

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 21—January, 1895.

I.

ORIGIN AND COMPOSITION OF GENESIS.

HISTORY OF THE CRITICISM TO THE RISE OF THE GRAFIAN HYPOTHESIS.

THE first book of the Bible, perhaps equally with the last, deserves the title of Revelation. The revelation of the past alone furnishes the key to that of the future. Genesis is second to no book of the Old Testament in its announcement of great truths. These truths are confessedly fundamental; hence the book itself is fundamental. During the last century and a half critics have been busy with it, as with other books of the Bible. They have started concerning it many questions which perhaps will long await an answer. At the same time, continuous and brilliant discoveries in the sphere of Biblical science are quickening the hope that the fascinating problem of the origin of Genesis in history is approaching a solution.

The true point of view in investigating the subject should be the scientific. By this we do not mean that, for the time, we should lay aside our faith in Christ or denude ourselves of every prepossession. Clearly that would be impossible, were it desirable. We simply mean that we should make an honest, and, as far as the circumstances will permit, a thorough study of the facts involved, and let the facts determine the conclusions reached. This might seem, perhaps, an unnecessary statement or at least a matter best assumed and left unsaid. Under some conditions this would be true; but so many assumptions enter into the critic's work, and the result is such a variety of types of criticism, that it has become customary

with Homilies. Such explanation of this is needed as will allow one to say, *e. g.*, whether thirty-four lines (Eng. trans.) have been subtracted from Rec. i. 9, (say) by Rufinus, or added to the History out of the Homilies.

But whatever may be the result of the fuller discussion of this Syrian form, which must come sooner or later, some things which give critical value will certainly stand. Chapters 2-11 of Book iii of the Recognitions, *e. g.*, which has been so long in dispute, is contained in the History; and so whether omitted in translation by Rufinus (as it probably was) or not, it belongs to the Recognitions, though absent from the majority of its MSS. Moreover, even if only a compilation, the work affords other important clues for the text of the Recognitions and Homilies which have not as yet been made use of in any edition.

PRINCETON COLLEGE.

ERNEST CUSHING RICHARDSON.

THE EARLIEST QUOTATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS SCRIPTURE.

THE position which I propose to maintain in this brief paper is that we have an express quotation of a passage of the Gospel of Luke as Holy Scripture in 1 Tim. v. 18. The whole verse is thus rendered in the Revised Version: "For the Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his hire." The punctuation makes it probable that the revisers did not regard the sentence, "The labourer is worthy of his hire," as forming a part of the Scripture here cited by the apostle. That the quotation of Scripture does not extend beyond the word "corn," they seem to indicate by placing after that word a full stop and not a colon (compare Acts i. 20). It may be that the whole body of revisers should not be accounted responsible for the interpretative punctuation employed in this case. But it is a fact that it represents the explanation of some of the best commentators. Even Calvin contends that, in the last clause, Paul "does not cite a testimony of Scripture, but a proverbial saying which common sense dictates to all." Indeed, we are sometimes cautioned against appearing in dangerous company by making Paul quote here the Gospel of Luke. Dr. F. C. Baur takes this view and employs it in the interest of his destructive criticism. And VanOosterzee does not hesitate to say that, if the formula "the Scripture saith" is here applied to Luke x. 7, the Tübingen school of critics is right in drawing from such a quotation a proof of the later composition of the First Epistle to Timothy. But we are persuaded that, in the course of this discussion, it will be seen that in so doing we are not playing into the hands of Dr. Baur and his party, but, on the contrary, are doing something to strengthen the internal evidence of the Pauline authorship of 1 Timothy.

It is of importance to note that the same remarkable Old Testament passage employed by Paul in 1 Tim. v. 18 as an argument (far-fetched in the eyes of rationalists) for ministerial support, is used by him for the same purpose and commented on in an earlier epistle, 1 Cor. ix. 9. There he quotes it as "written in the law of Moses." It is taken from Deut. xxv. 4. After justifying his application of the principle involved in it to laborers for Christ, he refers the Corinthians to the case of those ministering in the temple, who received a living for their service in it; and then he makes the declaration in ver. 14, "Even so did the Lord ordain that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." Meyer is undoubtedly right in understanding by the Lord here mentioned, the Lord Jesus Christ; and in holding that the apostle had respect to the utterances of Christ which we find in Matt. x. 10 and Luke x. 7. A similar appeal to an enactment which the incarnate Saviour ordained when on earth, and which is recorded in the Gospels, is made by Paul in 1 Cor. vii. 10. But the interesting and important point on which we would now fix attention, and which is of special value in interpreting 1 Tim. v. 18, is that Deut. xxv. 4, in its striking and peculiar allegorical application, was associated in Paul's mind with an express declaration of the Lord Jesus asserting the right of ministers of the Word to be supported. Now in 1 Tim. v. 18 we have the same words of the law of Moses, applied as in 1 Cor. ix. 9, and combined with the very words in which, according to the Evangelist Luke, Christ did actually declare the right of preachers of the Gospel to a maintenance. Such a combination of what Moses implicitly ordained in the Law with what Jesus Christ explicitly ordained in the Gospel, is what might be expected from Paul by those who remember what he had written in 1 Cor. ix.

We must not be kept from pressing the significance of this coincidence by the remark that Christ's words in Luke and Paul's identical words in 1 Timothy are the dictate of common sense. They are the dictate of common sense—a proverb—but in a particular application, which, as the history of the Church shows, has not been always allowed, and which needed to be enforced with the weight of our Lord's divine authority. There is a mighty difference in the effect produced when I read the saying, "The labourer is worthy of his hire," simply as a general moral maxim, and when I read it as the expression of the mind of the King and Head of the Church that His ministers should be suitably remunerated. And in arguing earnestly for ministerial support and inculcating its duty, if I could adduce this saying as thus used by Christ, I should feel that in giving it his sanction, and connecting it with His name and authority, I was fastening it on the conscience of every loyal Christian with a far stronger bond of obligation than if I merely repeated it as a commonplace of worldly morality. Now, we have satisfactory evidence, as has been shown, that Paul was acquainted with the words of Christ which are recorded in the Gospel of Luke and which are employed there by his divine Mas-

ter for the same purpose for which he himself employs them in 1 Tim. v. 18. We know, too, that he had them distinctly in his mind when pleading on a previous occasion the same cause. How then can we imagine that, in writing to Timothy on the same subject, he should have no thought of these words having ever been adduced and applied by Christ, and should think of them only as in use among men? This would be strange forgetfulness on the part of the apostle.

Suppose that the sentence, "The labourer is worthy of his hire," were found anywhere in the Old Testament. No one would listen to a commentator who should say that the apostle, in the verse before us, did not mean to cite this sentence as a part of the Scripture which he introduces by the formula: "The Scripture saith." It was a custom of ancient Jewish authors, and is a frequent usage in the New Testament, to run together two or more texts of Scripture taken from different places and to make them read almost as if they were one continuous quotation (cf. Surenhusius, *Biblos Katallages*, p. 45 sq.). As examples of such combination our readers may consult such passages as Acts i. 20, Rom. ix. 33, James ii. 23.* As in these places, so in 1 Tim. v. 18, two different passages appear clearly to be quoted as Scripture. Observe that the conjunction "and" follows the former of the two proof passages, indicating that the quotation of Scripture is not yet finished, but that more of it is to follow. Observe that when Deut. xxv. 4 is quoted in 1 Cor. ix. 9 it is preceded by the formula: "It is written in the law of Moses." But this formula is not retained in 1 Tim. v. 18. And yet, if the view which we antagonize is true, such a restricting formula would have been appropriate here, instead of the general one: "The Scripture saith." Paul could not quote Luke x. 7 as "written in the law of Moses." But does he quote it as *Scripture*? "Nothing *compels*" us to think so, says Huther. "It is not at all *necessary*" to do so, says VanOosterzee. Such forms of expression betray the consciousness of these commentators of their deviation from the natural exegesis. By the considerations adduced, we are forced to hold that Paul does here quote the Gospel of Luke as Scripture, just as Peter classes the Epistles of Paul with the Scriptures of the Old Testament (2 Pet. iii. 16).

The practice of quoting the books of the New Testament as Scripture must have been of early origin. Hilgenfeld, who now holds the leadership of the school of Baur, maintains that the epistle of pseudo-Barnabas was composed before the close of the first century. In that epistle we find Matt. xxii. 14 quoted as Scripture. The discovery lately of two Greek manuscripts of this epistle has exposed the futility of the attempts made to set aside the authenticity of the formula of quotation employed in it. We find it altogether credible that Paul was acquainted with the Gospel according to Luke. We

* In 1 Clem. xxiii the same usage is exemplified in the combination of Isa. xiii. 32 and Mal. iii. 1.

consider it incredible that he should not have known of it. Luke was the faithful and beloved companion of Paul. He was regarded by the early Fathers as having written his Gospel under the influence of that apostle. Internal evidence sustains this testimony. The Gospel of Luke was composed before the Acts of the Apostles ; and the way in which the narrative in the latter book closes shows that it must have been written before the death of Paul, and even before the end of his first imprisonment, and, therefore, before Paul wrote his First Epistle to Timothy. It is absurd to suppose that Paul regarded what God spake by His Son, when it was committed to writing, as less sacred than the record of what God had spoken by the prophets (1 Cor. xiv. 37 ; John xx. 31). Christ's spoken Word recalled to remembrance was for Paul divine and authoritative (1 Cor. ix. 14). Should we then be surprised to find the same Word when written recognized by him as Holy Scripture? (1 Tim. v. 18).^{*} We have only to add that the singular correspondence in the ideas expressed and in the use of the same places of the Law and of the Gospel, which we have shown to exist between 1 Tim. v. 18 and 1 Cor. ix. 9, 14, furnishes an impressive testimony to the unity of authorship of the two Epistles and deserves to be reckoned among the "undesigned coincidences" contained in Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

DUNLOP MOORE.

^{*} Even Matthew Arnold concedes that "at no time after the written sayings of Jesus were published can it have been *impossible* for a Christian to call them Scripture" (*Cont. Rev.*, March, 1875, p. 519).