think it was my old friend Professor Nestle²) that one could alter

¹ The student will, perhaps, ask if there are any more traces of Enoch's *Lord of Spirits* in the New Testament. There is a possible instance in He 12^o, where the text may become more forcible by the correction of 'subject to the father of Spirits' to 'subject to the Lord of Spirits,' the contrast being now between 'fathers of our flesh' and 'Lord of our spirits.'

² This can hardly be right, or his son would have

θεμέλιον καλόν, 'a good foundation,' into *θέμιλιαν καλόν*, 'a very good prize,' the word being used of the reward given to a successful runner. Now this is a thoroughly Christian statement: the prize is the Life Eternal, which the believer is to run so as to obtain. It is the very word used by Ignatius in his letter to Polycarp (c. 2):

'Be sober, as an athlete of God: *the prize* (*θέμιλιαν*) is immortality.'

But what has this to do with Tobit?

Suppose now we turn to the text of Tobit, we shall find that amongst the good advice which the old gentleman gives to his son on his departure from home, there is an especial emphasis laid on the virtue of almsgiving, by means of which one stores up righteousness against the evil day, when one has to give an account of himself. The exact terms employed are as follows:

θέμιλιαν γὰρ ἀγαθὸν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἀνάγκης·

'thou treasurest up for thyself a good prize in the day of need' (To 4^o);

but this is almost exactly the language of the passage in 1 Ti, when we have made the slight emendation suggested above. In other words, the text of the Pastoral Epistles has been affected by the text of Tobit. The reader can now regard with confidence the observations of Simpson in this matter, and it is not necessary to repeat them in detail. I see that Simpson refers also to a paper which I published on the subject in the *American Journal of Theology* (1899), and says:

'St. Paul is possibly conscious of his indebtedness to Tobit, which must certainly have been a part of his library (*A.J.T.* p. 546). . . . R. Harris has already pointed out the use St. Paul made of Tobit iv. 10 in Gal. vi. 10. . . . Still more important are the alleged parallels between Tobit and the Pastoral Epistles.'

Not only does it appear that there is an acquaintance with Tobit in the Pastoral Epistles, but it may be affirmed that there is a similar acquaintance with Tobit's literary companion the *Story of Ahiqar*: for here, in the instructions which Ahiqar gives to his nephew Nadan, which are in literary parallelism with Tobit's instructions to his son Tobias (a pair of Poloniuses these!), we find in the Syriac version the words:

'My son, help thy friend when he is before the recorded it in the footnotes to the new edition, where he actually mentions another conjecture (*κεμήλιον*).

ruler, that thou mayest be able to help him from the lion ' :

this is clearly the original of St Paul's expression that :

' No man stood by me . . . but the Lord stood by me, and strengthened me, and I was delivered from the mouth of the lion ' (2 Ti 4¹⁷).

We are now going to move from the question of textual parallelism into the wider field of general literary dependence in Semitic documents. We have just given an instance of such literary connexion in the case of Tobit and *Ahikar*, where we find a long list of pious advices in the mouth of each of the principal characters. There is, however, another feature in Semitic story-telling which almost deserves a study of its own, on account of the way that it suggests association or relation between documents. We refer to the alternation between prose and verse, whenever the story seems to demand rhythm or exalted expression. We will illustrate it, first of all, from a comparatively modern document, known to every one as the *Story of Sindbad the Sailor*. In this tale the principal characters move from prose to verse with great facility, though it does not follow that the translators of the Arabic will suggest the transition to their readers. For instance, when the overloaded porter in the beginning of the story is touched with envy at the ease and splendour of the rich, he breaks into verse as follows (we mark the strophes, but do not indulge in a metrical translation) :

' How many poor people are without rest,
And rejoice in the luxury of shade ;
While I am in great fatigue ;
And my condition is marvellous,
And my burden has become heavy ;
While other people are happy without trouble,
This generation has not borne another burden like
my back ;
And he yonder is joyful in his life always,
In merry-making, in glory, in eating and drinking.'

Rather a doleful song ; the point to be noted is that it is a song, if in a minor key. Sindbad himself is in the habit of using rhythmic expression, sometimes just a verse or two of the Koran, sometimes an actual strain of verse, as in the following :

' I landed and ate of the fruits of the island,
and drank of its waters till I was refreshed, and
my life returned to me, and my strength and
spirit were restored, and I recited :

'' Oft when thy case shows knotty and tangled
skein,
Fate downs from Heaven and straightens
every ply :
In patience keep thy soul till clear thy lot,
For He who ties the knot can e'en untie ''
(tr. Burton, p. 71).

What the characters in the *Arabian Nights* do in the way of expression of emotion is common practice in Semitic compositions, for which the Biblical parallels will at once suggest themselves, from the Book of Genesis onward to the New Testament. Tobit is a case in point ; at the end of the book, which is also the joyful end of the troubles of every one involved in the narration, the aged man turns musical, and breaks into a Magnificat of his own, which is called the *Prayer of Tobit*, but would be better described as the *Thanksgiving* or the *Prophecy of Tobit*. It opens in the following strain :

' Blessed be God that liveth for ever, and His
Kingdom,
For He chastiseth and showeth mercy ;
He leadeth down to Hades below the earth,
And He bringeth up from the great destruction,
And there is nothing than can escape His hand.'

We have now shown two things clearly : first, that there are actual quotations from Tobit in the New Testament ; second, that the metrical parts of Tobit are framed on a general Semitic model, for which we gave a sufficient analogy in the story of *Sindbad the Sailor*. There is nothing to be surprised at in either of these conclusions ; in any case, Tobit belongs to the *Arabian Nights*, just as certainly as its companion volume the *Story of Ahikar* ; the fact that it hangs in the air, between the Old and New Testaments, like Muhammad's coffin between heaven and earth, would not justify us in attaching it to either the New Testament or the Old Testament. It would be the height of ineptitude to try to recononize it.

When we have settled the fact of the influence of Tobit upon the language of the New Testament, we come to a much more difficult question, its influence upon the history or the doctrine.

In order to make clear what we mean, let us consider a parallel question, viz. the converse inquiry as to the influence of the *Old Testament* upon Tobit. That there was such an influence appears from the study of two parallel situations : first, the appearance of the Angel of the Lord to Manoah in the Book of Judges, and his dramatic disappearance from the scene in the flame of a

sacrifice ; second, the similar disappearance of the archangel Raphael, when he throws off his disguise, ceases to be your cousin Azarias, and goes back abruptly to Paradise. The parallelism between the two events, so far as language is concerned, is in the following direction : the angel in Judges ' *goes up* in the flame of the altar,' in Tobit we can see that there was once a similar statement, if we make a minute and necessary correction to the text ; as it stands it reads that

' they rose up and saw him no more.'

Evidently it was the angel that rose up, and we should say :

' he rose up and they saw him no more.'

Now look at Jg 13²¹ :

' the angel did no more appear to Manoah and his wife. Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of the Lord.'

So in Tobit 12²² :

' then they confessed . . . that the angel of the Lord had appeared unto them.'

The parallel being now complete, we see that the terms employed are the proper words to describe the ascension of an angel, that is to say, his disappearance. This brings us back to the New Testament again, for we shall find the angel in Tobit intimating that he is about *to return to Him that sent him*, which we recognize to be Johannine language, the constant expression of Jesus Himself. The Son of Man is to ascend where he was aforetime. It was the Father that sent Him.

We see, then, that the first idea of what we call the Ascension is that of the return of a celestial messenger. It is Jesus as Angel rather than Jesus the Son that is being contemplated by the

New Testament writers in the first instance. On the human side the emphasis is laid on disappearance ; that seems to be the explanation of the shorter text-endings of Luke, where the modern critics edit :

' He was parted from them,'

and omit :

' He was carried up into heaven,'

though the one was implied in the other, if we study the parallels.

From the same quarter we get a ray of light on the closing words of Luke's Gospel.

The end of Tobit's Gospel, if we may so say, is that they were continually ' praising and blessing God.' It is well known that the dual expression of adoration with which Luke concludes was reduced by Hort to a single term, ' blessing God ' instead of ' blessing and praising God,' and that the verse so simplified was one of the corner-stones in his theory of conflated texts ; according to this view, two separate textual streams, one saying ' blessing ' and the other ' praising,' were united to a single resultant text, ' blessing and praising God ' : but this is curiously like what we find in Tobit. Here, too, we have the angel insisting on the note and necessity of praise. ' Praise God, praise him for ever . . . give God thanks,' is the language of his farewell. If we find a close coincidence between the text of Tobit and the longer text of the end of Luke, we shall have to inquire *de novo* whether the supposed conflation really exists ; and, if it does, what part Tobit has in its reconstruction. For the influence of Tobit upon New Testament language may now be considered as established. It may even have affected the manner of narration of the Ascension.

The Other Mary.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN R. MACKAY, D.D., EDINBURGH.

I WISH to restate an old argument, in the sense that one of the witnesses to whom Matthew appeals in support of the truth of the death and burial, of the empty grave and post-resurrection appearing of Jesus, is none other than his own mother. Dr. Dunlop Moore of Pittsburg, more than thirty years ago, gave the primary reasons for this per-

suasion in an excellent, although brief, paper contributed by him to *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*. But much water has passed under our bridge since then, and it now seems to me that there is a call for a restatement of the grounds upon which a conclusion, in the sense now stated, may reasonably be cherished.