

M. W. Jacobus

---

The Citation  
Ephesians 5<sub>14</sub>  
as Affecting the  
Paulinity of the Epistle

Sonderdruck

aus den

**Theologischen Studien,**

Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstage des Herrn  
Wirkl. Oberkonsistorialraths Weiss.

BS2695  
.A.J17



BS 2695  
.4.J17

LIBRARY OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
APR 10 1915

**The Citation Ephesians 5<sup>14</sup>  
as Affecting the Paulinity of the Epistle**

by M. W. Jacobus  
in Hartford, Conn., U. S. A.

There has always been a serious difficulty with this citation of our Epistle, not so much in understanding it, though it is not overclear in meaning, as in locating the original of which it is a reproduction.

The first supposition would naturally be that it came from the Old Testament, the only other definite citation used by the Author (4s) apparently having its origin there; but when one takes the citation and goes to the Old Testament to find its source, the quest becomes an almost hopeless one. So much indeed is this the case that most critics, while admitting a possible Old Testament ultimate basis for the words, hold their direct derivation to have been from some source outside the Canon, chiefly some early Christian hymn (e. g. Bleek, Braune, Klöpffer, von Soden), or some apocryphal production (e. g. Meyer, Schrader). No real argument has been attempted in proof of such a view, unless it is by Braune who believes it confirmed by the reference to "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" in v. 19, as well as by the significance of church hymns in themselves<sup>1</sup>) but even this is not what might be called a

---

1) Com. on Eph. (in Lange Com.) transl'd by Riddle — New York. 1870. p. 186.

Festschrift f. Bernh. Weiss.

vigorous reasoning. The general theory of an extra canonical source is in fact rather an instance in which, the more likely source of the Old Testament having apparently failed, there seemed to be no other possible source left save these which were adopted as a sort of last resort, the general admission being that, even with these sources, the question remains shrouded in darkness. It doubtless does, for, on the basis of such extra Biblical sources as above proposed, there can be practically no proof of the theory. The hymn or the apocrypha from which the citation is supposed to have been made is not known to exist; it is simply assumed to meet the emergency, so that the theory is a purely speculative one.

It is, of course, quite possible that such a theory should prove itself true. The mere fact that it is hypothetical does not necessarily make it false. In fact if an Old Testament source be absolutely barred out and this be a bona fide citation, as it seems quite evidently to be, then its source must have been an extra Biblical one and, among the many discoveries of the present day, some traces of it may be found. The citation would be so far itself proof that a source once existed and that one would be justified in searching for it.

There is however, and always must be, one stubborn difficulty in the way of holding this extra canonical view. Assuming the honesty of the Author in making his citation, it is impossible to understand the formula *διὸ λέγει* as indicating any other than an inspired source for the words which follow it<sup>1</sup>). This is the universal significance of *λέγει* with New Testament writers, not only when it is accompanied by subjects which leave no doubt as to the Biblical source intended<sup>2</sup>), but where it is without subjects at all<sup>3</sup>). Such use of *λέγει* would be

1) Toy, Quotations in the New Test. New York, 1884. p. 198. Clemen, D. Gebrauch d. A. T. in d. neutest. Schriften, Gütersloh, 1895, p. 220.

2) e. g. ὁ νόμος (Rom. 3 19 I Cor. 9 8); ἡ γραφή (Rom. 4 3. Gal. 4 30. Jac. 2 23); ἡ δικαιοσύνη (Rom. 10 6) ὁ Χρηματισμός (Rom. 11 4); τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (Heb. 3 7) Δαυεὶδ et al. (Rom. 4 6; 10 16. 19 ff).

3) Rom. 9 15. I Cor. 9 10. II Cor. 6 2. Heb. 1' ff., where it refers

perfectly natural with Hebrew writers; for, when the doer of an action is not named, the instinctive tendency of the Semitic mind is to attribute it to the great Doer from whom all action eventually flows. It is, consequently, quite interesting to note how frequently this personal use of λέγει occurs in such a Semitic book as Hebrews. We may admit the existence of such Hellenistic collections of Old Testament passages as Hatch suggests<sup>1</sup>), or of such Old Testament anthologies as Vollmer proposes<sup>2</sup>), and understand that New Testament writers as well as Church Fathers may have used them in citing and cited from them with such acknowledged Old Testament formulae as the one in question before us, and yet the exclusive Biblical significance of these formulae be fully maintained; for in these cases their use would be justified by the fact that, whatever was the form of the passages gathered into these manuals, they were in actual content Old Testament passages and only such. They were inspired Scripture, though they might be found collected outside the Canon and, if quoted, had a right to be quoted for what they were<sup>3</sup>).

back to ὁ θεός. Rom. 10<sup>s</sup>, where it refers back to ἡ δικαιοσύνη. Rom. 15<sup>10</sup>. Heb. 8<sup>13</sup> and Paul in Acts 13<sup>35</sup>, where the subject is understood from that inferred as speaking in the quotations preceding. Rom. 9<sup>26</sup>. Heb. 4<sup>7</sup>; 5<sup>6</sup>, where it is accompanied by local statements which make the references clear. Jac. 4<sup>6</sup>. Eph. 4<sup>8</sup>. Heb. 10<sup>5</sup>, 8, 30; 12<sup>26</sup>, where the O. T. sources are evident from the quotations themselves.

1) Essays in Biblical Greek. Oxford, 1889. pp. 203 f.

2) Die A. T. Citate bei Paulus. Freiburg i. B. 1895. pp. 43, 48.

3) This usage of λέγει removes all such theories as:

- a) That our citation is from some unrecorded word of Christ (Rhenferd) — in which case in fact Χριστός should have stood before λέγει.
- b) Or that it is from some "Geisteswort" given to the Church by its inspired prophets and based upon an O. T. Scripture (Steir).
- c) Or that Paul himself is here posing as a prophet and speaking from his own subjective consciousness (Bugenhagen, Calixtus).
- d) Or that λέγει is here used impersonally — "dicitur" (Bornemann) The impersonal use of λέγειν, common to all langu-

But, if this be the significance of our formula, it becomes critically necessary to exhaust every possibility of adjusting the citation to the Old Testament before we assume that, in spite of the formula, what is cited is after all of extra Biblical origin.

There seem to be three possibilities of such Old Testament adjustment:

1. There is the possibility of some definite Old Testament passage from which our Author may have taken the thought, if not the words of our quotation.

2. There is the possibility of some combination of Old Testament passages which our Author may have had in mind as he wrote, working their common sentiment into the thought of our quotation<sup>1</sup>).

3. There is the possibility of some extra Biblical collection of Old Testament passages, as Hatch and Vollmer suggest, in which there may have been made some combination of phrases as would make it possible for our Author to secure our quotation without much if any alteration.

Against the first possibility is the persistent fact that any Old Testament passage from which our quotation may have been made, even in thought if not in word, seems almost beyond finding. The passage most generally proposed, and for which there has been the most said, is Isa. 60:1 "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee." But when one comes to compare our citation ("Ἐγειρε, ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνόστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός), with either the Hebrew (אֲנִי קִיּוּם

---

ages, is confined to the passive form of the verb (λέγεται). Φημι is so used in the active, but almost wholly parenthetically.

1) In this general class would belong Johnson's view that the quotation is merely a statement of the substantial teaching of various O. T. Scriptures to the effect that Christ shall be the light of those who turn from their sin to seek him. The quotations of the N. T. from the Old, Considered in the Light of General Literature. Philadelphia, 1896, pp. 114f.

:חח: עֲלֶיךָ יְהוָה וּכְבוֹד אֲוִרָךְ (or with the LXX: (Φωτίζου φωτίζου, Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἥκει γάρ σου τὸ φῶς, καὶ ἡ δόξα Κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνετέταλκεν) it becomes clearly evident that, as far as similarity of words is concerned, there is hardly anything to sustain the proposition. There is scarcely any similarity between our citation and the LXX; while, in the case of the Hebrew text, the imperative *ἔγειρε* would of course correspond to *קומי* and the phrase *καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός* could perhaps be understood as an effort to reproduce *ורח עליר יהוה*, but there all similarity ends and the most ingenious device to account for the remaining words and phrases, *ὁ καθεύδων* and *ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, wholly fail. It is also apparent that, even in the matter of similarity of thought, the comparison does not carry itself through. If it could be supposed that the Author has taken the Old Testament passage and compressed its thought into the one idea "Arise" and then taken this idea and elaborated it into the directions of "awaking from sleep" and a "resurrection from the dead" and finally put all this exhortation into the form of a condition upon the fulfilling of which Christ's shining on them was to depend, we might possibly account for it; but to work this out would require a considerable amount of imagination on the part of the critic who suggests it and a much larger amount of arbitrary handling of his Old Testament passages on the part of the Author himself. It certainly does not satisfy us and we do not wonder that those which hold to it do so with little or no enthusiasm of conviction.

But if this is the most likely passage from which our quotation could have come and this is all that can be said in favor of it, it stands to reason that the other passages which have been suggested have almost nothing to commend them. Such passages are: Isa. 26:19 "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth the dead." (Heb. *הַקִּיּוֹצִי וְרִנְנִי שִׁכְנֵי עֶפְרַיִם* : תפיל : תה גה' ה' גאר דרוסוס ה' פארὰ סוּ זאמא אַטוֹיִס עֶסְטִינ, ה' דֶּה גה' טוֹן אַסֶּבֶוֹן פֶּסֶעִלְטִי.) Isa. 51:17 "Awake, awake, stand up,



As to Johnson's view referred to above<sup>1</sup>) it would seem to amount to a confession that no definite combination was possible and to make its suggestion of a substance of various Scriptures as a kind of guess of last resort. It would appear in fact, if any combination of passages was in the Author's mind, definite or indefinite, the only combination possible could have been some arbitrary one found in some such Old Testament manual as Hatch and Vollmer suggest; but against this possibility remains the unfortunate fact of its thoroughly arbitrary character, even granting a full acceptance of the assumption that such manuals did exist. If the Author was unfamiliar with the Old Testament from which he quoted, or did not care to press its exact statements into the service of his thought, perhaps a recourse on his part to such an irresponsible assemblage of passages could be understood; but the other citation in his Epistle (4s), where a distinct Old Testament passage is quite definitely used, would appear to make this more than unlikely. But what then shall we do? In the way of each of these three Old Testament possibilities there seem to be strong difficulties. Does this mean that we must give up all thought of an Old Testament source at all for our quotation and fall back on the gratuitous assumption of a liturgical or apocryphal origin? We confess there does not seem to be any other way out of our difficulty, unless critics have failed to exhaust these three groups of possibilities which have been placed before us. This failure we are quite willing to believe they have made, because it is evident that, in all the investigation so far, there has been one radical mistake, and this is, that there has not been taken into full enough consideration the connection of our quotation with the context in which it stands<sup>2</sup>). The binding of the quotation with what precedes it through the illative formula *διὸ λέγει*

1) p. 12.

2) Cf. Clemen's strange interpretation of the Ep's context: *Gebrauch d. A. T.* pp. 220 f.; also Braune's interpretation: *Com.* p. 186.

leaves no doubt that, in the Author's mind, this connection was a close one. It is not likely therefore that we will understand the quotation itself, unless we appreciate the connection; and it is only as we rightly understand the quotation that we will be in position to solve the problem of its source.

The chapter in which our citation occurs is located in the hortatory portion of the Epistle and in that specific part of it where the Author, after having enlarged upon the faults which exist in the relations of men to each other (425—52), proceeds to make his exhortation against those personal faults which more especially affect the holiness of his readers (53—21). There is given in vs. 3 f. an enumeration of vices which he says are most radically opposed to their character as saints and in v. 5 there is added, as the reason for his bringing of these forward so prominently, the fact that the foremost of them are vices which exclude from all share in the Kingdom of Heaven. With v. 6 he directs his attention to those who were deceiving his readers into these vices and (v. 7) urges against becoming partakers with them in their conduct of life, the reason for which urging is given in v. 8, viz: the fact of the radical change in their spiritual condition which would make any fellowship with these who would so deceive them essentially impossible. Now this statement of v. 8 is made emphatic by the use of abstract terms in the predicate (*σκότος* and *φῶς*) which emphasis is carried out, not simply by the continuation of the term *φῶς* in the conclusion, but by the fact that this conclusion is appended without any connective *οὖν* to the primary thought which precedes (*ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε*). To this exhortation further the reason is added in the statement of v. 9 that light has no results — does not realize itself, amounts to nothing — unless it is carried out in character and life. This reason is added parenthetically however so that the participle of v. 10 (*δοκιμάζοντες*) is joined directly to the concluding verb of v. 8 (*περιπατεῖτε*) as carrying out this verb's idea regarding its mode and manner.— As children of light they are to walk, with this idea constantly before them, of examining and testing what would be well

pleasing to the Lord. At the same time the verbs of v. 11 (*μὴ συνκοινωνεῖτε* — *δὲ ἐλέγχετε*) follow in ordinary sequence as additional items in the exhortations, showing negatively that the readers were not to be partners with these evil workers in their unfruitful and resultless deeds of darkness, but rather to protest against them and to reprove them; so that v. 12 gives the reason on which the concluding exhortation of these two verbs is based, viz: that these deeds which they did in secret were too shameful even to be spoken about, to say nothing of being done.

This brings us to v. 13 which forms the immediate context of our citation. Confessedly it is a difficult verse, not merely because of the connection which it has as a verse with the verses which precede it and the connection which its two parts have between themselves, but also because of the meaning of its individual words. The most natural connection is of course 1) to join v. 13<sup>a</sup> with v. 12, as in contrast with it (*δέ*) and so, along with it, as proof (*γάρ*) of v. 11, giving thus the completed reason for the reproof urged in this verse, viz: the fact that these evil deeds are indeed too shameful to be spoken about; but that, although this is so, yet where they are reproved they will become manifest; 2) to join v. 13<sup>b</sup> with v. 13<sup>a</sup>, as giving the reason (*γάρ*) for this last statement that these deeds will become manifest when reproved, viz: the fact that everything which becomes manifest is light.

Now when we come to ask what all this means it is evident that we will obtain a satisfactory answer to our question only by a careful study of the words themselves which form our verse. And it is also evident that our study will secure us this result only as we remember the cardinal principle of all hermeneutics — that wherever the same words occur, they must be taken in the same way and given the same meaning, unless there is some strong reason against so doing.

With this principle before us therefore it becomes quite clear 1) that *ἐλεγχόμενα* must refer to *ἐλέγχετε* (v. 11) and must mean, "reprove", "rebuke"; 2) that *φανεροῦται* and *φανερούμενον* must both be taken in the same voice and must

both mean alike "make manifest", the opposite of *τοῦ σκοτός* (v. 11) and *κρυφῆ* (v. 12); 3) that *φωτός* and *φῶς* must both be understood in the ethical sense, as in vs. 8f. With these meanings then thus adjusted our verse reads: "But all things reproved by the light — i. e. the light of divine truth as represented in the Christians who are themselves children of this light, who are suffused by it, who are bearers and heralds of it — manifest themselves in their true nature — i. e. show themselves out — for everything which so manifests itself is itself of the nature of light." In other words the Author has in mind the effective, saving reproof accomplished by the light of the Gospel, which turns the works of darkness into works of light and so makes them possible of manifestation, in fact so makes them necessary of manifestation; since, having become light, they must manifest themselves. His endeavor is to present to his readers, as his most effective reason for their not becoming partners with those who practice these evil deeds, the fact, not simply that these deeds are not fit so much as to be named, but rather that these deeds of darkness are capable of being changed into deeds of light, through the conversion of those who do them; so that, far from yielding to the seductions of those who would lead them into these evil ways, it should be their ambition to bring to bear upon them the effective and saving rebuke of the Gospel that shall change them into doers of the deeds of light and not of darkness. As a consequence therefore the verbs *φανεροῦνται* and *φανερούμενον*, while possibly passive in form, are evidently medial in signification. This would not be out of accord with even the best of Greek style<sup>1)</sup>; and would be quite in agreement with the usage of *φανεροῦσθαι* in several New Testament passages<sup>2)</sup>, so that, finally, the idea of our verse shows itself to be that

1) Cf. Winer, Am. Ed. § 38 pp. 254f. Jelf § 367. 2.

2) e. g. Joh. 1 31; 9 3. II Cor. 4 10 (so also v. 11). I Joh. 2 19; 4 9 — Cf. also Mark 16 12 and such passages as II Cor. 5 10f. I Pet. 5 4. I Joh. 3 2. — See also the interchange of the Act. (with reflex pron.) and the Pass. (in the above reflex sense) in Joh. 21 1, 14.

all things reproved effectively by the light manifest themselves, because, through this saving reproof, they are themselves converted into light and so must necessarily manifest themselves, for light cannot do anything else than show itself where it exists'). Now to this general idea of the Christian's responsibility to reprove the evil which is around him our citation is appended by means of the illative particle (*διό*), in order to give an authoritative illustration of the idea. "Wherefore — as carrying out this spiritual principle of reproofing the deeds of darkness — the Scripture saith: Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee."

But this being the progress of thought leading up to the citation and this being the connection of the citation with the preceding thought it must be painfully clear that the chief difficulty with all the Old Testament sources so far proposed — both single passages and combination of passages — lies not merely in the dissimilarity of their ideas with those of the citation but in the impossibility of their ideas having any relation to this thought with which the citation is preceded. None of the passages proposed has any connection with this principle of the reproof of evil. No such thought appears in Isa. 60<sup>1</sup>, not even as this passage is carried back to the preceding chapter and made to depend for its significance on the thought there produced. The Prophet's cry is addressed, not to the doers of evil, but to the elect remnant of Jehovah's own people and its purpose is not to awake them from the sleep, nor from the death of iniquity, but to arouse them to a sense of the realized hope which has come upon them in their blessing of light. The connection of the passage is with the idea

1) In favor of this rendering of our verse is the peculiarly parallel passage 1 Cor. 14:24 f.: *ἐὰν δὲ πάντες προφητεύωσιν, εἰσέλθῃ δὲ τις ἄπιστος ἢ ἰδιώτης, ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων, ἀνακρίνεται ὑπὸ πάντων, τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνονται, καὶ οὕτως πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον προσκυνήσει τῷ Θεῷ, ἀπαγγέλλων ὅτι "Ὁντως ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστίν.* In addition to which passage is the somewhat similar one of Joh. 3:21: *ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ὅτι ἐν Θεῷ ἐστίν εἰργασμένα.*

of darkness, rather than with that of sleep or of death. It goes back thus to 59<sup>a</sup>. "We look for light, but behold darkness; for brightness, but we walk in obscurity, we grope for the wall like the blind, yea, we grope as they that have no eyes: we stumble at noonday as in the twilight."—So comes the enthusing cry of our passage over against their despair: "Arise, shine; for thy light is come and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee". But there is no possible way of fitting this in with the thought of the Epistle which precedes our citation. It is utterly foreign to it, moves along an entirely different plane and works in an entirely different direction<sup>1</sup>). And yet this passage in Isaiah (60<sup>1</sup>) is supposed to be the most probable source of our quotation. Equally therefore do the other proposed passages fail. Those in Isaiah (26<sup>19</sup>; 51<sup>17</sup>; 52<sup>1</sup>; 9<sup>2</sup>) are all of them addressed to God's people—not to sinners outside of Israel—and have all of them to do with the entrance of this people upon the realization of their hope—not with their repentance and recovery from sin; while the passage from the Psalms (44<sup>23</sup>) proves itself even yet more unfit, as it is addressed to Jehovah himself and is a cry to him for help. It would seem consequently that none of these passages has any right to be considered as the source of our citation.

This brings us then to the practical question whether, in this new light of the context in which our citation stands and the citation's close connection with it, there would suggest itself to us, as the source of the citation, any other Old Testament passage than these which have been proposed above.

In answering this question it might as well be confessed at the outstart that, if it be true that a hortatory quotation, such as ours is, can find its source only in the outburst of a prophet's or a psalmist's mind; or, if it be held that this quo-

---

1) So that Böhl's ingenious attempt to get the last clause of the citation from verse 2 of Chap. 60 amounts to nothing. His understanding of the context in both Prophet and Epistle is wrong. D. A. T. Citate im N. T., Wien, 1878, pp. 253f.

tation is essentially poetic and must have a poetic passage for its origin, then there is nothing in psalm or prophecy from which it could have come. If however it be true that this quotation is not essentially poetic, and if it be true that prophecy and psalm are not the only possible sources for hortatory quotations, then it may be possible to go outside the book of Isaiah or the Psalms and find the passage which the Author had in mind, the one chief condition being that the thought of the passage shall fit into the thought which our quotation has, as it stands connected with the context which precedes it. But it is quite evident that the poetic character of this quotation has never been proved<sup>1)</sup>; while it must also be evident, on general principles and specially from New Testament usage in quoting, that a hortatory quotation might readily go outside of prophet and psalm for its origin, if there be hortatory passages in the narrative parts of the Old Testament which lend themselves to quoting<sup>2)</sup>.

With these facts in mind it would seem by no means going astray should we place in comparison with our quotation the passage from the first chapter of the book of Jonah, where the recreant servant of Jehovah is aroused by the mariners from his sleep and apprised of the danger in which he and all of them are.

The Hebrew of the passage reads: **מִהִילָךְ נִרְדָּם קִים קָרָא אֶל־אֱלֹהֵיךְ אֵלֵי יְתַעֲשֶׂת הָאֱלֹהִים לָנוּ וְלֹא נֹאכֵר** The LXX is as follows: *Τί σὺ βέγγεις; ἀνάστα καὶ ἐπικαλοῦ τὸν Θεόν, σου ὅπως διασώσῃ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ μὴ ἀπολώμεθα.*

Now it is evident, even at first glance, that there are some

1) Westcott and Hort's poetic arrangement of it in their Greek text is their judgment as to its character, but nothing more. Von Soden also contents himself with the general remark: »Dies selbst kann seinem Tonfall nach entweder eine feierliche Formel oder einem Hymnus entnommen sein« (Com. über Eph., in d. Holtzmann'schen Hand-Com. z. N. T., Freiburg i. B., 1891, p. 141).

2) e. g. Rom. 15:10, quot'd fr. Deut. 32:43; Gal. 4:30, quot'd fr. Gen. 21:10; I Pet. 1:16, quot'd fr. Lev. 11:44.

striking resemblances between this passage and the quotation in our Epistle.

1) There are resemblances in words :

a)  $\text{רר}$  corresponds to *καθεύδειν*, though we are quite ready to believe that the Hebrew verb would have been better reproduced by *κοιμᾶσθαι*, as being stronger than *καθεύδειν*, especially as the Author seems to have understood the sleep metaphorically as the sleep of death. The participle form in which  $\text{רר}$  is cast also bears resemblance to the  $\acute{\omicron}$  *καθεύδων*, though the Hebrew participle is not to be taken in the absolute vocative sense which  $\acute{\omicron}$  *καθεύδων* represents. The LXX  $\text{Τί σὺ ῥέγγεις}$  : renders it much more faithfully b)  $\text{קיק}$  corresponds to *ἀνάστα*, both in meaning and in the form of the verb.

2) There are, beyond this, resemblances in ideas :

a) The dead sleep of  $\text{רר}$  is clearly reproduced in the  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$  *τῶν νεκρῶν* from which the sleeper is called upon to arise. And this is quite significant, since it is difficult to understand how the Author would have come upon the idea of death and given it to us so distinctly in his quotation unless he had found it in the original from which he made his quotation. b) The purpose of the cry to arise — the hope that perhaps ( $\text{אילי}$ ) God would bethink himself of them ( $\text{עשה}$ ) and they would not perish ( $\text{אכר}$ ) finds at least an adaptation by the Author to the New Testament setting in which he has placed the passage. The idea of saving is clearly contained in *ἐπιφάσκειν* which is used here ethically, though in its LXX usage it is always physical<sup>1)</sup>. It is intended to carry out in verbal form the ethical idea already present in  $\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  (vs. 8f., 13).

3) But, most of all, there is a resemblance between the general thought of the context in which the Old Testament passage stands and that of the context of our quotation : In Jonah the narrative which leads up to v. 6 gives an account of the Prophet's commission to go and preach against Nineveh, and his truant rebellion against Jehovah, which brought him

1) Job 25 5 ; 31 26 ; 41 9 (10).

down to Joppa and placed him on board this Tarshish bound vessel; then the storm which followed him on the sea, the mariners' fear, the Prophet's deep sleep in the hold of the ship, and at last the shipmaster's urgent cry, as he roused him out of his stupor: "What dost thou mean by soundly sleeping? Arise, call upon thy God; peradventure he will bethink himself of us and we will not perish". In other words here is a state of sinful rebellion against Jehovah, from which the cry (at least in the purpose of Jehovah) is to be part of the means of rousing the sinner. The principle of the reproof of evil consequently lies in the thought of the passage and to a mind that in the Old Testament was quite ready to see the spiritual behind the narrative it would not be an unnatural thing to apply it to such a line of thought as we find in the context which precedes our citation in the Epistle and apply it in the way we find it here applied. In fact it seems almost impossible to rid ourselves of the impression that the thought in the Author's mind, as he came up to the point of the citation, must have sent him back to just such a passage as this in Jonah to get a Scripture illustration for his thought. Here in the Epistle the Author is pressing home upon his readers their responsibility in the reproof of the works of darkness around them. They could not have anything to do with such deeds, for they must reprove them, and they were to remember that, once effectively, convertingly reproved, they would themselves become light and as such manifest themselves abroad. Here in this Jonah narrative he finds what on the surface seems but a rousing cry from senseless sleep, but what in reality was the first step in a divine rebuke upon a sinful servant of God, administered indeed through heathen instrumentality, but a rebuke which led ultimately to repentance and return to the service of God. What more fitting to give point to the Author's exhortation to his readers than this Old Testament incident which lent itself so readily to spiritualization. To be sure the mind which could so gather up an Old Testament historical incident must have been one accustomed to see

divine teaching in all Old Testament events and skillful in gathering out of the events the teaching which they gave; but, granted such a mind, and our citation finds its most natural origin in this Jonah passage which we have suggested.

It can consequently hardly be an objection that what is here given by the Author as a Scripture illustration of his thought is really but the frightened cry of pagan sailors to their prophet passenger at sea. The Prophet for the time being is, in his rebellion against Jehovah, the representative of the rebellious world of sin; while the heathen mariners, in their rousing him from his stupor, are the unconscious instruments of Jehovah who thus comes to bring before this faithless servant the consequences of his sin. The underlying idea of the rebuke and reproof of sin is still there and this is enough for the Author who needs just this idea to illustrate what he is urging upon his readers as their duty towards the evil which is lying dark around them. At all events as between this Jonah passage on the one side, and these Isaiah and Psalm passages — either singly or in combination — on the other, there seems to be in our mind but little difficulty to choose. The thought of the context in the Epistle makes the one a very possible source for the citation and makes the others next to impossible as its origin.

We come thus to the concluding question of our paper: Granting this to be a critically justified conclusion, what bearing has it upon the Paulinity of our Epistle? We would not of course contend that the criticism of the Epistle was closed with a favorable answer to this query. There may be and doubtless are other objections to its Apostolic or even first century origin, but we feel that a good deal is decided for or against the Epistle by the answer which is given here; so that it is not a question of small importance and we may not discuss it except in a most careful way.

To help us in this discussion let us remember:

1) That, while Paul's citations are mostly from the prophetic and poetic parts of the Old Testament, at the same

time he does not hesitate to appeal to the narrative parts as well<sup>1</sup>).

2) That, while his text seems to be most commonly the LXX version, it is quite apparent, in some cases, that he has gone to the original Hebrew, or perhaps some Aramaic version instead — oral or written<sup>2</sup>) — of both of which things his Rabbinic training would have made him quite capable<sup>3</sup>).

3) That his attitude toward the Old Testament is one not merely of reverence for its divine origin, but of belief in its complete inspiration — perhaps not to the same absolute extent as the Author of Hebrews who seems to ignore all human authorship in the Old Testament word, but nevertheless in a most characteristic way that makes its inspiration a most real and definite thing<sup>4</sup>).

1) I Cor. 9<sup>9</sup> (Deut. 25<sup>4</sup>); 10<sup>7</sup> (Exod. 32<sup>6</sup>); 15<sup>45</sup> (Gen. 2<sup>7</sup>). II Cor. 6<sup>16</sup> (Lev. 26<sup>11f.</sup> — with Ezek. 37<sup>27</sup>); 6<sup>18</sup> (II Sam. 7<sup>14</sup>); 8<sup>15</sup> (Exod. 16<sup>18</sup>). Gal. 3<sup>8</sup> (Gen. 12<sup>3</sup>; 18<sup>18</sup>); 3<sup>10</sup> (Deut. 27<sup>26</sup>); 3<sup>13</sup> (Deut. 21<sup>23</sup>); 4<sup>30</sup> (Gen. 21<sup>10</sup>). Rom. 4<sup>17f.</sup> (Gen. 17<sup>5</sup>); 9<sup>9</sup> (Gen. 18<sup>10</sup>); 9<sup>12</sup> (Gen. 25<sup>23</sup>); 9<sup>15</sup> (Exod. 33<sup>19</sup>); 9<sup>17</sup> (Exod. 9<sup>16</sup>); 10<sup>5</sup> (Lev. 18<sup>5</sup>); 10<sup>6ff.</sup> (Deut. 30<sup>12ff.</sup>); 10<sup>19</sup> (Deut. 32<sup>21</sup>); 11<sup>3f.</sup> (I Kings 19<sup>14, 18</sup>); 11<sup>8</sup> (Deut. 29<sup>3</sup> — with Isa. 29<sup>10</sup>); 12<sup>19</sup> (Deut. 32<sup>35</sup>); 15<sup>10</sup> (Deut. 32<sup>43</sup>).

2) Cf. Toy (Quot's in N. T.) and Böhl (Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel zur Zeit Jesu, Wien, 1873; Die A.T. Citate im N.T., Wien, 1878) for discussion of this disputed point.

3) e. g. I Cor. 3<sup>19</sup> (Job 5<sup>13</sup>); 14<sup>21</sup> (Isa. 28<sup>11f.</sup>); 15<sup>54</sup> (Isa. 25<sup>8</sup>). Rom. 9<sup>17</sup> (Exod. 9<sup>16</sup>); 10<sup>15</sup> (Isa. 52<sup>7</sup>); 12<sup>19</sup> (Deut. 32<sup>35</sup>). Cf. Toy, Quot's in N.T. sub loc. In cases where the LXX reproduces the Heb. exactly it is of course an open question whether after all the Ap. may not have had the original Heb. in mind. The only cases where there is any approach to certainty are where the LXX differs and the Ap. seems to follow the Heb. in preference to the Greek.

4) This is evident a) from such appeals as he makes in Gal. 3<sup>16</sup> to a specific word, as well as b) from his frequent emphasis of the precise words of his appeal (Gal. 3<sup>10</sup> "curse"; Rom. 4<sup>11</sup> "seal"; Rom. 4<sup>17</sup> "Father of many nations"; Rom. 9<sup>7</sup> "Isaac"). And it is seen also c) in the elevated style of formula which he often uses and in which sometimes God himself is represented as speaking in his Word (II Cor. 6<sup>2, 16ff.</sup> Rom. 9<sup>15, 25f.</sup>), or the Scripture is personified as speaking (Gal. 4<sup>30</sup>; Rom 4<sup>3</sup>; 9<sup>17</sup>; 10<sup>6ff.</sup>; 11<sup>3f.</sup>) or even as foreseeing the future events with reference to which its words were uttered (Gal. 3<sup>8</sup>). And

4) That specially his conception of the Old Testament is one which holds it not as intended wholly and solely for the times in which it was written, but for those in which the Apostle himself was living<sup>1</sup>). This was a natural result of his fundamental belief in the Old Testament law as abrogated by the work of Christ. He viewed the law as temporary, provisional, having its fulfillment in Christ and so passing away. The typical method of his Rabbinic training was consequently lifted up to a new level and given a new impulse; for, if the law was fulfilled in Christ, it must have prefigured him and what was true of the law specifically must have been true generally of the Old Testament as a whole. Its history, its biography, even its geography must have had a meaning for these Gospel times and have been intended for them. So it is that, in writing to the Corinthians and warning them against their evil life, he cites the experience of Israel in the wilderness as having happened for our example, in which the Fathers stood as figures of us and adds farther on not only that their history has been a typical one, but that the record of it had been made specifically for our instruction who live in these latter days<sup>2</sup>). And in charging them with the responsibility of caring for those who spiritually ministered to them, he cites the provision in the law for the freedom of the oxen in treading out the corn and repeats substantially the same statement regarding it, saying that it was made with these Gospel times in view<sup>3</sup>). So we see the significance of such a statement as

---

if it be demurred that in these cases the Ap. is introducing with this formula merely the words which God actually spoke in the events recorded in the O.T. then such passages as Rom. 15<sup>10</sup>. Gal. 3<sup>16</sup> and even I Cor. 6<sup>16</sup> (*φῆσιν*) show such demurrer can not be universally applied. Cf. Vollmer, A.T. Citate, pp. 73 f.

1) Vollmer pp. 77 f.

2) I Cor. 10<sup>6-11</sup>. Cf. Ellicott, Com. on St. Paul's First Ep. to Cors. Am. Ed. Andover, 1889, pp. 191 f. Kling (in Lange Com.) Com. on I Cor. Am. Transl'n. (Poor) 3d Ed., New York, 1869, p. 200. Godet (in Clark's For. Theol. Library) Com. on St. Paul's First Ep. to Cor., Engl. Transl'n. (Cusin) Edinburg, 1887, Vol. 2, p. 66.

3) I Cor. 9<sup>10</sup>. Cf. Toy, Quotations in N.T. pp. 173f. Heinrici (in

he makes in his Galatian argument when he says: "And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the Gospel beforehand unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations be blessed" (1). And the significance further of such a statement as that with which he introduces his interpretation of the history of the bondwoman and the free in Chap. 4 of the same Epistle. "Which things are expressed allegorically—contain an allegory" (2). In fact this gives the meaning behind the Apostle's so frequent incorporation of Old Testament thoughts and ideas and even specific commands in the hortatory portions of this Epistle.

So it comes that, while holding strictly to the divine inspiration of the Old Testament and quoting it often with specific reference to its exact words, Paul holds himself free to quote from it loosely, since the essential thing was to reproduce the spiritual idea—in fact often holds himself justified in altering it in his quotation, so as to bring out its spiritual application to the situation around him in his work. Believing that the Old Testament was not only capable of such handling but was intended to have it, and believing in his own personal possession of the Holy Spirit of divine wisdom and truth, it was a perfectly natural thing for him to do (3). But in so dealing with the Old Testament it became quite necessary for him to establish a vital connection between his citation and the context in which he places it. This constituted the very object of his interpretation, for without this connection there would be no reason in this interpreted truth which he brought out. It

---

Meyer Com.) Com. üb. I Cor. 7te Aufl., Göttingen, 1888, pp. 247—250. Ellicott, Com. pp. 169f.

1) Gal. 3s.

2) Gal. 4:24.

3) Schultz's reference of this "double sense" in O.T. prophecy as created by the hearts of the O.T. people rather than as residing in the O.T. writings themselves misses wholly the N.T. writers' claim to be authoritative interpreters of O.T. truth; for this makes them accommodate themselves to the Jewish ideas which they reproduce (Art. "Ueber doppelten Schriftsinn", Stud. u. Kr., 1866, 1).

must fit into the context in which it moved. Indeed this is so in accord with Paul's general style of close nexus of thought, that, apart from the purpose of the quotation, it would seem an almost necessary thing for a writer like himself to do').

But this being Paul's attitude towards and his usage of the Old Testament in his Epistles, there seems to be nothing to prevent his having made such a quotation as this one, which we have before us, from such a narrative passage as this in Jonah, for such a purpose as is evident this quotation serves in the Epistle's thought. In fact the two things which are specially marked about the citation seem to have a distinctly Pauline cast viz: a) the spiritualization of the Old Testament narrative and b) the close reference of its spiritualized thought to the thought of the context in which it stands. The Apostle is exhorting his readers to have no contact with the unfruitful works of darkness around them, but rather to reprove them with Gospel truth; for negatively these are deeds of which it would be a shame even so much as to speak, while positively they were deeds which, if effectively reprov'd by the Gospel, would themselves become light and as such manifest themselves abroad for good; so then can be understood the reason for the divine rebuke upon the recreant Prophet. It was given on this same principle — that his recreancy deserved rebuke — and was intended to have this same effect — to ultimately bring him to repentance — and so has its proper application to the situation with which the Ephesians are confronted, to make which application evident the Apostle clothes the Old

---

1) Paul accomplishes this connection in various ways, sometimes by using his citations as justifications of his argument, sometimes by placing them as bases for his exhortations, sometimes by bringing them forward as illustrations of his thought (e. g. Gal. 3<sup>10</sup>, 1<sup>st</sup> f. Rom. 12<sup>1st</sup> f. I Cor. 10<sup>7</sup>). But always the context is kept vitally in view; although there would naturally be a greater freedom in handling the original passage where the purpose was illustration of thought, or even where it was basis for exhortation than where it was justification of argument (Cf. Johnson, Quotations of N.T. pp. 29—61).

Testament thought in its Christian dress: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee". This seems in every way to be the most natural interpretation of our passage, at least when the failure of all the other proposed interpretations is so conspicuous.

It would appear therefore that our citation constitutes no objection to the Paulinity of our Epistle. 'Accepting the most radical criticism of the Old Testament passages heretofore suggested as its source the Old Testament is after all the place of its origin; so that Westcott and Hort have erred in failing to print it in uncial type. The assumption of an extra canonical manual of Old Testament passages, from some combination contained in which this quotation may have come, is not necessary; still less is necessary the hypothesis of a Christian hymn or an apocryphal production of the second century. Admitting the Apostle's belief in the complete inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures, in the original purpose behind them and behind the events which they record — that they should serve the Gospel times, as well as the times to which they themselves belong — admitting his belief in his own apostolic fitness, through the special possession of the Holy Spirit, to interpret and apply these Scriptures and these events to the situations of his work and of his day, it is perfectly possible, thoroughly natural and almost necessary that he should go to such a narrative as this given in Jonah in order to secure an authoritative illustration for the thought he had in mind and, with this, an authoritative basis for the exhortation he had just delivered.





BS2695.4 .J17

The citation Ephesians 5:14 as affecting

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00064 0815