
Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

Author(s): Henry Todd

Source: *The Irish Church Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 25 (Jan., 1914), pp. 57-73

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30067771>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 03:48 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Irish Church Quarterly*

APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA.*

UNDER the above title a series of important books is placed in the hands of English readers. In the first volume there are twelve of the apocryphal writings enumerated in the Anglican Sixth Article, with the addition of 3 Maccabees and the replacement of the Book of Baruch by the Book of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremy. The second volume contains, besides the works with which Dr. Charles's name will always be honourably associated, The Letter of Aristee, The Books of Adam and Eve, The Sibylline Oracles, 3 Baruch, 4 Ezra, The Psalms of Solomon, 4 Maccabees, *Pirke Aboth*, and The Story of Ahikar. Altogether the Biblical student is offered no less than thirty-two commentaries on writings that are of the highest value for many of his investigations. To attempt to describe such an amount of literature within the limits of an article would be as feasible as trying to sail over the Pacific Ocean in a day. Accordingly I shall content myself with a short account of the workmanship, followed by a discussion of some of the important questions raised by Dr. Charles.

In almost every case each contributor had to furnish an introduction, a translation, and a commentary. Dr. Charles was therefore obliged to deal with a matter of great importance on which scholars are hopelessly divided. What subjects should be discussed in an Introduction? Dr. Charles answers this question in the

**The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English.* With Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the several Books. Edited in conjunction with many scholars by R. H. Charles, D.Litt., D.D., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, Fellow of the British Academy. Clarendon Press. £3 3s. od. net.

Preface. Introduction deals with ten topics :—1. Short account of the book, embodying its leading features and the editor's chief conclusions. 2. Title of the book. 3. The MSS. 4. Ancient Versions. 5. Date (a) of the original text; (b) of the Ancient Versions. 6. Integrity. 7. Authorship. 8. Influence of the book on later literature (a) Jewish; (b) Christian. 9. Theology of the book. 10. Bibliography : (a) chief editions of the text (and of the Ancient Versions); (b) chief critical inquiries; (c) chief editions of the book. There is hardly an Introduction in the two volumes in which this scheme is carried out. For example, that to 1 Esdras is given under eight headings, one of which is *Value*; that to the First Book of Maccabees is given under nine, one of which is *Contents*, and so on. Dr. Charles himself does not follow his own plan. There are no less than sixteen sections in the Introduction to the Book of Jubilees. No doubt, this variety is, to some extent, unavoidable, because no two books can be treated exactly alike. Questions arise concerning one which do not arise regarding another. Admitting this, however, it is desirable that scholars should, as far as possible, proceed on some uniform method in order to avoid the making of impossible demands on the memory. It does not require Isaac Casaubon's authority to assure us that there is no use in reading a thing unless it be retained in the memory. As long as every introducer does that which is right in his own eyes, so long the student is impeded, instead of being assisted, in his effort to retain what he has carefully read.

The present writer was compelled, in order to profit by the knowledge of others, to devise a scheme of his own. Taking into account the fact that a book may be viewed, firstly, as if it were the only book in the world, and secondly, as having important relations with books written before it, subsequent to it, and contemporaneous with it, the following enumeration was found helpful :—

1. Contents. 2. Affinities. 3. Peculiarities. 4. Char-

acteristics. 5. Integrity. 6. Object. 7. Sources. 8. Text. 9. Authorship. 10. Date. 11. Place of composition. 12. Destination. Affinities, Peculiarities, and Characteristics may be lexical, phraseological, stylistic, historical, ethical, or doctrinal. No place is given to either Title or Bibliography. A few lines will, as a rule, be sufficient for the former, and its proper place is before the first of the notes that constitute the commentary. Bibliography serves two useful purposes : it preserves the names of the scholars who have worked at the book, and also guides the student to valuable sources of information concerning it; but it is not, strictly speaking, a part of Introduction.

Testing the various Introductions in my own way, I found them all most instructive and most readable. Mr. Townshend's remarks on the author of the Fourth Book of Maccabees as an autocrat of language may serve as a sample.

"We may note the author's love of double-barrelled prepositional compounds, as where he speaks of parents as *ἐναποσφραγίζοντες*, stamping their seal on the child; and of prepositions used intensively in composition, as in *ἐπιπρωγολογούμενος*, another of his coinages, to express the skinflint's extra-gleaning of his grapes. Indeed his love of the ornate is such that he will invent a three-barrelled prepositional compound, if the fancy strikes him; as when, in the case of the torture of the first of the seven brethren, in order to describe the horrid ingenuity of the torturers, he says, *τὸν τροχὸν προσεπικατέτεινον*, 'they overstrained against him the wheel,' or as the Syriac Version has it, 'they made the wheel more cruel by artifice against him.'"

With reference to the translations, it is difficult to estimate the amount of work that the general editor and his fellow-helpers have accomplished. Not only was the acquisition of several languages a necessity, but also a laborious comparison of manuscripts and versions had to be made in the hope of obtaining the original text. Such toil ought to be fully appreciated by those who enjoy its results. New translations of

many of the Apocrypha are given, and a quotation from Sirach xxxiv. 16-17, may serve as an illustration :—

“The eyes of the Lord are upon them that fear Him,
A mighty shield and strong stay,
A cover from scorching Sirocco, a shadow from noontide heat,
A guard from stumbling, and a succour from falling,
Heart-gladdener and eye-brightener,
Healing, life, and blessing.”

The notes on each book are excellent and rarely fail to remove the obscurities, explain the historical allusions, and define the puzzling words which occur in it. Biblical affinities are, as a rule, indicated. Those who are hard to please can occasionally find fault. The following examples will show their general character.

Assumption of Moses, ix. 1. “Then in that day there shall be a man of the tribe of Levi, whose name shall be Taxo.” The note declares that Dr. Burkitt’s interpretation of Taxo is correct. By applying Gematria to the Hebrew transliteration of the Greek equivalent of the true form of Taxo, Dr. Burkitt found Eleazar. If this interpretation be correct, then it is just possible that St. Paul, who was affected by the mental atmosphere of his time, employed proper names in such a way that their true significance can only be ascertained by an exercise of great ingenuity. Euodia and Syntyche may, as some Germans affirm,¹ be derived from an exclamation of Leah’s and the name of one of her sons.

The note on Book of Jubilees, iv. 7, 8, is: “Usually the mother names the child in Genesis, the father in Jubilees, as the Samaritan text in Gen. iv. 25. Exceptions are Gen. iv. 26; v. 29; xxv. 25, 26; Ex. ii. 22.” The careful reader will wonder why it is necessary to call attention to the difference between a name maternally or paternally bestowed, and may, in this way, be started on a line of investigation entirely new to him. He may find that there is something in the marginal note in the R. V. on 2 Sam. xii. 24.

¹ See Zahn, *Einleitung in d. NT.*, ed. 2, i. 397.

Suggestiveness characterizes many of the notes and makes them very valuable. Considerations of space, doubtless, account for the brevity of many of them, but occasionally we meet with a very long one. The Fourth Book of Maccabees opens with the words:—"Philosophical in the highest degree is the question I propose to discuss, namely, whether the Inspired Reason is supreme ruler over the passions." The note on "Inspired Reason" is almost an essay, and is delightful.

"Philosophy is the power-house of the soul. It covers the motive-power by which our higher nature rules or tries to rule our worse self. Man's first want is meat and drink, and how to supply the want his first problem. The physical side of the problem solves itself; he either finds food or he starves. But there is also a spiritual side to the problem, and to it Philosophy contains the answer—or answers."

Further on reference is made to a little dialogue of Cleanthes, the mention of whose name suggests the following:—

"It has happened to some young men entering the study of philosophy to feel a sudden qualm lest they were being made fools of by a set of bookworms calling themselves philosophers, weaklings, constitutionally unable to enter into the feelings of a healthy natural man. Such may take comfort in the recollection that the writer of this little dialogue, Cleanthes, who, after Zeno, was the great prophet of the Stoics, in his unconverted days had been a pugilist, and that no man ever stood up in the ring but had a working knowledge of our animal nature and the need of keeping one's head in spite of its promptings."

These may serve as samples of the excellence which prevails throughout the notes in both volumes. There are a few, however, to which objection may be made, and these must be exemplified. The note on The Books of Adam and Eve, xxix. 7 declares that in this verse there are marks which show that it is of Christian origin; but an addition is made in brackets which appears to contradict this. Perplexity is the result.

Commentators never fully realize how careful they ought to be. The present writer heard an address on a

passage in the Book of Jeremiah, in the course of which the speaker said: "The word in the original is *animus*." Suppose this gentleman to read the note on the Letter of Aristeas, 145, which mentions that the word ἀρράκης is translated "bald locust" by both R. V. and A. V., he would air his knowledge of the original of Lev. xi. 22, by quoting a Greek word.

Dr. Moffatt remarks on the expression "the King's Friends" that it was revived in the eighteenth century by the political mercenaries who intrigued for George III. Did these political mercenaries read 2 Maccabees? Did they even read 1 Kings iv. 5?

Sometimes a note is inexcusably too short. At Sirach i. 28, reference is made to the ἀνὴρ δίψυχος of St. James as a parallel to the man with a double heart. This is most fitting, but why is no mention made of the occurrence of the expression "day of eternity" in 2 Pet. iii. 18, in the note on Sirach i. 2?

However, the highest praise is due to the scholars who have laboured so strenuously to enable us to understand the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. All who give learning a high place in their list of "good things temporal" will welcome with delight the two magnificent volumes to which the preceding remarks relate. They are a splendid exhibition of wide scholarship and untiring industry. The printing and binding are excellent, and the price—three guineas net—is not excessive. In the last number of the *Hibbert Journal* Dr. Moffatt expressed the hope that Dr. Charles would do for the New Testament what he has now done for the Old. This wish will be heartily echoed by all Biblical students.

The labours and views of Dr. Charles demand special attention. The books which this distinguished scholar has edited are as follows:—The Apocalypse of Baruch, The Assumption of Moses, The Martyrdom of Isaiah, The Book of Jubilees, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, The Book of Enoch, The Book of the Secrets

of Enoch, and Fragments of a Zadokite Work. The extensive learning and marvellous industry of Dr. Charles arouse the highest admiration. The present writer is unable to express how much he owes to him for the delight and instruction given him by his writings.

It is easy to show that the literature to which Dr. Charles has devoted himself throws great light on many portions of the Gospels, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse. At the time our Lord began His public ministry divergent views existed as to the origin of the Messiah, the scene of His kingdom, the nature of His sovereignty, and the time of His investment with it. Was the Messiah to be human or superhuman? Was His kingdom to be Palestine, or a new heaven and a new earth? Was His sovereignty to be mainly material or purely spiritual? Was He to be invested with it on His appearance or after a departure and a return? The Gospels and some of the Pseudepigrapha conjointly furnish the various answers given to the foregoing questions. For example, in John i. an account is given of a deputation to the Baptist. Those sent inquire why John is baptizing if, amongst other alternatives, he is not the Messiah. If the members of the deputation, or those by whom they were sent, knew that John was the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, evidently membership of the tribe of Levi was consistent with Messiahship. In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs the Messiah is to come from Levi. This has been described as a phenomenon strange and unique. At any rate it throws light on John i. Similarly, the other branches of Messianic doctrine may be illustrated.

The Pseudepigrapha illuminate, amongst other things, the following in the Pauline Epistles:—Belial, the man of lawlessness, the resurrection of the body, angelic orders, and the trump of judgement. For the General Epistles one instance may be given out of many. In 2 Pet. iii. 8, we are told that with God a thousand

years are as one day. This principle is applied in Jubilees iv. 30 to explain the fulfilment of the penalty pronounced on the eater of the forbidden fruit. At his death Adam

"lacked seventy years of one thousand years; for one thousand years are as one day in the testimony of the heavens, and therefore was it written concerning the tree of knowledge: 'On the day that ye eat thereof ye shall die.' For this reason he did not complete the years of this day; for he died during it."

It is unnecessary to exemplify in the case of the Apocalypse. Beyond all doubt the Pseudepigrapha are of great value to the student of the New Testament.

A far greater claim than this, however, is made, and it must be carefully examined. Dr. Charles is of opinion that the writers of the New Testament were well acquainted with the Book of Enoch and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and frequently made use of them. This is a matter of the highest importance and should not be accepted unless the evidence demands it. The present writer has no hesitation in declaring that Dr. Charles sees affinities where there are none, and places too much value on those that may actually exist. The second portion of the tenth section of the Introduction to the Book of Enoch opens with the words:—"1 Enoch has had more influence on the New Testament than has any other apocryphal or pseudepigraphic work. A few examples will clearly illustrate this." An examination of Dr. Charles's examples will show that many of them may be rejected. On the Enoch side we find the expression "generation of light," and, corresponding to it on the New Testament side we have "children of light" from Ephesians with a reference to 1 Thess. v. 5, and also "sons of light" from St. John's Gospel with a reference to Luke xvi. 8. Are we to believe that, either directly or indirectly, St. Paul's employment of the expression "children of light" is due to the expression "generation of light" in Enoch? Are we to regard our Lord's use of the term "sons of light" as a sign of the "influence" of the Book of Enoch on

His phraseology? "Son of" is one of the very commonest of Hebrew idioms. Our Lord spoke of "the son of peace," "sons of the kingdom," "son of Gehenna," "son of perdition": why not of "sons of light"? It is amazing to find four passages of Scripture brought forward as an indication of the "influence" of the phrase "generation of light."

Similarly we find "Lord of Lords King of kings" on the Enoch side and 1 Tim. vi. 15 and Rev. xvii. 14 on the New Testament side. It is just as reasonable to derive the phrase in *Revelation* from the phrase in 1 Tim., or *vice versa*, as to put both forward as instances of the "influence" of Enoch on the New Testament.

Again, on the Enoch side we find "Lord of spirits," and corresponding to it "Father of spirits" on the New Testament side. Is there, necessarily, any sign of "influence" here? One might as well affirm that "Father of lights" and "Father of spirits" are so related that one of these was suggested by the other. In 1 Cor. ii. 8 we meet with the phrase "Lord of glory," and in Eph. i. 17, "Father of glory." Was St. Paul's employment of the latter occasioned by his use of the former? These expressions are related to one another in the very same way as "Lord of spirits" and "Father of spirits." Another example is, "dwelling places of the holy" in Enoch and "mansions" in St. John's Gospel, on which no remark is necessary. The instances adduced are typical of many others, and they may all be calmly laid aside on the ground of irrelevancy. An examination of those left will result in a further reduction. On the Enoch side we have "tree of life" and the same phrase on the New Testament side. This illustrates what may be said of many of Dr. Charles's examples: they have their common origin in the Old Testament. Let us turn back to one of the cases already mentioned. In Enoch we meet with "Lord of lords, God of gods, King of kings"; in 1 Tim. vi. 15,

E

with "King of kings, and Lord of lords"; in Rev. xvii. 14, with "Lord of lords, and King of kings." Most likely all these come from Deut. x. 17.

Those that remain, when the list is reduced by excluding the irrelevant and those that may be traced to the Old Testament, are few in number and do not conclusively show indebtedness on either side. The following is as favourable an instance as any of possible influence: Enoch xxxviii. 2—"It had been good for them if they had not been born"; Matt. xxvi. 24—"it had been good for that man if he had not been born." Some persons may be inclined to see indebtedness on one side or the other, but surely the sentiment of these words must have arisen in the minds of many when some terrible disaster or horrible fate fell on any one they knew.

With reference to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Dr. Charles declares that there are traces of this work in many passages of the Gospels; "and that St. Paul seems to have used the book as a *vade mecum*." Now as regards the Testaments, interpolation by Christians is admitted on all sides, and therefore uncertainty must always arise when a parallel between this book and the New Testament is pointed out. In many cases where Dr. Charles would say a New Testament writer is indebted to the Testaments, Dr. Plummer would say that the latter had been interpolated by a Christian. In other instances the Old Testament might be alleged as a common source. For example, Dr. Charles finds the source of "For I know nothing against myself" (1 Cor. iv. 4) in *Test. Iss.* vii. 1, "and am not conscious of committing any sin." In Bishop Gibson's commentary on the Book of Job the note on xxvii. 6 reads:—"The LXX in this clause is noteworthy . . . as containing the remarkable phrase used by St. Paul in 1 Cor. iv. 4."

Even when Dr. Charles seems most certain, eminent scholars have failed to agree with him. *Test. Levi* vi.

11, reads: "But the wrath of the Lord came upon them to the uttermost"; 1 Thess. ii. 16, "but the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." According to Dr. Charles, St. Paul has actually quoted the Testaments in this passage. Textual criticism, however, has a great deal to say on this parallel, and, further, it may be an interpolation either in the Testaments or even in St. Paul's Epistle. At any rate, so distinguished a scholar as Dr. Burkitt finds himself unable to accept Dr. Charles's views.²

Phraseological affinities must be used very cautiously. There may be modes of forming expressions in one age that are unfamiliar to another. In the New Testament we meet with "crown of life," "crown of glory," and so on, and these may indicate that familiarity with the race-course suggested the description of any reward by a genitival phrase beginning with "crown." A recipient of extreme praise might be said to have obtained a "crown of praise." The expression "crown of righteousness" occurs in *Aristeas*, 2 Tim., and the Testaments, but there may be no indebtedness anywhere. In fact, the phrase may have been in existence for ages before the earliest of these writings appeared. It must be kept in mind that one person alone, having read a book, might give wide currency to some of its expressions and ideas, which might be used by authors entirely unacquainted with their original source.

Dr. Charles is not the only person who attaches great importance to phraseological resemblances. In the third section of the Introduction to the *Story of Ahikar* we read:—

"*Ahikar* iv. 14, has the account of *Nadan's* revelry, after he got rid of his uncle, and of beating the men-servants and the woman-servants, etc. We have to compare carefully *Matt.* xxiv. 48-51 and *Luke* xii. 43-46, and it will be seen that the language of *Ahikar* has coloured one of our Lord's parables."

² *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1908, p. 138.

Here is the passage from Ahikar :—

“And when Nadan my son came, no funeral feast did he make for me, nor any remembrance at all; but gathered him the vain and lewd folk, and set them down at my table, with singing and with great joy; and my beloved servants and handmaidens he stripped and flogged without mercy.”

Is there any use in suggesting our Lord's indebtedness to this, or to any passage, for the idea of a person beating servants? “No striker” is one of the qualifications of a bishop. A couple of questions may be asked. Did the author of *The Burial of Sir John Moore* take the expression “dimly burning” from a marginal note in A. V. on Is. xlii. 3.? Was Browning's “think thy thoughts” suggested by a marginal note in A. V. on Dan. xi. 34.? In the tenth section of the Introduction to the Wisdom of Solomon mention is made of the person that coined the term “parallelo-mania.” Thanks are due to this scholar for teaching us this word. With profound respect, I suggest that Dr. Charles and Dr. Harris are suffering from this malady.

The critical student must pursue all his investigations regardless of consequences, and if one of these is the removal of a large portion of the originality of the New Testament writers it must be accepted. But there is also the obligation of insisting on rigidity of demonstration; and in the case under examination this has not been complied with. The New Testament writers knew and quoted the Old Testament, and if they knew the Pseudepigrapha they have not displayed their knowledge of them in the same way in which they have shown their knowledge of the Canonical writings. The Book of Isaiah may have been St. Paul's *vade mecum*, but surely not the Testaments.

The next point for discussion is the development of ethical ideas. *Test. Reub.* iv. 3 reads: “Even until now my conscience causeth me anguish on account of my impiety.” Dr. Charles states: “This is the first

occurrence in Jewish literature of the conscience as a fully-developed conception." This assertion is stated in too absolute a form. A good case can be made in favour of the view that the Hebrews used the word "heart" in a sense equivalent to conscience in its developed state. In Luther's translation of the Bible the word "Gewissen" occurs in Josh. xiv. 7 and Job xxvii. 6. Let "conscience" be accepted as a rendering in the former and we have Caleb stating, "I brought him word again according to my conscience." There seems very little difference between this and the passage in the Testaments. Also good sense results from making a similar substitution in Job xxvii. 6: "My conscience will not reproach me so long as I live." "Heart" was a very significant term with the Hebrews, and may have included a great deal of the connotation of the term "conscience." Dr. Cheyne's note on Ps. xxiv. 4 is, "God can see the stains on the hands and heart (conscience) of a criminal." All that can safely be said is that probably the passage in the Testaments is an advance on anything that may be implied by the term "heart" in certain passages of the Old Testament.

In the same absolute manner Dr. Charles assigns dates to various writings. It is very important to know when the second section of the Book of Enoch was written, but the available evidence is unsatisfactory. The fourth and fifth verses of the thirty-eighth chapter are:—

"From that time those that possess the earth shall no longer
be powerful and exalted,
And they shall not be able to behold the face of the holy,
For the Lord of Spirits has caused His light to appear
On the face of the holy, righteous and elect.
Then shall the kings and the mighty perish
And be given into the hands of the righteous and holy."

³ T. K. Cheyne, *The Book of Psalms translated from a revised text, with Notes and Introduction*, i. 103.

According to Dr. Charles, the later Maccabean princes are "the kings and the mighty" alluded to. The expression is extremely vague and might have many other references as well. To maintain this interpretation violence has to be done to xlvi. 7: "And their faith is in the gods which they have made with their hands." It would hardly occur to any person to regard this as "a strong expression for the idolatrous tendencies of the Sadducean court," unless it had to be fitted in with a date already settled on. Dr. Charles seems to feel this, for in the splendid edition of the Book of Enoch which he put forth in 1912 he suggests that the passage is corrupt. Further, the passage in which the Parthians are mentioned is treated as an interpolation. When corruption and interpolation have to be assumed in support of a proposition, doubtfulness, not certainty, is the result.

Perhaps the most interesting of all the questions raised by Dr. Charles is the significance of the term Son of Man in the Book of Enoch. Is it a title of the Messiah? Its first occurrence must be carefully noted. Enoch xlvi. opens as follows:

"And there I saw One who had a head of days,
 And His head was white like wool;
 And with Him was another being whose countenance had the
 appearance of a man.
 And his face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy
 angels,
 And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all
 the hidden things concerning that Son of Man, who he
 was, and whence he was, (and) why he went with the
 Head of Days?"

The fact that Enoch is the first to use the term Son of Man seems fatal to the contention that it is Messianic. Enoch wants to know who a certain being is, and whence he was, and styled this being Son of Man. If Son of Man is equivalent to Messiah, then Enoch knows that the being about whom he is inquiring is the Messiah. This seems extraordinary. Subsequently we find the

word "this" or "that" before Son of Man. Dr. Charles says that the demonstratives probably represent the Greek definite article. The word "probably" should be noted. But is not the demonstrative sufficiently explained by reference to Enoch's inquiry? This Son of Man means "this being you asked about."

A third objection against the Messianic significance of the expression Son of Man is that it is twice applied to Enoch himself. In Enoch lx. 10 we read: "And he said to me: 'Thou son of man, even thou dost seek to know what is hidden'"; and in lxxi. 14: "Thou art the son of man who art born unto righteousness." Dr. Charles regards these as interpolations. What about the interpolators? They knew the second section of the Book of Enoch and evidently did not regard Son of Man as a title of the Messiah.

A fourth objection may be based on Matt. xvi. 13: The writer of this verse cannot have regarded Son of Man as a Messianic title, because if he did, then Peter's confession is largely deprived of its significance, as it was almost put into his mouth. But the author of the First Gospel, according to Dr. Charles, knew the Book of Enoch and made great use of it. If so, his authority is against Dr. Charles's interpretation of Son of Man. This objection cannot be met by stating that our Lord's question is given correctly in either Mark or Luke, but not in Matthew. This may be perfectly true, but it has no bearing on the issue. The point is, that whoever wrote Matt. xvi. 13 did not regard Son of Man as a title of the Messiah, and whoever wrote Matt. xvi. 13 knew the Book of Enoch.

The foregoing discussion will at least show that the works edited by Dr. Charles are full of interest and worthy of the closest study. Undoubtedly they help us to understand many parts of the New Testament, but to affirm that our Lord and St. Paul studied any of them is to go beyond what the evidence warrants.

The Pseudepigrapha conclude with Fragments of a Zadokite work, a manifesto of a party described by Dr.

Charles as follows: A religious revival inside Judaism took place during the twenty years subsequent to 196 B.C. Its promoters, failing to secure many adherents, retired to Damascus and established a Covenant of Repentance under their Star or Lawgiver, whose precepts they were to observe until the arrival of the Teacher of Righteousness. From Damascus they returned to Palestine, proclaiming themselves the true Israel, the Temple to be their Sanctuary and Jerusalem their holy city. Four Orders—Priests, Levites, Israelites, and Proselytes—with a Censor, constituted the party. How long they lasted cannot be ascertained, but they probably formed a part of the great company of the priests mentioned in Acts vi. 7. The Zadokite work was written between 18 B.C. and 70 A.D, or possibly between 18 B.C. and 8 B.C. Its characteristics are: the placing of the Prophets on an equality with the Law, depreciation of David and his line, prohibition of divorce, rigid observance of the Sabbath, and the expectation of a Messiah, not from Judah, but from Levi and some other tribe.

The last of Dr. Charles's works is a valuable contribution to the history of religion and will command the attention of scholars.

That the two volumes under review will be very serviceable to students may be shown by simply referring to the index of any first-class commentary on a book of the New Testament published during recent years. There we shall find numerous references to the Apocrypha and especially to the Pseudepigrapha. It is a great advantage to have an easy way of looking up these references. What has been said of commentaries applies to many books on Biblical subjects. For example, the Rev. R. H. Alford has just issued a work entitled *Jewish History and Literature under the Maccabees and Herod*.⁴ In it there are many quotations

⁴ *Jewish History and Literature under the Maccabees and Herod*, by B. H. Alford, Longmans, 2s. 6d. net.

from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. For example, the teaching of the Book of Jubilees on angels, the festivals, the Patriarchs, and the last things is dwelt upon. Mr. Alford's book skilfully describes, in alternation, the principal events in Jewish history and the noteworthy writings that appeared during the hundred and thirty years before the Nativity. This meets a real want, because it is possible to find many a well-informed man unacquainted with Jewish history though well acquainted with Grecian and with Roman history. Mr. Alford's book abounds in useful knowledge, clearly conveyed, and deserves a wide circulation.

HENRY TODD.