

9-1-1965

Christ's Use of the Old Testament with Special Reference to the Pentateuch

Victor A. Bartling
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bartling, Victor A. (1965) "Christ's Use of the Old Testament with Special Reference to the Pentateuch," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 36, Article 47.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol36/iss1/47>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Christ's Use of the Old Testament with Special Reference to the Pentateuch

VICTOR A. BARTLING

In the preparation of this essay I was determined to let the Gospels give us the answer to Part I concerning our Lord's attitude toward the Old Testament. It seems to me that there is much that we can gain for our own guidance and inspiration from such a study. Part II deals with the question of the authorship of the Pentateuch. It is appended in the hope that it will help to put current discussions on the Mosaic authorship of the first five books of the Bible into a Biblical frame of reference.

I

CHRIST'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

In the first and, for me, most important part of this essay, I shall present a bit of the mass of material on Christ's use of the Old Testament contained in the Gospels as they lie before us. I underscore "as they lie before us." I am well aware that almost step for step the words of Christ recorded in the Gospels have been challenged as not being utterances of the "historical Jesus" and have been attributed to later "community construction" (*Gemeindetheologie*), with or without the guidance of the Paraclete, depending on the critic's presuppositions. My own presupposition in this essay is that in the Four Gospels we see and hear Jesus as God would have

us see and hear Him. This Jesus is as accessible to the plain layman as to the most finished scholar, perhaps even more so. According to the American Bible Society, by the end of last year the entire Bible had been translated into 228 languages, and parts of it into 1,202 languages and dialects. One or the other of the Gospels, usually (as on our New Guinea field) the Gospel of Mark, has been the form in which God's written Word has first begun to do its powerful work upon men and brought the incarnate Word before their eyes and ears. Waves of criticism will come and go, but the Gospels as they lie before us will continue to capture minds and hearts till the end of time. We may take note of the recent words of H. P. Van Dusen of Union Seminary:

Let us recall that the Reality which has served the Christian Movement as a determinative norm has not been the scholars' biography of Jesus, or the theologians' construct of Christ. It has been the figure portrayed in the Gospels. In every age, and not least our own, the plain man, picking up this plain tale in his pitiable ignorance of critical principles and theological presuppositions, has found himself gripped by a living man of history who not only stands out upon the records with remarkable clarity but reaches forth from the records to conscript the devotion of his soul.¹

(EDITORIAL NOTE: This essay was delivered to the joint meeting of District Presidents and theological faculties of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, Dec. 4, 1963.)

¹ "Liberal Theological Reassessment," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, May 1963, 354.

In preparing for the subject before us I have read and reread the Four Gospels in an edition of Nestle and put arbitrary symbols on the margin to characterize the various passages: quotations with introductory formulas; conscious quotations without such formulas; passages alluding in some way to the Old Testament; then reminiscences, conscious or unconscious, of Old Testament language. Nestle, as you know, is helpful in his use of heavy type for quotations as well as for allusions and reminiscences.

I might have used the Westcott-Hort edition which has, I think, gone farther than Nestle in this. Take, for example, John 1:51. Here Christ, speaking to Nathanael, represents Himself as the Reality of Jacob's dream-ladder (Gen. 28:12): "I say to you, you will see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." Nestle here does not employ heavy type, but Westcott-Hort's edition does distinguish the words "heaven" and "the angels of God ascending and descending" as derived from Genesis (LXX). The title "Son of man," too, might have been thus distinguished. This favorite name for Himself is used by our Lord some 70 times in the Synoptics. Its use is to be traced to Daniel 7, having there the idea of sovereignty, divine kingship; but in Jesus' use it is combined with the idea of suffering. He welds the Danielic concept with the Isaianic concept of the Servant of the Lord. One could almost say that in Jesus' self-understanding much of the Old Testament prophecy is concentrated in the two-word title.

Such concentration of whole blocks of Scripture in individual words and phrases is a frequent phenomenon in the *verba*

Christi. His people were people of one Book, just as He was; and so, no doubt, many Biblical associations would leap to the mind of His hearers as He spoke, associations that we with our multifarious reading of many books, newspapers, and journals can discover only by patient use of concordances. The mere mention of the word Scripture (γραφή) in a certain context, without any verbal quotation, might often have been enough in Jesus' days to bring home a lesson or clinch a point. Take, for example, John 7:38: "He who believes in Me, as the Scripture has said, 'Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water.'" Nestle has a note in his margin: "*unde?*" The reference, in all probability, is not to any special book or to any one isolated passage, but rather to the general tenor of such passages as are referred to by Nestle in his invaluable margin.

Similar to Nestle's "*unde?*" is his frequent "*in libro quodam?*" Take Luke 11:49: "Therefore also the Wisdom of God said, 'I will send them prophets and apostles, some of whom they will kill and persecute.'" Nestle asks in what book that saying is found. In the parallel of Matt. 23:34 Jesus says: "Therefore I send you prophets and wise men and scribes, some of whom you will kill and crucify." Here the Wisdom of God is interpreted as being essentially Jesus Himself. Where Nestle asks "*in libro quodam?*" (Luke 11:49), the RSV, prompted by Matthew's version of the *logion*, so it would seem, gives a reference to 1 Cor. 1:24 (Christ "the Wisdom of God") and Col. 2:3 (Christ, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom"). We shall waive further investigation of the problem of this specific *logion* and only add the reminder what a rich and

rewarding field of investigation opens to the scholar as he studies the quotations used by our Lord according to the Evangelists, employing in such study both the Hebrew and Greek Old Testaments and asking such questions: Do these quotations agree verbatim with either the Hebrew or Greek or with both or with neither? Which of them are free quotations? Which incorporate a measure of interpretation? How shall we account for variations in the form of the quotations as given by several Synoptic writers? And so forth.

A *lectio continua* of the Gospels from the point of view of the first part of the title of this paper—it can be done also with a translation—soon establishes that wherever one looks in the Four Gospels, in Mark, in the so-called "Q" material, in "special Matthew," "special Luke," or in most of the categories posited by Form Criticism, always and everywhere the Bible was for Jesus the Voice of God and absolutely authoritative. For our present purpose, therefore, we may take the relevant material wherever we find it. Such continuous pointed reading leaves one with the ineradicable impression that Jesus lived in the Scripture, that His thinking and speech was molded by the oracles of God. Jesus and Scripture: One cannot think of the one without the other. One is reminded of the blessed man of Psalm 1, whose "delight is in the law of the Lord and on His law he meditates day and night." Jesus must have done just that. One also thinks of that only glimpse we get of the boyhood of Jesus (Luke 2:41-52), the 12-year-old Galilean Lad sitting among the teachers in the temple halls, "listening to them and asking them questions" while they were "amazed at His understanding

and His answers." One recalls His reply to His mother's remonstrance: "How is it that you sought Me? Did you not know that I must be ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου?" Τὰ πατρὸς μου, "the things of my Father," that includes the Father's house; but it is more than that—it surely includes the Torah, the Father's Word. "My Father," He says, reverting to Mary's word "your father and I have been looking for you anxiously." It would seem that already so early in life He was finding in the Old Testament a movement divinely directed to Himself as the goal, as God's Son in a sense that no other man could apply to himself, and along with that there was dawning upon Him consciousness of a divinely given vocation in which He must (δεῖ) be engrossed in utter obedience. These are all accents that become increasingly pronounced in the *verba Christi* after the inception of His public ministry.²

JESUS AND OLD TESTAMENT EVENTS AND PERSONS

We should now like to give special attention to Jesus' mention of persons and events in the Old Testament narrative. We take them in their Biblical historical sequence. In Mark 10:6-9 (Matt. 19:4, 5) Jesus speaks of the beginning of creation, the primal pair: male and female, the two joined together so that they are no longer two but one. In John 8:44 there may be an allusion to the story of the Fall in the reference to the devil who was "a murderer from the beginning and has nothing to do with the truth." In Luke 11:51

² See the δεῖ-passages listed in Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 171.

(Matt. 23:35) the blood of Abel recalls the tragedy of Genesis 4. Noah, his days, his entrance into the ark, and the destructive cataclysm are referred to in the powerful passage on the Day of the Son of man (Luke 17:26, 27; Matt. 24:37-41). Abraham occurs in various connections, notably in John 8:33-59, where Jesus speaks of Abraham's true descendents, closing with the remarkable words: "Your father Abraham rejoiced that he was to see My day; he saw it and was glad. . . . Before Abraham was born (*γενέσθαι*), I am." In John 7:22 Jesus speaks of circumcision as originating not with Moses but with the patriarchs (alluding to Gen. 17:10-12). Sodom and Gomorrah occur in Matt. 10:15 (Cf. 11:23, 24; Luke 10:12). Lot, his exit from doomed Sodom, his wife are mentioned in Luke 17:28-32.

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are coupled together with many who shall come from the east and the west to sit at the table in the eschatological kingdom (Luke 13:28; Matt. 8:11). Moses as lawgiver and writer appears frequently in the utterances of Jesus (a point that shall receive special attention later in this essay). The Word of God that came to Moses at the flaming bush occurs in all the Synoptics in His debate with the Sadducees on the Resurrection: "And as for the dead being raised, have you not read in the book of Moses, in the passage about the bush, how God said to him, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? He is not the God of the dead, but of the living; you are quite wrong." (Mark 12:26, 27; Matt. 22:31, 32; Luke 20:37, 38)

The manna which nourished the fathers in the desert figures prominently in the

Bread of Life discourse that followed the feeding of the 5,000 in John 6. In John 3:14 the lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness becomes the type of the lifting up of the Son of man. David, the great ancestor of Jesus, appears only in two discourses of the Lord. First, he is mentioned in the Sabbath controversy which ensued upon the disciples' plucking and rubbing the grain on the Sabbath (Mark 2:23-28; Matt. 12:1-8; Luke 6:1-5). Jesus reminds His opponents how David and his men ate the "bread of presence" in the house of God which according to the letter of the Law only the priests could eat. Secondly, there is the highly significant reference to David in connection with His use of Psalm 110 in his parting assault on His opponents just prior to the Passion (Mark 12:35-37 and parallels). Solomon and his splendid wardrobe appears in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 6:29; cf. Luke 12:27) and then once again he is mentioned as the royal host of the Queen of the South. (Luke 11:31; Matt. 12:42)

The prophets Elijah and Elisha figure in Jesus' first sermon in His home synagog at Nazareth (Luke 4:25-27). Jonah appears in the same passage that refers to the Queen of the South (Luke 11:31; Matt. 12:42). Frequently the Lord speaks of the prophets in general, especially of the suffering of the true prophets of God and of Jerusalem's melancholy distinction of being the murderer of prophets (e.g., Matt. 5:11; 23:35 ff.; Luke 11:49 ff.). Luke alone preserves the reference to the contrary case, the popularity of false prophets (Luke 6:26). We close this section with one more passage, one already alluded to, Luke 11:49-51 (cf. Matt. 23:35 ff.): "Therefore also the Wisdom of God said,

'I will send them prophets and apostles, some of whom they will kill and persecute, that the blood of all the prophets, shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary. Yes, I tell you, it shall be required of this generation.'" The death of Zechariah here mentioned is described in 2 Chron. 24:21. Now, Chronicles comes last in the Jewish canon as we find it in our *Biblia Hebraica*. This *logion* of Jesus would seem to indicate that as early as His days the canon ended with Chronicles. If this is so, Jesus in this passage takes in with one sweep the whole course of Biblical history from the foundation of the world down to the end of His Bible; yes, He goes beyond this to "this generation," the generation amid which He lived and worked.

Is it at all permissible to ask whether Jesus uses the stories connected with these personages and events of His Bible as mere illustrations, without regarding them as facts? The question is raised because of widespread allegorizing practices of many when they handle these same data and, beyond that, the stories of the Gospels and the Book of Acts. We may grant that Jesus at times employs *ad hominem* elements in arguments in which He refers to Old Testament data; for example, in the Sabbath controversy in John 7:19-24. Jesus had healed the sick man at the Pool of Bethesda (5:1-6). It was a Sabbath Day, and the Jews were furious. In defending His action Jesus refers to the divinely instituted rite of circumcision. If a boy's eighth day fell on the Sabbath, he was unhesitatingly circumcised. "Are

you angry with Me," Jesus asks, "because on the Sabbath Day I made a man's whole body well?" Jesus was not giving a lesson in history about the origin of circumcision, but He meant to provoke them to honest thought about their inconsistencies with regard to Sabbath observance and to awaken in them some sense of the law of laws, that of love. A similar *ad hominem* element is seen in the reference to David's eating the "bread of presence." Again, this is not a lesson on an item of history, but it is an item of history to illustrate the heart of ethics. But even if our Lord employs such *ad hominem* elements, there is no reason to question His acceptance of the data as factually true.

Take the Book of Jonah. It has been variously explained as history, legend, allegory, parable, or mythology. The primary message is clearly that of God's universal grace: His interest and mercy extend far beyond the Jews to the whole human race. Was it fiction and merely parabolic to our Lord or was it taken by him as history? Let me read the passage as given by Luke (11:29-32; cf. Matt. 12:38-42): "When the crowds were increasing, He began to say, 'This generation is an evil generation; it seeks a sign, but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of Jonah. For as Jonah became a sign to the men of Nineveh, so will the Son of man be to this generation. The queen of the South will arise at the judgment with the men of this generation and condemn them, for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold, something greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of

Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here.'"

We note the juxtaposition of the Jonah reference and the account of the Queen of the South. The latter account is recorded in both 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles. Plainly Jesus regarded both accounts as historical. It is not first fiction, then fact; but fact and fact—not to teach a lesson in ancient history but to call the people to repentance in view of the coming Day of Judgment. Shall we suppose that Jesus means to say that "imaginary persons who at the imaginary preaching of an imaginary prophet repented in imagination" shall rise up to condemn the actual impenitence of His actual hearers on the *Dies irae, dies illa . . . quando Iudex est venturus?* I admit that many scholars interpret this Jonah reference differently.

Equally solemn is the setting of the references to Noah, to Sodom and Gomorrah, to Lot and to Lot's wife. Jesus appeals to the dreadful acts of God in history recorded in Scripture as a warning of what will happen when men refuse to repent. Jesus does not view these records as fiction, and He does not present them to His hearers as anything less than history.

Conscious quotations (especially from the Pentateuch, Psalms, Isaiah, and Daniel) are most frequently introduced by such telling formulas as γέγραπται, οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται, πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις ("it is written," "have you never read," etc.). Behind all His quotations, whether expressed or not, stands God, also when a human author is mentioned. In Mark 7, speaking of real defilement, He says in verse 9: "You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God in order to keep your tradition. For Moses

said: 'Honor your father and your mother' (the parallel in Matt. 15:4 substitutes God for Moses). Because, for Jesus, God stands behind the total Scripture, γέγραπται ("it is written") settles every controversy; γέγραπται repels the threefold attack of the Tempter; γέγραπται establishes every teaching of doctrine or ethics. There is no appeal from the γραφή to any other norm.

Since Jesus lived in the Word, it is natural that the words of Scripture came spontaneously to Jesus' lips at the supreme crisis of His life. In Gethsemane He says in the language of Psalm 42: "My soul is very sorrowful" (Matt. 26:38), and Psalm 22 in Hebrew seems to have been the meditation of the Crucified in those three terrible hours: "Eli, eli, lama sabachthani . . . I thirst." His dying utterance was very likely His regular bedtime prayer: "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit." (Psalm 31:6)

In much of this, His living in the Word, His appeal to the Word as the authoritative norm for all religious teaching, Jesus is our great Exemplar. And as teachers and preachers of the church we have pledged ourselves to that norm. But there was something in Jesus' own consciousness about the Scriptures that was specifically His own, something which not even Paul nor any other apostle nor any other church teacher of the past or present could have shared with Him. We have already alluded to this. Besides deriving much teaching material from the Old Testament and being aware that His teaching squared with Scripture, Jesus held to a conviction that went far beyond this: He regarded the whole Old Testament movement as a divinely directed movement, a movement that had arrived at its goal in Himself, so

that if He Himself in His historic person and work were taken away, the Old Testament would lose its purpose and significance. This none other could say. He was the confirmation and the consummation of the Old Testament in His own Person.

II

In the *verba Christi* recorded in the Gospels only four names appear as transmitters of God's Message to men as recorded in the Old Testament: Moses, Isaiah, David, Daniel. Counting parallel passages as a single instance, I find a total of only twelve *logia*: eight in which Moses is involved, two for Isaiah, one each for David and Daniel.

I shall list them for our convenience with enough text to enable us readily to identify the respective *logion*. For my own convenience I use the text of the English Revised Version as given by A. T. Robertson in his *A Harmony of the Gospels* (1922).

Moses

- 1) Mark 1:44 (Matt. 8:4; Luke 5:14): "Offer for your cleansing what Moses commanded." [See Lev. 13:49; 14:2-32]
- 2) Mark 7:10 (Matt. 15:4): "For Moses said [Matt., "For God said"], Honor your father and your mother, etc." [See Ex. 20:12; Deut. 5:16]
- 3) Mark 10:3-5 (cf. Matt. 19:7, 8): "Moses allowed a man to write a certificate of divorce. . . . For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment" [See Deut. 24:1]. N.B.: The following words from Gen. 1:27; 2:24 are not explicitly attributed to Moses.

- 4) Mark 12:26 (Matt. 22:32; Luke 20:37): "Have you not read in the book of Moses . . . 'I am the God of Abraham,'" etc. [See Ex. 3:6]. Matt. has: "Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?"
- 5) Luke 16:29: "They have Moses and the prophets"; v. 31: "If they do not hear Moses and the prophets."
- 6) Luke 24:44 "Everything written about Me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled" (cf. Luke's report, v. 27).
- 7) John 5:45-47: "It is Moses who accuses you, on whom you set your hope. If you believed Moses, you would believe Me, for he wrote of Me. But if you do not believe his writings (τοῖς ἐκείνου γραμμασιν), how will you believe My words?"
- 8) John 7:19 "Did not Moses give you the Law?"

Isaiah

- 9) Matt. 13:14 f.: "With them indeed is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah which says . . ." [See Is. 6:9, 10]
- 10) Mark 7:6, 7 (Matt. 15:7-9): "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites . . ." [Is. 29:13]

David

- 11) Mark 12:36, 37 (Matt. 22:43, 44; Luke 20:42-44): "The Lord said to my Lord." [Psalm 110:1]

Daniel

- 12) Matt. 24:15 (Mark 13:14): ". . . the abomination of desolation spoken of by the prophet Daniel . . ." (Mark

does not mention Daniel by name).
[See Dan. 9:27; 11:31; 12:11]

[Additional texts on "Moses and Scripture" outside of the *verba Christi*: Acts 3:22 ("Moses said: 'The Lord will raise up for you a prophet' . . ." [see Deut. 18:15]); 15:21 (Moses "read in the synagogues"); 26:22 ("saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses said would come to pass"); 28:23 ("trying to convince them about Jesus both from the law of Moses and from the prophets"); Rom. 10:5 ("Moses writes that the man who practices the righteousness . . . shall live by it" [see Deut. 9:4; 30:12]); 1 Cor. 9:9 ("written in the law of Moses . . . do not muzzle an ox . . ." [see Deut. 25:4]); 2 Cor. 3:15 ("whenever Moses is read a veil . . ."); Rev. 15:3 ("they sing the song of Moses").]

In going over the *verba Christi* and putting them into various categories I had, first, the overpowering impression of the indisputable authority accorded by Him to the γραφή; secondly, I was almost shocked at the unexpected paucity of reference to the human agents used by God in the γραφειν of His Word. The emphasis is unmistakably on the *Auctor Primarius*. This is reflected in the artless way in which the evangelists substitute "God" for "Moses." One is reminded of the same emphasis on divine causation and power in our basic text on "Inspiration," 2 Tim. 3:16: "All Scripture θεόπνευστος" "God-breathed," "ex-Spirated by God," "God-caused," hence "able to instruct for salvation," "profitable," to the end "that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work."

The question before us is: "Do the *verba Christi* compel the view that Moses is the

writer of the Pentateuch as it has come down to us?" Some say "Yes," with the qualification that someone else wrote the account of Moses' death in Deut. 34. Others answer that the evidence of the Dominical words is inconclusive on this point.

In the eight *logia* above in which Moses is mentioned, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 8 [cf. Rom. 10:15; 1 Cor. 9:9] speak of Moses as Law-giver. In No. 3 [cf. the two Pauline passages just referred to] "writing" is mentioned. According to No. 4, Ex. 3:6 can be read ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ of Moses, the extent of the specific book (definite article) is left undefined. (Compare Acts 3:22, where Moses is the one who speaks of the Greater Prophet in Deut. 18:15.) In No. 7 the Fourth Gospel records Christ's testimony that Moses wrote about Him and speaks of Moses' writings (γράμματα, letters, written words) over against the Lord's spoken words. In No. 5 we find the popular twofold division of the canonical books [cf. Acts 26:22; 28:23]; in No. 6 we have a threefold division. In such popular divisions of the Old Testament "Moses" need be no more than a *denominatio a parte fortiori* as, in the threefold division, "Psalms" is a *pars pro toto* for the *Hagiographa*. "Moses" even seems to stand for the whole Old Testament in Acts 15:21 and 2 Cor. 3:15, just as "Law" in the wider sense frequently stands for Holy Scripture generally.³

It is granted on all sides that the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch was held in the New Testament period by the Jews. "Philo (*Life of Moses*, iii. 39), Josephus (*Ant.* iv. 8,48), the Mishnah (*Pirqê*

³ See Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, p. 545, νόμος, 4 b., for a listing of passages.

Abóth i. 1), and the Talmud (*Baba Bathra* 14b) are unanimous in their acceptance of the Mosaic authorship. The only debate centered in the account of Moses' death in Deut. xxxiv. 5ff. Philo and Josephus affirm that Moses described his own death, while the Talmud (*loc. cit.*) credits Joshua with eight verses of the *tórá*, presumably the last eight."⁴

The *verba Christi* certainly acknowledge extensive material in the Pentateuch as actually Mosaic. They accord to all the Pentateuch divine authority. But, as I see it, they do not show that our Lord fully shared the view of Philo and Josephus that the whole of the five volumes from the first word to the last came from the hands of Moses.

The problem connected with the "authorship" of the Pentateuch, in which all five books are anonymous in their several entirety, had best be left in the hands of acknowledged Old Testament scholars about whose total commitment to the *sola Scriptura* principle there is no question. We shall listen to them and if they disagree on some conclusions we shall perhaps come to the conclusion that we still have unsolved problems on our hands and must wait patiently for further light, while we in the naiveté of faith shall continue to listen to the magisterial voice of God speaking to us in the Pentateuch as in all other parts of our Bible.

As an example of such competent Biblical scholarship working on the *sola Scriptura* basis, and yet arriving at some conclusions at variance with those of others who stand on the same basis, I refer

⁴ *The New Bible Dictionary*, ed. J. D. Douglas, 1962, p. 958.

to G. Ch. Aalders, professor of Old Testament in the Free University of Amsterdam, whose book *A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch* (London: Tyndale Press, 1949) has been very influential in discussions of the Pentateuch problem. He states that he "considers it an honor to profess his belief in the divine inspiration and entire trustworthiness of Holy Scripture and its supreme authority in all matters of faith and conduct" (p. 143). Prof. Aalders has condensed the argument of his book in an article on "The Historical Literature of the Old Testament" in *The New Bible Commentary*.⁵ From this article I cite the conclusion (p. 34):

Taking all these facts into consideration we find that there are two possible views on this question on authorship, both of which are held among conservative scholars. Some attach great importance to the fact that history knows nothing of any author other than Moses for this section of the Bible. It is allowed that there may have been some slight modification in the copying or translation and perhaps one or two small additions, in particular the account of Moses' death. But it is concluded that these five books were put into the form in which they have come down to us by Moses himself. This view is well put forward in Dr. O. T. Allis' work *The Five Books of Moses*. A slightly different view is that the book as we know it was compiled by an author at a somewhat later date (probably during the early years of the monarchy) who made use of extensive Mosaic literature together with some pre-Mosaic material. This thesis is worked out

⁵ Edited by F. Davidson, first ed., 1953, published in America by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.

CHRIST'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, ETC.

in detail in my own work, *A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch*. It is important to note, however, that in both cases it is maintained that the work was completed under divine inspiration and, as part of the Bible, is God's message to us.

CONCLUSION

Part II is really only an introduction to a very complex subject. This paper has by no means exhausted the study of the authorship of the Pentateuch. The question of the authorship of the Psalms, Isaiah, and Daniel should also be considered. However, I submit this paper to you for your study in keeping with my announced

purpose, namely to listen to God's Word on these topics.⁶

St. Louis, Missouri

⁶ Compare also the resolution adopted at the 46th Regular Convention of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, June 16—25, 1965, which states in part: "The Scriptures do not in so many words ascribe the human authorship exclusively to these men, but neither do they in so many words negate these conclusions. . . . [W]hile we uphold the importance of the human authorship of the Scriptures, even though the human author of each book cannot be ascertained, we recognize that divine authorship is the dominant factor in the origin of the Bible . . ." The *Proceedings* of the convention will be published in the near future by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.