

IS THE APOSTOLIC LITURGY QUOTED BY  
ST. PAUL ?

THE extant liturgies of the Church catholic are very numerous, and are preserved in many languages; yet may they all be collected and arranged in a few groups. Such groups are families, within which the members are united by the common possession of features derived from one parent type. But even the parents were originally related. Although the families are now very different in outward form, yet is it soon discovered by the attentive observer that they have all proceeded from some normal stock. The differences are not marks of distinct origin, but are the results of adaptation to local needs, in the use made by different revisers of the one common liturgical heritage. This common stock, which was the prototype of every extant liturgical form, we designate the *apostolic liturgy*. We cannot summarize its contents, but it must have contained whatsoever is common to the extant liturgies both of form and of expression. We cannot speak dogmatically of the age of these several common features, except to assert that they must have been accepted generally, not only before Christendom was rent by schisms, but even in the earliest days of the planting of the chief national Churches. History records no time when Antioch and Alexandria, Rome and Edessa, may have met to decide the form and order of their common celebration of the holy mysteries. The resemblances between the liturgies of these chief centres, in the essential features, must certainly be attributed to the labours of apostolic men, if not of the

Apostles themselves. They were imposed by the recognised authority of those who delivered the decrees and traditions to the first converts, and ordained the primitive elders.

Is that apostolic liturgy quoted in the New Testament? To such a question a complete answer cannot be given, because the apostolic liturgy is not before us in its entirety. While much has been added to the primitive form in the extant liturgies, it is also undeniable that much may have perished. There are many apparent quotations in the apostolic epistles which cannot be identified. They may be from liturgical forms not now extant. We know from Ephesians v. 19 that Christian hymns were already in use at that early date. From such canticles the passage in 1 Timothy vi. 15, 16<sup>1</sup> appears to be quoted. 1 Timothy iii. 16<sup>2</sup> reads like part of some profession of faith; still more does 1 Corinthians xv. 3<sup>3</sup> resemble the form of a primitive creed.

But, further, it must be allowed that the resemblances between passages in the extant primitive liturgies and in the apostolic epistles are numerous and striking. To give examples. The Epistle to the Hebrews was perhaps addressed to those Christians for whom the *Liturgy of St. James* was primarily intended: certainly in x. 19, 20<sup>4</sup> the author expressed himself in language which coincides in thought and even in terms with some phrases in the "Prayer of the Veil." Again, the "Prayer of the Oblation" in the same liturgy, and the passage from the Epistle to Titus (iii. 5, 6)<sup>5</sup> have remarkable affinities; while the liturgical words, "passing by and blotting out the handwriting that is against us, Thy suppliants," at once call

<sup>1</sup> "The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings," etc.

<sup>2</sup> "God was manifest in the flesh," etc.

<sup>3</sup> "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," etc.

<sup>4</sup> "Boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us."

<sup>5</sup> "Not by works of righteousness which we have done," etc.

to mind a similar passage in Colossians ii. 14. In the *primitive Liturgy of St. Mark*, one of the earlier prayers is very much like that remarkable passage in 1 Timothy ii. 1,<sup>1</sup> wherein St. Paul, in the manner of a "bidding prayer," gives direction how prayer should be made.

An obvious explanation of what has been observed is, that the compilers of the liturgies have quoted the apostolic writings; but many of these apparent quotations are probably echoes of teaching received from the Apostles or their immediate successors. Citations from the Old Testament there certainly are; it is not denied that there may be also quotations from the New Testament; yet much was derived from tradition rather than directly from written documents. Many and independent indications of antiquity suggest that the oldest portions of the primitive liturgies were in use at a period so early that some of the books of the New Testament were not yet in general circulation, even if already written.

But there is one liturgical passage which surpasses in interest any of those yet named, and indeed all others of the same class. In the Liturgy of St. James, which is the norm of one of the most numerous groups, or families, there are words which have been pointed to as the source of the quotation made by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians ii. 9: "But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." This view was unhesitatingly maintained by the late Dr. Littledale, who, with his colleague Dr. Neale, rendered such excellent service to Englishmen who are interested in catholic antiquities.<sup>2</sup> If this opinion can be accepted, it will not indeed

<sup>1</sup> "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers," etc.

<sup>2</sup> The early liturgies were the daily study of Dr. Neale for many years. He could repeat nearly all the text by heart. The opinions of such students certainly deserve respectful consideration.

follow that the whole office now extant as the Liturgy of St. James was composed before A.D. 60, but it will be strong evidence that the central parts of this office were in existence in St. Paul's days. Some prayers, and many expressions, have been added to the office in subsequent revisions; but it will not be denied that the liturgy in its essential features has come down to us in its integrity from very early times. If then St. Paul quoted from the body of the work, in writing to the Corinthians, the Liturgy of St. James was known, and had been committed to writing, in the first half of the first century.

But here it must be pointed out (and this has to some extent escaped observation) that the Liturgy of *St. Mark* might claim equal antiquity on the same grounds. In that office also the words are found, but not in the same context. They are in the *anaphora* in each office; but in the Liturgy of St. James they are in the oblation which follows the consecration of the cup, whereas in the Alexandrian office they are introduced into the prayer which follows the reading of the diptychs. They cannot be original in both liturgies, and it must be confessed that the passage in which they occur in St. Mark does not bear such distinct marks of originality as that in which they are found in St. James: hence it has been argued that they were quoted from the latter liturgy by some reviser of the former. Still of this there is no proof, and more reasonable is it to suppose that they were part of the words of that apostolic liturgy which was the parent of the several extant families. Whoever was the author of this poetical passage, its preservation was insured by the beauty and rhythm of the phraseology; and this also secured it a place both in the Jerusalem and Alexandrian offices, although in a different connexion in each. In the *Syriac St. James* however the words are not found. The significance of the omission cannot be fully estimated until the true relation of the last

named office to the *Greek St. James* has been determined. It is not the relation of original and version; rather would it seem that the Greek and Syriac offices represent two adaptations in two different languages of the primitive liturgy, which was originally compiled in the vernacular of Palestine, a dialect related indeed to the cognate Syriac, but not identical with it. We learn from Acts vi. that Christians were found amongst the Hellenists at a very early period; therefore a Greek liturgy must have come into use almost contemporaneously with that designed for the Hebrew Christians. Now if the later revisers of the extant *St. Mark* and *Greek St. James* did not quote from St. Paul, then it is certainly possible, at all events arguable, that St. Paul quoted from that primitive Greek liturgy whence were derived the present forms of the *St. Mark* and *Greek St. James*.

The passage in 1 Corinthians reads thus: Ἄλλα, καθὼς γέγραπται Ἄ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσε, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ [v.l. ὅσα] ἠτοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι αὐτόν. The introductory formula certainly suggests a biblical source. The term γέγραπται has borrowed a technical sense from its related noun. As γραφαί has become practically limited to *the book*, so has this particular tense of the verb come to be almost exclusively used in quotations from Sacred Writ. This general remark is true of the gospels and the epistles alike, but it will suffice now to limit observation to the *usus loquendi* of St. Paul. About this no doubt can be entertained.

1. In some thirty places where a citation is made, which is certainly from the Old Testament, and usually *verbatim*, such quotation is introduced by γέγραπται, with or without καθώς. That other quotations from the Old Testament are differently introduced has no bearing on the inquiry.

2. No one of the non-scriptural quotations in the Pauline writings is introduced in this way. For example, in Titus

i. 12 the words of the Cretan poet are not introduced by *γέγραπται*, but by *εἶπέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης*.

3. With the exception of the place in question, there is only one passage (1 Cor. iv. 6) where *γέγραπται* is not used with obvious reference to Scripture. The words are, *ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ὃ γέγραπται φρονεῖν*. But any allusion to secular, or even ecclesiastical, writings is improbable. We must (with Theophylact) understand a reference to the sentiments already committed to writing by St. Paul about divisions; or (with Bengel) to the general teaching of the Bible. In either case the passage will hardly be an exception to the Pauline *usus* of *γέγραπται*.

4. It is also to be observed that, amongst the quotations from the Old Testament introduced by *γέγραπται*, some are not literal citations of the extant Septuagint text. Take, for example, Romans xii. 19, *γέγραπται γὰρ Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος*, which appears to be a reference to Deuteronomy xxxii. 35, where however the Septuagint is *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω*.

5. Again, in 1 Corinthians xiv. 21 (“In the law it is written, ‘With men of other tongues and other lips’ . . .”) we may see that St. Paul would even unite a text from Deuteronomy xxviii. 49 with another in Isaiah xxviii. 11, 12, and yet under the common title of “written in the law”: unless indeed we suppose, in spite of the *ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*, that the reference is wholly to Isaiah’s words; for the resemblance is greater to those than to anything in Deuteronomy.

From these facts it would be reasonable to infer that the *γέγραπται* in 1 Corinthians ii. 9 introduces a quotation from Isaiah of words which are near enough to satisfy the conditions of the Pauline *usus citandi*; but on behalf of the liturgical origin of the passage, it has been declared that this quotation, “when tested by the Septuagint, proves to have only a superficial resemblance to it.”

The supposed original in Isaiah lxiv. 4 reads as follows: Ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἤκούσαμεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον [v.l. ἶδον, cod. A.] Θεὸν πλὴν σοῦ [A om. a pr. m. Θεὸν πλὴν σου], καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου, ἃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον. Also we have at lxv. 16 the words, ἐπιλήσονται γὰρ τὴν θλίψιν τὴν πρώτην, καὶ οὐκ ἀναβήσεται αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν. If St. Paul quoted from the Bible, it is almost certain that he employed the Septuagint. He was writing to the Greek-speaking Corinthians; and although for a special purpose he might have used a literal version of the Hebrew, this is not found to be the case here. At Isaiah lxiv. 4 the Hebrew, according to the Massoretic text, is: "And from old time they have not heard, they have not perceived with the ear, eye hath not seen, a God beside Thee, (who) acteth on behalf of him that waiteth for Him." The Vulgate changes the person: "Deus absque te, quæ præparasti expectantibus Te"; so the Peshitto—both have been corrupted by the Septuagint. As regards Isaiah lxv. 16 there is nothing in the Hebrew which would be the original of the ἀναβήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν; but in ver. 17 such Hebrew is found, where the Septuagint has οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν.

One solution of the difficulties connected with the *form* of the Pauline quotation would be to suppose that the Apostle quotes from some type of text other than either the original Hebrew or the Septuagint, in fact, from an Aramaic version, or even recension, a text of Isaiah such as probably our Lord read from in the synagogue at Nazareth. This view is not indeed to be rejected summarily. There are not wanting indications that a recension of the Hebrew, in many respects divergent from the Massoretic text, was in use in Palestine in the first century. A trace is found in the remarkable citation from Micah in St. Matthew ii. 6, where the prophet's words are given by the evangelist in a form different from either the Hebrew or the Septuagint of

Micah. This recension may even have been extant in a kind of *targum* in Aramaized Hebrew; but since we must at present confess almost complete ignorance of the text, of the extent, and of the circulation of the earliest Jewish targums, we can derive no assistance from that quarter towards the solution of the question before us.

If we look in another direction, it is interesting and significant to observe that none of the Fathers even hint that St. Paul quoted from a liturgical source, although the suggestion is made that the Apostle cited an apocryphal work, or some lost part of Holy Writ. But often the Fathers introduce the words among other texts without special remark. Chrysostom notices that the citation corresponds in sentiment with Isaiah lii. 15.<sup>1</sup>

The supposition that the passage was original in the primitive and apostolic liturgy would require the admission that, even in the days of St. Paul, the liturgy had been committed to writing. *Γέγραπται* must imply a written source. But no evidence has yet been produced to show that there were written liturgies in the first century. The words appear in the liturgies of *St. Mark* and *Greek St. James*, in all respects in the same way as do other quotations from the Bible. There is no difficulty in the supposition that the compilers quoted St. Paul: the contrary opinion involves many difficulties, and demands the assumption of positions not yet established. A third supposition, that the compilers and St. Paul both quoted Isaiah, and adapted his words in the same fashion, is clearly incredible.

On a review of the several arguments, we conclude that

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Jerome, *Ad Pammachium* (de opt. gen. inter.); Chrysostom, *On the Corinthians*, l.c.; Clement (Alex.), *Quis Dives sal.* xxiii., et sæpe; Cyril (Jer.), *Catech.* vi. 6; Origen ap. Tischend. *N.T.*, l.c., and *In Ierem.* xviii.; Hegeippus ap. Routh, *Rel. Sacc.* i. 219; Clement (Rom.), *Ad Cor.* i. 34, ed. Wotton, p. 144 and n.: and cf. *Poli Synop. Critt.* v. 351.

there is no evidence to justify our attributing the quotation in 1 Corinthians ii. 9 to any other source than the Old Testament. It is taken primarily from Isaiah lxiv. 4, but with a reminiscence of lxv. 16—two Septuagintal texts combined and adapted in the manner freely employed by the writers of the New Testament. The quotation is not made to establish a doctrine, but only for illustration. The apostle asserts that his words are in harmony with ancient utterances recorded in Holy Writ; and an allusion to two passages, each being part of a context which speaks of the coming blessedness that is to succeed the departing tribulation, is enough for his purpose. The phraseology is varied, but the meaning agrees with the sentiments of the prophet whom the Church has always known as the son of Amoz, but who is to the higher criticism only a vague and shadowy being, the "Great Unnamed."

It follows therefore that in the *Greek St. James* the words which are also found in 1 Corinthians ii. 9 are quoted from St. Paul; and if the most decisive of the supposed quotations turns out after all to be not derived from a liturgical source, it would be unreasonable to construct a theory of the antiquity of the primitive rites by the evidence of the other resemblances which have been already pointed out; for it would be difficult to refute the contention that they are quotations from New Testament writings made like others which are indubitably taken from the Old. And yet, as before suggested, the apostolic phrases and sentiments in the oldest parts of the earliest liturgies may be more directly derived than even by literal quotation from written documents. Where historical evidence fails, internal evidence will necessarily influence the conclusion. No Ritualist will imagine that the primitive rites need factitious arguments and unsupported assertions to enhance their claims as the earliest forms of Divine service. Ritualists will agree that, though St. Paul did not quote from one

of them in writing to the Corinthians, they still declare their antiquity by unimpeachable credentials. The arrangement, the sentiments, still more the very phraseology, all which are the common heritage of different Churches, can only have had their origin in the days of a Christendom which was still united both by adherence to a common faith and also by that constant intercommunion which ceased to be practicable when the territory of Christendom was extended. Rubrical directions which have long grown obsolete are the productions of a far off age. The prayers, which often allude to conditions only found in the earliest times of Christianity, are replete with thoughts and phrases that breathe the very spirit of the Apostles themselves. But to maintain the antiquity of a particular office, on the ground of a supposed quotation from it in an epistle which is admitted to be a genuine writing of the first century, is to support a true position by an untenable argument.

G. H. GWILLIAM.