

Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary

THE USE OF DEUTERONOMY 25:4 IN 1 CORINTHIANS 9:8-10

by

Matthew A. Postiff

Greek Exegesis of 1 Cor 8-16: 232, 9:25 A.M.

Dr. William W. Combs

December 7, 2004

### *Introduction*

The passage in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10 has been the subject of much debate. In the context, the apostle Paul is defending the right of gospel preachers to material support for their preaching. He uses a number of illustrations, appeals to the OT law and sacrificial system, and points to the message of the Lord Jesus Christ in supporting this right. In so doing, he quotes Deuteronomy 25:4, “Do not muzzle an ox while it is treading out the grain,” and subsequently asks two rhetorical questions, “Is it about oxen that God is concerned?” and ““Surely he says this for us, doesn’t he?”

To many interpreters, the expected “no” answer to the question shows Paul’s disregard for the oxen, and his misunderstanding of the law which seems rather to affirm God’s care for the oxen. The second question and its expected “yes” answer seems to indicate that Paul has ignored the plain sense of the original quotation from the Mosaic Law and made it allegorically speak of “us” instead of the oxen or farmers using the oxen. The trustworthiness of Paul’s use of the Old Testament is thus called into question. One writer states the ultimate problem this way: “It cannot be said that the inspiration the Bible teaches is of the verbal-plenary mold if the apostle erroneously handles the Scriptures.”<sup>1</sup> From this angle, the text in 1 Cor. 9:8-10 becomes a problem text begging for clarification from those who affirm the inspiration and literal interpretation of Scripture.

On one hand, this *negative* view of the situation consumes much space in the commentaries<sup>2</sup> and calls for a conservative response, which this paper provides. On the other hand, if we

---

<sup>1</sup> S. Lewis Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), p. 41.

<sup>2</sup> Indeed, Garland says, “How Paul interprets the passage about not muzzling an ox (Deut. 25:4) has drawn more attention from scholars than the point he draws from it.” See David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, in *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), p. 409.

can move beyond the question of inspiration and inerrancy, namely by understanding that 1 Cor. 9:8-10 does *not* reflect negatively on Paul or the veracity of Scripture, simply because all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,<sup>3</sup> then this passage presents a different challenge. We can look at the text for the *positive* indications it gives us about the proper handling of the OT to derive principles relevant to modern life. This certainly applies to the use of the OT in the NT, but also may bring light to our own understanding of OT texts that are not explicitly mentioned in the NT.

To carry this discussion further, consider the Bible's claim that all Scripture is profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness. Upon reflection, this may perplex the reader, who sees a mass of Old Testament material whose profitability in the present dispensation may not be entirely clear. Examples include the food laws, the sacrificial laws, and even seeming minutiae like the safety requirement of a parapet around the roof of a new home. These may defy our ability to discern contemporary significance. Certainly general principles like God's holiness are evident in the OT text,<sup>4</sup> but is there more for us to understand? Are there ways in which we can further understand the present-day significance of the OT text in a sound, conservative way which does not rely on finding hidden meanings in the text of Scripture? Can we see more of what our Lord spoke concerning Himself in "all the Scriptures"?<sup>5</sup> Can we understand how Paul could use a seemingly obscure text like Deut. 25:4 and apply it helpfully to his present situation?

---

<sup>3</sup> See 2 Tim. 3:16-17. Certainly this is a dogmatic assertion, one that will not be proven in this paper as it is abundantly clear from the Bible. Yet it is an assertion that is helpful to cast an entirely different and refreshing light onto the subject of Paul's use of the Old Testament. To believe this will spare us from getting bogged down as we look at the issues surrounding this text.

<sup>4</sup> For example, Lev. 11:44.

<sup>5</sup> Luke 24:27.

While these questions cannot be answered fully in this paper, it is hopeful that this examination of Paul's use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10 may shed some light on them. To deal with the negative side of the question, we will show that Paul does indeed use the Deuteronomy 25:4 passage in a straightforward, plain, literal sense. On the positive side, we will also examine some rubrics for discerning principles from the OT Scriptures based on our understanding of what Paul has done. This will require interaction not only with the texts in Deuteronomy and 1 Corinthians, but also with some material from the study of hermeneutics.

This paper is organized as follows. First, the context of the passage is discussed so that the passage can be located in the overall argument of the apostle. The text itself is presented after that with brief comments on textual and translation difficulties. Then, various approaches that have been suggested to handle the alleged problems with the text are outlined. Next, various details of the passage are considered and the author's approach to the text is formulated. The paper then discusses the relation of all of this to hermeneutics in general and draws some conclusions.

### *Context and Text*

#### Connection of 9:8-10 to Context of 1 Corinthians

By this point in the letter, Paul has dealt with a number of problematic issues that plague the church at Corinth, including divisions, sexual immorality, and legal disputes among the believers. He then takes up some issues that the Corinthians asked him about in a previous letter. In chapter 7 he deals with the concern of marriage. The section beginning at chapter 8 and running through chapter 10 is concerned with meat offered in sacrifice to idols and the eating of

that meat in idol temples.<sup>6</sup> Because chapter 9 falls in this section, it is necessary for us to examine it carefully so that the argument of chapter 9 can be placed into its proper context.

Apparently the Corinthians wanted to maintain their sumptuous temple diet, by arguing that idols were just wood and stone, and nothing more, because they *know* there is only one true God (8:4-6). They also based their behavior on their *rights* or *freedom* as believers (8:9). While they are technically correct in a sense, Paul argues from two vantage points that the Corinthian participation at the idol's temple is wrong.

First, it is wrong because of their unloving attitude and what it does to their Christian brothers. Their infatuation with knowledge and rights outweighed any desire for the edification of their fellow believers and in fact showed that they were simply being arrogant (8:1-2). They should have recognized that eating of food was a non-issue (8:8) and instead used their freedom to enhance the walk of other believers (8:13), including those who are "behind the times" in their scruples about participation with what seems to be the idolatry of their past (8:7, 10).<sup>7</sup> The Corinthians' "knowledgeable" participation (8:11) was causing these weak brothers to stumble back into idolatry (8:10-11). This, Paul teaches, is not the way of Christian love. Instead, it constitutes a sin against Christ (v. 12).

In other words, Paul lays out the first argument against their arrogant, self-centered attitude as a reason to stop their practice of participation in the idol's temple. But that is not the only

---

<sup>6</sup> I am basically following Fee in this section, who explains this section very well, and gives a well-researched definition of the term *ειδωλοquvtnw*. See Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, in *The New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), p. 357-491.

<sup>7</sup> We'll see shortly that those "behind the times" believers are not so out of touch, because Paul will show that the reality behind idols are in fact demons in 10:20. The scruples of the "weak" brother show that he understands or has an intuition about this connection, and so the "weak" as they are commonly labeled does not mean the same as "weak" of Rom. 14-15, where those weak brothers were wrongly informed about food and observation of special days. The weak brothers here are actually correct. The "strong" are wrong on the two counts outlined.

argument against their practice. Second, eating sacrificial meat in the temple is wrong because it is out-and-out idolatry and as such is totally incompatible with the Christian walk. This subject is taken up in chapter 10. The Old Testament example of Israel shows the dire consequences of idolatry and the need to flee from it (10:1-13). The fact that sharing in an idol's meal constitutes fellowship with demons is the climax of Paul's argument against the Corinthian practice (10:14-22). Finally, he explains why it is permissible in certain circumstances for them to purchase meat from the market and eat it in their own private homes, whether it *may have been* sacrificed or not. It is permissible because it does not constitute a fellowship with the idol (demon).<sup>8</sup>

Sandwiched in between these two sections is a chapter 9, which many commentators say is a digression.<sup>9</sup> Others suggest it is an example to the Corinthians of how Paul restricts his own freedoms for the sake of other believers in order to demonstrate how the Corinthians should restrict theirs.<sup>10</sup> Fee has ably shown that these traditional interpretations are not correct. He argues that the majority of chapter 9 does not seem to be an example.<sup>11</sup> Rather, chapter 9 forms an integral part of his response on the idol-food problem. He says:

[Paul] had earlier forbidden their attendance at the temples. They are challenging that prohibition, both by a set of theological arguments (8:1, 4, 8) and by calling

---

<sup>8</sup> Incidentally, this section shows that εἰδωλοκωτῶν is not simply "eating meat sacrificed to an idol." That was permissible. What was not permissible was "eating meat sacrificed to an idol *in the temple of the idol*." Otherwise, Paul's instructions may seem contradictory to his readers: "don't eat because it causes your brother to stumble and this is unloving" (8:1-13) and "don't eat because it is idolatry" (10:1-22) but "go ahead and eat without asking questions" (10:23-33). The key is eating *in the idol's temple*.

<sup>9</sup> See, for instance: Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians in Sacra Pagina*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), p. 357.

<sup>10</sup> See, for instance: R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1935), p. 355; F. W. Grosheide, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, in *The New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953), p. 200-201; John MacArthur, *1 Corinthians* in *The MacArthur New Testament Commentary* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1984), p. 200, 208; William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther, *1 Corinthians*, in *The Anchor Bible* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), p. 240; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, p. 409; S. Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New*, p. 42.

<sup>11</sup> Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 393.

into question his apostolic authority. From this response it would appear that the challenge came from two sources. First his failure to accept material support...[calls] into question his apostleship...Second, [he ate marketplace food] in Gentile settings, but declined when among Jews (vv. 19-22). Such vacillation does not seem worthy of an apostle.<sup>12</sup>

Paul vigorously defends his apostleship in order to show that he *does* have the authority to issue commands to them regarding their practice of eating idol-food (namely, to straighten up their attitude and to stop practicing idolatry). As an apostle, he argues that he is fully worthy of their material support, but that he has not used this right in order that he may go above and beyond the call of his stewardship. By so doing, he can also offer the gospel free of charge (9:15-18). In fact, in order to win as many to Christ as possible, he consciously modifies some of his behavior in different settings in order to avoid bringing unnecessary offense with the gospel (9:19-23). In other words, the Corinthians' view of Paul as a vacillating non-apostle is totally wrong. Rather, Paul is directed by a single-minded, self-disciplined purpose in his Christian life (9:24-27), and this kind of approach is what Paul enjoins on the believers, lest they fall like Israel did (10:1-6).

All of this prepares us to finally fit 9:8-10 into its immediate context. Paul shows that He is an apostle based on his witnessing the resurrected Jesus Christ, and the fact that the Corinthians became believers under his ministry (9:1-2). He thus defends his right, as an apostle, to material support, and does so along five lines (9:3-4). First, the other apostles and brothers of the Lord have that right (9:5-6); second, examples from everyday life, such as the soldier, farmer, or shepherd, show that, in each case, the worker must be paid for his services (9:7); third, Paul uses the example of the ox from the law to uphold the same principle, that even the animal of burden ought to be allowed to eat from its work (9:8-10); fourth, priests and other temple workers are

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 393.

supported by the offerings (9:13); fifth and finally, the Lord Jesus Christ Himself commanded support for workers in the gospel (9:14, presumably from Matt. 10:10 or Luke 10:7).

It is quite obvious on the surface what Paul is trying to convey—that as an apostle and gospel preacher, he has a right to financial support, just like the other apostles and temple-workers, and because of the command of the Lord Jesus Christ. This is consistent with the common sense approach that is found in military and agricultural endeavors. Indeed, it is in agreement with common decency and humane treatment such as that afforded to the ox for its labor.

We now turn to a more detailed study of our text.

#### Text of 1 Corinthians 9:8-10

The following translation closely follows that of the NIV, with a few minor changes as noted.

<sup>8</sup>Do<sup>13</sup> I say this merely from a human point of view?<sup>14</sup> Doesn't<sup>15</sup> the Law say the same thing? <sup>2</sup>For it is written<sup>16</sup> in the Law of Moses: "You shall not<sup>17</sup> muzzle<sup>18</sup> an ox while<sup>19</sup> it is treading out the grain." Is it about oxen that God is concerned?<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> mhV indicates that the question expects a negative answer.

<sup>14</sup> Greek kataV a[nqrwpon, "as a man" or "from a solely human perspective."

<sup>15</sup> ou\* indicates that the question expects an affirmative answer.

<sup>16</sup> Greek *gevgraptai*, perfect passive, "it stands written." It is often used in the New Testament for citations of the Old Testament.

<sup>17</sup> The future tense of *khmwvsei*" reflects the Qal imperfect form used in the general prohibition לֹא תִשָּׂא בִדְשָׁו in the Hebrew. I have translated it in English with "shall" to bring out this timeless quality of the command.

<sup>18</sup> Greek *khmwvsei*". Metzger points out that the reading *fimwvsei*" (initial two letters different) has stronger external support but that the Committee preferred the former on transcriptional grounds. See Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, second edition (Stuttgart, Germany: German Bible Society, 1994), p. 492. It makes little difference, because both mean *to muzzle*.

<sup>19</sup> The Hebrew has a prefixed infinitive construct form, בְּדִישׁוֹ, which can be interpreted with a temporal idea, "when it is threshing" or "in its threshing." It is a temporal participle in the Greek, a\*low'nta.



<sup>10</sup>Surely<sup>21</sup> he says<sup>22</sup> this for us, doesn't he? Yes,<sup>23</sup> this was written for us, because when the plowman plows and the thresher threshes, they ought to do so in the hope of sharing in the harvest.<sup>24</sup>

*Survey of Explanations of Paul's Use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10*

A myriad of interpretations has been offered for the three verses above, particularly as to how Paul thinks about the OT text. Some of the approaches deal primarily with the text in Deuteronomy and find in it a meaning that is not readily available on the surface of the verse itself. Others deal primarily with the method of Pauline usage of the Deuteronomy passage. This section outlines a number of those approaches. A short evaluation of each approach is given.

### Allegorical/Contradiction

In the allegorical interpretation, Paul is thought to abandon the original sense of the law and makes his own meaning in the epistle. He either did this either unconsciously or consciously. Hanson: "Did Paul use allegory in 1 Cor. 9:9? We may answer with some confidence: not consciously... The analogical use of it would be more familiar to Paul than the literal... But he has

---

<sup>20</sup> Again, mhV indicates that the question expects a negative answer. We could translate, "God is not concerned about oxen, is he?" The verb here is *mevlei*, which means to be a care, concern, source of concern, or to be of interest to someone. It can also mean to pay attention. See Walter Bauer, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., revised and edited by Frederick W. Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), s.v. "*mevlei*". Hereafter known as BDAG.

<sup>21</sup> Greek *pavntw*", to be discussed in detail later. This along with the expected negative answer to the first part of the previous question is a key to the interpretation of Paul's thought here.

<sup>22</sup> Note that the same verb is used here (*levgw*) as in verse 8; in the latter, the subject is "the Law;" in the former, it is understood to be "God." Paul does not hesitate in any way to indicate that what the Law says is exactly the same as what God says.

<sup>23</sup> Greek *gavr*, usually is translated "for" but in this case the context shows that it explains the previous question with an affirmative answer. Thus, it should be translated "Yes" or "indeed" or "surely."

<sup>24</sup> See Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, p. 492. He says that the shorter reading adopted here (*e\*lpivdi* twice, translated once in NIV) explains the longer readings in the TR and other MSS (*e\*lpivdi* three times: "that he who plows should plow in hope, and he who threshes in hope should be partaker of his hope.")

not reached the stage where the literal meaning has disappeared, as had happened a generation later. Formally, therefore, it is an example of allegory, but we may acquit Paul of deliberately designing an allegorical use of the text.”<sup>25</sup> Deissmann gives numerous examples that, in his view, constitute Paul using allegorical interpretation and doing “great violence of interpretation. Instances of such violence are, for example...the application of the words about the ox, which was not to be muzzled while threshing, to the Apostles.”<sup>26</sup> This allegorical method allowed the interpretation “to get beyond the letter” despite “the tyranny of the letter.”<sup>27</sup> Longenecker agrees: “1 Cor 9:9-10 is certainly allegorical.” Paul was “subordinating the literal sense and elaborating an additional meaning that spoke to the situation being addressed...In 1 Cor 9:9-10 he seems to leave the primary meaning of the injunction in Deut 25:4...to insist that these words were written for a reason not obvious in the passage itself.”<sup>28</sup>

These claims are weak on several counts. They suggest that Paul did not know what he was talking about or that he was mishandling the OT Scripture. A conservative view of the inspiration of Scripture cannot agree to either of these charges. Hodge agrees: “this is entirely foreign from the manner of the New Testament writers. They never argue except from the true historical

---

<sup>25</sup> Anthony T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), p. 166.

<sup>26</sup> Adolf Deissmann, *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*, trans. William E. Wilson (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), p. 102.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 102.

<sup>28</sup> Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, second ed (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), p. 109. See also J. G. McConville, *Deuteronomy*, in *Apollos Old Testament Commentary*, ed. David W. Baker and Gordon J. Wenham (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002), p. 369; Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, trans. James W. Leitch, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 154-5. Conzelmann says that Paul articulates the principle which is actually *contrary* to Deut. 25:4! Moffat writes, “For Paul, the literal sense of the injunction had no significance at all...” And then, as if to say that Paul’s allegorical method is not even up to par, he continues, “...it is one drawback of mystical or allegorical interpretations that, in extracting what is supposed to be the higher meaning of a text or incident, they often miss the profound, direct, significance of the literal statement.” See James Moffat, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938), p. 117.

sense of Scripture.”<sup>29</sup> Brewer argues that the allegorical approach is not well-founded because “of the approximately one hundred examples of exegesis which could be dated before 70 CE, not one used allegory, or even attempted to interpret anything other than the plain meaning of the text. If allegory was absent from rabbinic exegesis, it would not be surprising to find it absent from Paul.”<sup>30</sup>

### Proverbial

In this interpretation, the statement in Deut. 25:4 is to be understood as a proverb, much like “Don’t look a gift horse in the mouth.” While the literal meaning was the initial occasion for the proverb (evaluating the age of a horse by looking at its teeth), the proverb basically does not ‘mean’ that anymore. Rather, the proverb means “do not question the value of a gift.”<sup>31</sup> Similarly, “you cannot teach an old dog new tricks” is used in contexts far removed from where it originated. Zuck as well as Lowery take this approach by saying that Moses initially intended the statement to be a proverb that referred to humans rather than animals.<sup>32</sup> S. Lewis Johnson agrees to this possibility, but says that the statement may have become a proverb over time rather than initially being given as one.<sup>33</sup>

The weakness in this approach is the circumlocution needed to see this in the text of Deu-

---

<sup>29</sup> Charles Hodge, *An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), p. 158.

<sup>30</sup> David I. Brewer, “1 Corinthians 9.9-11: A Literal Interpretation of ‘Do Not Muzzle the Ox,’” *New Testament Studies* 38:4 (October 1992): 555-556.

<sup>31</sup> The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy, Third ed., 2002. Accessed December 3, 2004, available from <http://www.bartleby.com/59/3/dontlookagif.html>, Internet.

<sup>32</sup> See Roy B. Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation* (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1991), p. 263-265; also David K. Lowery, “1 Corinthians,” in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary, New Testament*, ed. John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck (Colorado Springs, CO: Cook Communications), p. 523.

<sup>33</sup> S. Lewis Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New*, p. 48-9.

teronomy. While the interpreters above would not ultimately deny the plain meaning of the statement (it being the basis of the meaning of the proverb), it takes several steps to get to the proverbial understanding which do not seem to be evident on a plain reading of the text.

### Human-Contextual

In this view, the context of Deuteronomy demands that the text about the ox be interpreted to refer to a person. This is because all the surrounding injunctions have to do with people (divorce, treatment of servants and the poor, fair punishment of criminals and their families, and the levirate marriage). The somewhat oddly-placed injunction about the ox gives the clue that an ox is not really an ox, but is rather referring to a laboring servant. The text is cast in light of ideas of fairness and dignity. Two commentators on Deuteronomy, McConville and Merrill, take this general approach, as well as Thiselton in his 1 Corinthians commentary.<sup>34</sup> This view is somewhat different than the proverbial view, not in the fact that the interpretation relies heavily on the context of Deuteronomy, but in that the statement was not originally intended as a proverb nor did it become one over time.

The weakness with this interpretation is at least threefold. Anyone reading the verse would understand it to refer to a real ox. Second, if Moses meant to speak of a laborer or other person, he would have done so plainly, just as he did in 24:12-15 and Lev. 19:13. Third, it can be questioned whether the context has any determining function. Craigie has pointed out that the passage “does not appear to have any particular relationship to its immediate context.”<sup>35</sup> In other

---

<sup>34</sup> McConville, *Deuteronomy*, p. 367. See also Eugene H. Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, in *The New American Commentary* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1994), p. 325. In addition, see Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, in *The New International Greek Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), p. 686.

<sup>35</sup> P. C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, in *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), p. 313.

words, it could just be (and likely is, in the author's estimation), a command without much context, somewhat like the Proverbs where there is a largely disconnected string of aphorisms.

### Rabbinic Legislative

Brewer argues for what he calls a literal interpretation of the Deuteronomy passage, and does so in a similar, though more complex way, than the *human-contextual* argument above. He says, "Paul does not mean to deny the literal observance of this Law, because his continuing argument will depend on its literal interpretation."<sup>36</sup> But to demonstrate the methodology of Paul's use of the OT here, he explains that Paul used rabbinic legislative argumentation to build a case for a new ruling<sup>37</sup> not explicitly set forth in the law.<sup>38</sup> To the question "Does God care for oxen?" Paul can expect a "no" answer because, according to rabbinic interpretation, the Deuteronomic command is simply one to be obeyed, not investigated as to whether it demonstrates mercy to animals.<sup>39</sup> In answer to the second question "Does he say it for our sakes?" the rabbis would say that the decree cannot be for animals, since animals are unreasoning and cannot read. The main point of the law is for man's benefit.<sup>40</sup> Therefore the answer to the second question is "yes." The statement at the end of verse 10 ("when the plowman plows...in the hope of sharing in the harvest") is construed as a loose citation of a mishnah to the same effect, which was a ruling derived from Deuteronomy 25:4 and 23:25-26. It relies on a legislative ruling from lesser to greater—

---

<sup>36</sup> Brewer, , p. 557.

<sup>37</sup> This Brewer calls a Halakah. Terry defines this term as legal exegesis that aimed "by analogy and combination of specific written laws, to deduce precepts and rules on subjects which had not been formally treated in the Mosaic Code." See Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics*, (Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1974), p. 607.

<sup>38</sup> Brewer, "A Literal Interpretation," p. 564.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 557.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 557-8.

how much more man ought to be able to partake of a crop if an animal is allowed to do so. Thus the ox is equated with any human laborer by rabbinic legislation.<sup>41</sup> Historically, Brewer argues, this was the way in which the Deuteronomy passage came to be seen as a standard text speaking of any laborer—not just an ox. Finally, Paul uses an argument from greater to lesser to argue for his support in the ministry—if he has done the important work of spiritual farming, it is not much for him to get a material harvest.<sup>42</sup> “In conclusion, the understanding that ‘ox’ in Scripture implied all labouring species was already well established by the time of Paul.”<sup>43</sup> Brewer also appeals to the neighboring texts in Deuteronomy (as in the *human-contextual* approach outlined earlier) to show that *ox* can be used to refer to people.

One weakness of Brewer’s argument is that the literal meaning to Paul was not what the text originally meant. The ‘literal’ meaning evolved over time as new legal precedent was set. Rabbinic legislation defined what the term ‘ox’ meant, and Paul ran with it. It seems that the ultimate and literal meaning changed from Deuteronomy to the time of Paul. So when Brewer argues for a literal interpretation of the text, his ‘literal’ is not as literal as we might expect upon a simple reading of the title of his work.

Another serious weakness of this understanding is that it depends on the historical development of Jewish exegetical procedures, which may not have any claim on the truth. Paul becomes hostage to the approach of the day, or worse yet, accommodates himself to the mode of argumentation of the rabbis in order to get his point across.<sup>44</sup> Terry says, “The study of the an-

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 561, 562, 563.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 559.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 564.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 555: “Paul too was willing to use whichever arguments his hearers would accept...”

cient Jewish exegesis is, therefore, of little practical value to the one who seeks the true meaning of the oracles of God.”<sup>45</sup> In fact, he goes on to point out, Jesus condemned “the current Halachic and Hagadic tradition of the elders, which in some instances nullified the commandments of God...”<sup>46</sup>

### Eschatological/Christological

This is probably the most complex of any of the approaches listed, but several interpreters surveyed in this paper do take this view. Included are Fee, Hays, and Snodgrass. The latter mentions several presuppositions regarding OT usage in the NT. Included is “eschatological fulfillment.” He claims that Christians saw themselves already in the end times and that the OT Scriptures, viewed in such a light were, “therefore, texts that were descriptive of the reality they experienced.”<sup>47</sup> Hays suggests much the same when he says, “Paul claims that the text addresses the church of his own time directly, in an oracular fashion, metaphorically instructing them to provide financial support... This is for Paul not a derived sense of the text, but its fundamental meaning, now eschatologically disclosed.”<sup>48</sup>

The weakness of this position is that it imports meaning into the OT text from the later eschatological age. It has no controls on the meaning of the OT text. For instance, Fee says, “Paul’s whole view of the OT was conditioned by his new eschatological existence in Christ. In saying that God is not (now) concerned for the oxen but for us, Paul reflects the same eschato-

---

<sup>45</sup> Milton Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics*, p. 609.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 629.

<sup>47</sup> Snodgrass, “The Use of the Old Testament in the New,” in *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*, ed. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2001), p. 209-229. He includes 1 Cor. 9:10 in this category.

<sup>48</sup> Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians*, in *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997), p. 151.

logical view of the OT expressed in 10:11.”<sup>49</sup> While he later tries to avoid saying that God is not concerned for animals, the change in meaning of the OT text seems to indicate that God’s concern for animals has changed over the years. It is not clear how much it has changed or if any thread of it remains.

#### Lesser-to-Greater

This interpretive approach is a very common suggestion,<sup>50</sup> arising in one form or another in many of the other interpretations. But we will call it out here specifically. Often called the *a fortiori* argument,<sup>51</sup> this approach says that since oxen are due such care in the law, men are due similar care for their labors, they being much more important than oxen. Chrysostom says, “Why does Paul mention this, when he could have used the example of the priests? The reason is that he wanted to prove his case beyond any shadow of doubt. If God cares about oxen, how much more will he care about the labor of teachers?”<sup>52</sup> Calvin agrees: “But anyone who will pay closer attention to this, will realize that there is more force about this text, in which the Lord asks us to care for cattle, for from this it can be seen, by inferring from the less to the greater, that, when He wants the dumb animals to be treated well, He requires much greater equity to be shown by men in their dealings with each other. When he says that ‘God does not care for the oxen’, we must not misunderstand him, as if his intention is to put oxen outside the providence of God, since

---

<sup>49</sup> Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 408.

<sup>50</sup> See Jack S. Deere, “Deuteronomy” in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary, Old Testament*, ed. John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck (Colorado Springs, CO: Cook Communication), p. 306; Hodge, *First Corinthians*, p. 157-158. Lesser-to-greater is denied by some. See Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 408 as well as C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper, 1968), p. 206.

<sup>51</sup> From Latin, “for a stronger reason.” It means “all the more: said of a conclusion that follows with even greater logical necessity than another already accepted in the argument.” See David B. Guralnik, ed., *Webster’s New World Dictionary*, Second College Edition, Prentice Hall Press, 1986, s.v. “a fortiori,” p. 24.

<sup>52</sup> As quoted in Gerald Bray, *1-2 Corinthians*, in *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament*, Vol. VII (Downers Grove, IL: 1999), p. 82.



God does not neglect even the tiniest sparrow.”<sup>53</sup>

Such an argument from lesser to greater is used throughout the Scriptures, if not in 1 Corinthians. First, God does indeed care for animals (Job 38:41; Psalm 36:6, 104:14, 104:21, 104:27, 145:9; 147:9); in fact, He even cares for the plant kingdom (Matt. 6:28-30). Second, men are supposed to have the same disposition toward animals (Prov. 12:10). Finally, the Lord Jesus specifically compares the value of animals to man in a lesser-to-greater way (Matt. 6:26, 10:29-31; Luke 12:6-7, 24) in order to demonstrate that God cares even more for mankind than He does for animals.

The lesser-to-greater argument is basically sound, and certainly not opposed to the next and final method of interpretation, which attempts to maintain the OT text in its plain, literal sense.

#### Literal/Principlal

Kaiser strongly opposes any effort to take Paul’s usage of Deuteronomy in some non-literal sense.<sup>54</sup> He says, in appealing to Godet,<sup>55</sup> that the context of Deuteronomy 24 and 25 shows that the main point was “not for oxen alone but to develop gentleness and gratitude in their owners... Thus it was not so much for animals as it was for men that God has spoken.”<sup>56</sup>

This is different than the *human-contextual* view because in that view the ox stands in place of a person, but in this view, the ox is an ox and the principle is extracted that a certain attitude is be-

---

<sup>53</sup> John Calvin, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, in *Calvin’s New Testament Commentaries*, trans. John W. Fraser (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), p. 187.

<sup>54</sup> See Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., “The Current Crisis in Exegesis and the Apostolic Use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10,” in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 21:1 (March 1978): 17. About the middle of the page he lists all the wrong approaches to 1 Cor. 9:8-10.

<sup>55</sup> Frederic Louis Godet, *Commentary First Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977), p. 439.

<sup>56</sup> Kaiser, “Crisis,” p. 13, 14.

ing enjoined on the hearers of the law. “Paul has not given a different meaning or a secondary and hidden sense to the Mosaic command. He has expertly taken from its temporary wrapping a permanent principle, as Moses intended.”<sup>57</sup> All of this is based on Hirsch’s classic distinction between meaning and significance, which Kaiser quotes. That distinction is as follows:

*Meaning* is that which is represented by a text; it is what the author meant by his use of a particular sign sequence; it is what the signs represent. *Significance*, on the other hand, names a relationship between that meaning and a person, or a conception, or a situation, or indeed anything imaginable...Significance always implies a relationship, and one constant, unchanging pole of that relationship is what the text means. Failure to consider this simple and essential distinction has been the source of enormous confusion in hermeneutic theory.<sup>58</sup>

In this case, the meaning is simply “do not muzzle the ox” which engenders an attendant gentle and caring attitude. The significance in connection with ministers is that they ought to be supported, as Paul clearly points out. Fee has some of this meaning/significance distinction in his explanation as well.<sup>59</sup>

This is the most acceptable of the views offered because it maintains a distinction between the meaning of a text and its (potentially many) applications or significances while at the same time not divorcing the meaning from the application.

#### *Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 9:8-10*

In this section we will make a more detailed examination of the three verses under consideration. Recall that Paul has already made the point of his right to support through two series of rhetorical questions—one series regarding the other apostles (9:5-6), and another series about

---

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>58</sup> E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), p. 8.

<sup>59</sup> See Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 408, where in point (2) he speaks of what the law *originally meant* versus what it *means*, that is, its *application*. I would not make the distinction “meant versus means” since what the text meant *is* what it means.

everyday examples such as the farmer (9:7). A third series of questions with several declarative sentences interspersed makes the same point from the Mosaic Law (9:8-10).

#### Verse 8

Verse 8 functions as a transition from the “less authoritative” examples of the previous verses. The first rhetorical question in this verse—“Do I say this merely from a human point of view?”—is intended to be answered with a no. In other words, Paul is claiming that his word is not just “the word of man.” With the second rhetorical question—“Doesn’t the Law say the same thing?”—Paul claims that his word is in fact the same as “the word of God.”<sup>60</sup> The point is that the message which is conveyed in vv. 5-7 is consistent with the teaching of the Law, which Paul will expound in the next couple of verses.

The two questions are actually one which is split in the translation to bring out the force of what is intended. The second portion informs the meaning of the first so that the phrase “according to man” is seen to be the opposite of “the Law.” Two possible bases of authority are thus contemplated. One base of authority is man, while the other is God. This is because from Paul’s perspective, what is written in the Law is indeed the very word of God Himself.<sup>61</sup>

It is important to note that with this phrase, without even looking to the next verse, we would expect that Paul is about to appeal to and explain a portion of the Law that supports what he is saying. We can watch to see *how* he makes use of the Law to support his point. In the next verse he more fully specifies where he gets his source material—the Law of Moses. This is the Pentateuch. Of course, we know that the upcoming quotation is from Deuteronomy though the particular location is not specified by the apostle.

---

<sup>60</sup> See also 1 Thess. 2:13.

<sup>61</sup> Notice how “he” (referring to God) speaks these things in v. 10.

But in light of the surrounding context, how can Paul make an appeal to the Mosaic Law? Does not he say just 12 verses later in 9:20 that “I myself am not under the law”?<sup>62</sup> Is the law a valid authority (as here) or is it not (as it seems in 9:20)? Is it binding on the Corinthians but not on Paul? What is going on here?

A dispensational and systematic approach to the Bible is necessary to correctly answer this question. Twice in chapter 10 Paul tells us his approach to the law and the other parts of the OT—they form examples for us, and serve to admonish us to avoid the evil actions others took. Rom. 15:4 supports this by saying that the things written in the OT were for us to learn from and gather comfort and hope. Not only this, but for the Christian there has been a decisive break from the Mosaic Law as a system, and from the law-type of arrangement in general (Rom. 7:4; John 1:17). With this brief background, it is possible to properly handle the upcoming reference to the Law. It has to be that Paul is using the law in a principial form, i.e. in a way that recognizes it is “out of mode” yet speaks in ways which teach us and cause us to avoid the wrong course of action. It is something from which we can learn, take examples, and find comfort, even though it is not still in effect.

#### Verse 9

A clear formula is used at the beginning of this verse in order to point out a quotation from the Mosaic Law. As is common in the NT,<sup>63</sup> the perfect tense passive verb **gevgraptai** is used to indicate the past yet at the same time permanent character of what was written by Moses.

---

<sup>62</sup> This phrase is missing from the MT. The critical apparatus in UBS4 has an impressive list of witnesses supporting this reading. In any case, numerous other places in the NT make clear basically the same point (Rom. 6:14, 7:6; Gal. 3:19, 5:18).

<sup>63</sup> See Matt. 2:5, 4:4, 4:6, 4:7, 4:10, 11:10, 21:31, 26:24, 26:31, among at least 50 other occurrences in the NT.

It was written, and still stands written.

Based upon this formulaic introduction to the OT quotation and in particular the use of the perfect tense, it is not valid to say that the law *says* something now different than what it *said* when originally written. Why? Paul's explanatory clause "For it is written in the law of Moses..." indicates the past character of the law equals the present character of the law. Compare with verse 8, in which the law "says" (present tense). Or verse 9, in which God "says" these things (present tense). The law "said" and "still says." For Paul, it is evident that what the law *meant* is precisely what it still *means*. It embodies the same principles now as it did when it was given. There is no notion here that the law gains an extra meaning simply because we are in a new age. Perhaps additional *applications* do come to light with new and different circumstances (i.e., the need of support for gospel ministers), but not additional *meanings*. The principles that Paul draws from the law were there and available all along. We could draw the same principles out ourselves.<sup>64</sup>

Literally the quote reads, "You shall not muzzle the ox in its threshing." The NIV adds "the grain" which is neither in the Hebrew original nor the Greek quote but serves as an aid to understanding for those not familiar with this farming process. A quotation from the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia will help to explain the threshing process to those of us who are not familiar with it:

Threshing-floors are constructed in the fields, preferably in an exposed position in order to get the full benefit of the winds...The floor is a level, circular area 25 to 40 ft. in diameter, prepared by first picking out the stones, and then wetting the ground, tamping or rolling it, and finally sweeping it. A border of stones usually

---

<sup>64</sup> It is freely admitted that we do not have the same "revelatory stance" as the inspired authors, nor with the authority that they have in making commands, and this is certainly a limitation which is not possible to overcome. Our job here is not to show that we can always draw out the principles of every OT text, but instead that it is reasonable in this particular case or ones like it to expect that we could do so.

surrounds the floor to keep in the grain. The sheaves of grain which have been brought on the backs of men, donkeys, camels, or oxen, are heaped in this area, and the process of tramping out begins. In some localities several animals, commonly oxen or donkeys, are tied abreast and driven round and round the floor. In other places two oxen are yoked together to a drag, the bottom of which is studded with pieces of basaltic stone. This drag, on which the driver, and perhaps his family, sits or stands, is driven in a circular path over the grain... The supply of unthreshed grain is kept in the center of the floor. Some of this is pulled down from time to time into the path of the animals. All the while the partly threshed grain is being turned over with a fork. The stalks gradually become broken into short pieces and the husks about the grain are torn off. This mixture of chaff and grain must now be winnowed. This is done by tossing it into the air so that the wind may blow away the chaff.<sup>65</sup>

Muzzling the oxen during this process would prevent them from being able to eat from the threshed grain as they worked. Doing so is not feasible in the long run as the animals need to eat to have enough energy to work, and it is not kind to muzzle the oxen in any case. Anyone who has owned a horse, for example, will know that when you put the horse in an enclosed pasture, he will quickly eat the choicest plants, such as the alfalfa. Any similar plants that are growing just outside the fence he will reach through the fence to eat them. But to put some under his nose and take it away before he can grab it basically amounts to taunting. So with the oxen—working in close proximity to some nice food, such as the grain being threshed, the oxen will want to partake. There is an issue of fairness here—to make the oxen work so hard and then deprive him of any benefit is not fair and kind treatment of the animal.

The participial form **a\*low'nta** is temporal and indicates that the muzzling is not to be done *during* the oxen's working period. The command is thus not simply trying to convey the idea that the oxen need to be fed at some point during the day, but that they are to be fed specifically during the time of their threshing activity. Presumably threshing would take many hours of

---

<sup>65</sup> James Orr, *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), s.v. "Agriculture," 1:77.

arduous labor in pulling a drag round and round the threshing floor. The oxen is to be fed, therefore, out of its own hard work and in the midst of it.

### The Two Questions in 9:9-10

UBS4 joins the last phrase of verse 9 and the first phrase of verse 10 as a single question. Other editions of the Greek NT split this into two questions<sup>66</sup> and that is how most English translations have it.<sup>67</sup> Left as one question, the text would read something like this: “Is God concerned about oxen—or doesn’t he doubtless say these things for us?” The juxtaposition of the two statements is important, for we are to understand the first relative to the second and not separately, because of the “or” (Greek *h]*) that connects them. It is not that Paul expects two answers, one which denies God’s care for oxen, and the other which denies the literal meaning of the OT text. Rather, there is one expected answer—agreement with Paul’s notion that the text can be relevantly applied to the present situation. He expects a “Yes, I agree that the point of that text applies in this situation.” The comparative force of the two clauses in the question might then be better brought out with a translation like “Is God concerned *only* about oxen—or does he say these things for us just as certainly?”<sup>68</sup>

We will henceforth consider the questions separately for purposes of examination, understanding that they are actually a single question.

---

<sup>66</sup> Hodges’ MT and the TR punctuate the last phrase of verse 9 and the first phrase of verse 10 as two separate questions. See Zane C. Hodges and Arthur L. Farstad. *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*. Second ed., Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1985; Trinitarian Bible Society, The. *Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, The New Testament: The Greek Text Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611*. London: England, Trinitarian Bible Society, undated (but it was published in 1976).

<sup>67</sup> See KJV, NKJV, NASB, NIV, for instance.

<sup>68</sup> The word *only* is used in the translation of verse 9 by the Amplified Bible, Expanded Edition. See the Comparative Study Bible (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999).

### *The Meaning of pavntw" in the Second Question*

Much of the debate mentioned earlier centers around the word pavntw" in verse 10. If it means "entirely" or "altogether", then it seems to deny any care of God for the oxen. Instead, it means "certainly" or "surely" so that the comparative sense of the two questions is highlighted as suggested above.<sup>69</sup> Collins offers the helpful suggestion of "really" for pavntw". In other words, "Doesn't he really speak for our sake?"<sup>70</sup> Otherwise, "this would make the apostle assert that the command in question had exclusive reference to men."<sup>71</sup>

It is simple to dismiss any interpretation that attributes to Paul a deprecating attitude toward the OT law and its statements. This is because there can be no contradiction in the Bible since it comes from God, it is inspired, inerrant, etc. Therefore, the context of the question itself, as well as an understanding that Paul does not contradict earlier Scripture in some arbitrary way, demands that we take an interpretation such as given by Bauer, "or is he (not) certainly speaking in our interest?"<sup>72</sup>

### *The Principle of the OT Injunction*

No hermeneutical gymnastics are required to save Paul from denying God's concern for the animal kingdom, or the literal import of the OT law, though many have exercised themselves with such. In fact, the literal understanding of the law is necessary to Paul's argument. The oxen are the workers, the grain is the support, and to muzzle the ox is to withhold proper support.

---

<sup>69</sup> Note that we strongly disagree with Brewer, "A Literal Interpretation," p. 556, fn. 15, who says regarding the use of pavntw", "it still leaves the question as to why Paul wrote in such a dangerously ambiguous manner."

<sup>70</sup> Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, p. 328.

<sup>71</sup> Hodge, *First Corinthians*, p. 158.

<sup>72</sup> BDAG, s.v. "pavntw'", p. 755-756.



Without the plain meaning, there would be no point or illustration on which Paul could rest his argument.

Note that to the Israelite, this command simply meant, “don’t muzzle the ox.” It did not speak of human laborers, no matter how much interpretive effort is expended trying to describe the command in some non-literal way. It really does refer to animals! It was not proverbial in the sense of the “gift horse” example given earlier—something which many readers of this paper have never experienced and thus know the original meaning only remotely. The activity of threshing was a very common one to the Israelite and so the statement would not be proverbial in the least—it would speak to an actual and common situation.

This OT law was designed to teach the Israelites a level of compassion for their working animals, such that they would not withhold the proper support from them. Anyone with this attitude truly engrained into their conscience would not think to treat a person in a worse fashion than his animal. It is not that the Deut. 25:4 text speaks of humans, but rather it teaches a disposition in the heart of the hearer toward animals, which disposition carries over into a caring concern in many other situations. If you asked such a person if they would withhold wages from their human laborers, they would be horrified—of course they would not do that. Note that this is not technically an argument from lesser to greater, though such an argument is not totally foreign to the case. Instead, it argues that the plain teaching regarding the ox should be so second-nature that it is a governing disposition in the behavior of the person in all kinds of situations.

#### Verse 10

The point of this verse is to call the attention of the Corinthians to the present relevance or application of the law just cited. Some interpreters take the reference to “us” to be to the apos-

tle and others of his ilk,<sup>73</sup> while other interpreters understand this in a more inclusive sense to include the Corinthians or the church or men in general.<sup>74</sup> I am inclined toward the latter, because the command was directed toward those potentially doing the “muzzling” and that would correspond to the Corinthians in this case, i.e. that Paul (the “ox”) has a right of support from the Corinthians (the “farmers”).

#### *The Meaning of ο@τι in 1 Corinthians 9:10*

Next, the application is stated very plainly, and that is that the plowman and the thresher should be able to share in the result of their labors. Note that the figure has shifted from oxen to people now. The application is still given in agricultural terms. There is little doubt as to what Paul means.

There is, however, some question as to the function of the ο@τι in context (“*because* when the plowman plows...” . Kaiser summarizes: “Three different ways of rendering this word have been suggested: (1) in a declarative or explicative sense, giving the substance of the Deuteronomy command in different words...(2) in a recitative sense, introducing a quotation from a non-canonical source...(3) in a causal sense, giving the reason why God gave this figurative command.”<sup>75</sup> He concludes that, because the point is the previous quotation (not a new one), and that the Deuteronomic command has nothing to do with plowing *per se* (it has to do with *threshing*), that the last option is the only feasible one.

---

<sup>73</sup> Fee, *First Corinthians*, p. 407, fn. 53. See also Deissmann, *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*, p. 102.

<sup>74</sup> Hays, *First Corinthians*, p. 151. The difference between the Corinthians themselves and the wider targets is not important for our discussion.

<sup>75</sup> Kaiser, “Crisis”, p. 15.

### The Message of the Section

The gospel ministry is like farming. Paul uses the farming figure in another prominent place, 1 Cor. 3:6-8, where he likens himself to a planter and Apollos to one who waters. In the same way, 9:8-10 has one plowing and one processing the harvest. The farming analogy is used in many other places in the Bible as well. The Lord Jesus Christ appealed to his disciples to pray for workers who would go out to work in the spiritual harvest of men's souls (Matt. 9:36-38). The harvest is large and much work needs to be done, if only we would have eyes to see it (John 4:35-38). In pointing to the diligence and hard work necessary to the pastoral ministry, Paul uses the same analogy in 2 Tim. 2:6, "The hard-working farmer ought to be the first to receive his share of the crops."

Paul has thus extracted for us the principle of the OT text. The disposition enjoined in the command itself suggests that the farm owner would not withhold the "hope" of the harvest from the one who does the initial work of plowing, nor of the later work of threshing to get the final product.

The connection to the present situation of Paul and his readers is what has befuddled interpreters. But the connection is just the fact that the gospel ministry is like farming. This connection is made explicit in verse 11: "If we have sown spiritual seed among you, is it too much if we reap a material harvest from you?" The figure shifts now from real farming (9:10) to spiritual farming (9:11).

Note that the connection between the OT law then and the present situation is distanced by a step in between. The OT law is not speaking directly about gospel ministers!<sup>76</sup> Rather, it is

---

<sup>76</sup> Contrary to Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 205-6. Somewhat incredibly, he says there, "The only interpretation that is not forced is that in the Old Testament law God had in mind not oxen, but Christian preachers and their needs. This does not mean that Paul would have denied the truth...that God

speaking about the requirement of a kind disposition toward animals. This disposition then works out (is supposed to work out) in other areas of life as a kind disposition in general, particularly toward the support of any kind of worker, in this case the plowman and the thresher. These who work right alongside of the oxen are due at least the same kind of care. Next, the analogy is shifted from physical farming to spiritual farming. Then, as the final step (9:11), an argument from greater to lesser is used to show that it is no stretch to understand the support of a gospel minister. His support is not even of the same quality as the work he does: he does eternal spiritual work, yet all he asks is some measly material support.

Thus if you grant the principle in the law that a kind attitude toward a working animal translates into a kind attitude toward people in general, and that this implies a requirement to support those who work,<sup>77</sup> then Paul should be able to receive some support which is of lower value than his work. The oxen works on grain and gets grain; the plowman and the thresher work on grain and get grain; the apostle works on the immortal souls of men and gets ... grain, basically.

It is clearly the case from this line of argument that the apostle ought to receive material support. In fact, if the Corinthians disagreed with Paul initially, they would have to be embar-

---

is concerned even over the fall of a sparrow; but it was quite different truth that he found in the Old Testament and expressed here.” In other words, the plain meaning of the text is true, but only by virtue of other Scriptures to a similar effect.

<sup>77</sup> John Calvin, *First Corinthians*, p. 187-88 has the same basic idea in his interpretation: “But what Paul actually means is quite simple: though the Lord commands consideration for the oxen, He does so, not for the sake of the oxen, but rather out of regard for men, for whose benefit even the very oxen were created. Therefore that humane treatment of oxen ought to be an incentive, moving us to treat each other with consideration and fairness... God is not concerned about oxen, to the extent that oxen were the only creatures in His mind when He made the law, for He was thinking of men, and wanted to make them accustomed to being considerate in behaviour, so that they might not cheat the workman of his wages. For the ox does not take the leading part in ploughing and threshing, but man, and it is by man’s efforts that the ox itself is set to work. Therefore, what he goes on to add, ‘he that plougheth ought to plough in hope’ etc., is an interpretation of the commandment, as though he said, that it is extended, in a general way, to cover any kind of reward for labour.”

rassed if they honestly face the argument that Paul gives here. They can plainly see now that he has the right to support, and (as he will later say), he is kindly not using or abusing that right, and does not want to start now. In the end, it can be seen that Paul is indeed an apostle worthy of support and one who has the authority to command them in regard to their temple attendance.

### *Related Passages*

There are two other Bible passages that are related to 1 Cor. 9:8-10. They will now be examined briefly.

#### 1 Timothy 5:18

The 1 Timothy text is related to the 1 Corinthians 9 passage in that it also quotes Deuteronomy 25:4. The same problem prevails in 1 Timothy regarding the use of Deuteronomy 25:4 as has been discussed with 1 Corinthians—the difference is that no rhetorical questions are asked about the verse in 1 Timothy. The intended meaning is just as clear here as in 1 Corinthians 9, that the pastor is to receive compensation for his work, particularly if it is well done.

#### Luke 10:7, Matthew 10:10

The 1 Timothy 5:18 passage also quotes our Lord's words in Luke 10:7 (or Matthew 10:10) that "the laborer is worthy of his wages." The parallel use of Deuteronomy and Luke is exploited by commentators in their expression of the doctrine of inspiration to prove that Paul considered Luke's writings on par with Deuteronomy as *Scripture*.<sup>78</sup> That is certainly true, and so the Lord's words are tied in with Deuteronomy in such a way that we are made to understand that Paul saw Jesus as making an application of Deuteronomy, at least implicitly. In other words,

---

<sup>78</sup> For examples, see Paul Enns, *The Moody Handbook of Theology* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1989), p. 164-5, 172, 259 and also William W. Klein, Craig L. Blomberg, and Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1993), p. 60, 88.

there was no doubt that the principle of ministerial support which Paul draws from Deuteronomy is in harmony with the mind of God.

### *Hermeneutics of Old Testament Usage in the New Testament*

In this section our goal is to address some of the positive side of the question (how can we better understand other OT texts and their application to our present situation) instead of focusing on the negative side (how can we justify Paul's use of the OT in 1 Cor. 9:8-10).

#### General Hermeneutical Guidelines

In the interpretation that has been presented above, the principle of the single-meaning of Scripture has been assumed. It is axiomatic to any use of language. As Terry says, "the moment we admit the principle that portions of Scripture contain an occult or double sense, we introduce an element of uncertainty in the Sacred Volume, and unsettle all scientific interpretation..."<sup>79</sup> Multiple meanings implies there is no meaning.

Furthermore, it is important to maintain, as has been shown above, that what the Scripture means today is precisely what it meant when it was written, that is, that the single meaning just defended does not change over time. 1 Cor. 9:8-10 seems to assume and rely upon this truth.<sup>80</sup> Without this controlling principle, a text can be made to say anything with the passing of time, just like it can be made to say anything if there are inherently multiple meanings to it.

---

<sup>79</sup> Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics*, p. 383, quoted in Kaiser, "Legitimate Hermeneutics," in *Inerrancy*, ed. N. L. Geisler (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979), p. 135-6. (The edition of Terry used by Kaiser is apparently different than the one available to me, as the page number does not match.)

<sup>80</sup> Gordon D. Fee and Douglas Stuart, *How to Read the Bible for All Its Worth* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993), p. 26: "A text cannot mean what it never meant. Or to put that in a positive way, the true meaning of the biblical text for us is what God originally intended it to mean when it was first spoken."

### Method of Extracting OT Principles

One of Brewer's main complaints was that earlier authors had made statements of their understanding of 1 Cor. 9:8-10, but had not offered a general methodology by which to ascertain how the Deuteronomy text (and presumably any other text) could have its principles or applications properly extracted.<sup>81</sup> That is to say, what is the method that we can use in order to answer the positive question that we set forth earlier in this paper—namely “How do we get at the *right* significance and be sure about it, and not just what we *think* is the right significance?” This is a difficult question indeed.

As a start, note that McCune offers several guidelines for discerning what he calls “continuing principles” which are principles of God's revelation from earlier dispensations that still hold in a later dispensation. The example studied in this paper certainly constitutes such a case. There are three guidelines that can be stated positively and one that must be stated negatively.<sup>82</sup>

#### *Positively*

First, the principle is a continuing principle if it is clearly stated or restated in the later dispensation. For instance, nine of the ten commandments are restated. Conscience and civil government are still operative (Rom. 2:15; 13:1-7). The example in 1 Cor. 9:8-10 falls under this category because Paul explicitly states the principle of paying the laborer for his work—there is no guesswork about it.

Second, the principle is a continuing one if it is based on the nature of God. Capital punishment is based on God's image in man (Gen. 9:6), and the subordination of men to women is

---

<sup>81</sup> Brewer, “A Literal Interpretation,” p. 555.

<sup>82</sup> The outline of the next three sections is from Rolland D. McCune, “Systematic Theology I” (class notes, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, Fall 2002), p. 59-60.

based on the economic Trinity (1 Cor. 11:3).

Third, the principle can be seen to be a continuing one if it is based on the natural created order. For instance, the fact that women are not to be preachers (1 Tim. 2:12-14) or that homosexuality is wrong (Rom. 1:26-27) are valid continuing principles.

### *Negatively*

Finally, the fourth guideline for discerning continuing principles is that the principle does not cause a conflict of some sort with a clearly revealed principle in the later dispensation. For instance, the example of the railing around a roof (Deut. 22:8) does not violate any NT principles. The restrictions on membership in the assembly of Israel, however (Deut. 23:1-3) could never be imposed on the church in the NT (James 2:1-6; Gal. 3:28; Eph. 2:11-18; Col. 3:11). The example of Deut. 25:4 certainly satisfies this guideline.

### *Form of Continuing Principles*

McCune also lists the various forms that continuing principles may take. These include the continuation of ordinance (marriage), a rule of life (civil government), result of judgment (the fall and curse), or the continuation or anticipation of an ordinance during a dispensational transitional period (temple activities in the book of Acts, or the Passover observance before the Law was given in Exodus).

For 1 Cor. 9:8-10, we perhaps should add another form, namely, the continuation of a principle that flows out of an earlier injunction (Deut. 25:4). In this sense, the continuing principle is somewhat “modified” since it is not directly the same as the earlier command.

### *What About When the Bible Does not Specify*

Given a principle we can use the above guidelines to evaluate it in light of OT and NT



revelation. The principle Paul gives us in 1 Cor. 9:10-11 obviously satisfies all the guidelines. In this sense, however, the problem is mostly solved already. It is relatively easy to see how to “rationalize” the principle given the two endpoints—namely the OT command and the NT statement of the derived principle. Much of the literature on 1 Cor. 9:8-10 over the years has been occupied with this very endeavor—to explain what happens between the endpoints.

The real problem lies in those instances where the NT is silent and we do not even have a candidate principle to evaluate: in other words, the second endpoint is missing. We need to come up with the principle ourselves.<sup>83</sup> The guidelines above are really only for *evaluation* of candidate principles but not *derivation* of them (see particularly the fourth guideline). In our case study, the question would be (if the NT did not mention or use the principle of Deut. 25:4) “what legitimate principle(s) can be derived from Deut. 25:4?”<sup>84</sup>

In such cases, other questions arise. How much “distance” is acceptable between the OT teaching and the candidate principle before the principle becomes too far-fetched? Or how little distance can there be before the principle or application is too close to a law which conflicts with the NT? To what extent can “principle derivation” be taught in a systematic form? Or is it more “caught than taught?”

For instance, we can revisit the text in Deut. 22:8. This text says, “When you build a new house, then you shall make a parapet for your roof, that you may not bring guilt of bloodshed on your household if anyone falls from it.” A candidate principle would be “adequate precautions must be built in so that carelessness does not result in loss of life.” This seems to be fairly

---

<sup>83</sup> Of course, we include the illuminating work of the Spirit of God. Without Him, none of the principle-discovery work discussed here is possible.

<sup>84</sup> This is similar to the general homiletical problem of how to generate legitimate application for the hearers of a sermon. The candidate principle generation problem is dealing with more general statements as opposed to more specific applications.

“close” to the purpose clause of the original statement. It may work out, by direct application, as railings on a deck, or (with somewhat more distance), as an electrical safety code that must be carefully followed. What about food handling to avoid potential food poisoning? There is quite some additional “distance” here between the OT text/principle and its application.

*Guidelines from 1 Corinthians 9:8-10*

Unfortunately, to answer the *general* question laid out above is outside of the scope of this paper. The goal set forth at the beginning was to see if we could answer the more *specific* question of what we can be learned from the apostle’s approach to the understanding of the OT.

First, note that Paul did not rely on the Deut 25:4 passage alone, though he certainly could have done so under the inspiration of the Spirit. He had four other arguments for his case—and two of those were references directly to Scripture. The example of the Levites and the command of the Lord Jesus are certainly convincing. Thus, a healthy comparison of Scripture with Scripture will serve to keep us from deriving wrong principles.

Second, note the respect with which Paul appeals to the OT. He does not, as we have shown, depart from the literal understanding of the OT text. He has expertly extracted the timeless principle from that text without changing the meaning of it. A literal understanding of the OT is essential to limit our principle-derivation to those principles that really derive from the text.

Third, Paul firmly holds to the exemplary and exhortational functions of the law in the present dispensation (as shown from the wider context of 1 Cor. 10 and elsewhere in his writings). From this fact we could expect that principles for us do indeed exist from the earlier revelation. We need not despair that they are impossible to derive, because the Scriptures were given to us with at least that purpose in mind.

Finally, Paul is committed to the notion that the Law does not change in meaning over time, i.e. that meaning is *stable*. What the Law meant when it was given is precisely what it means today. This significantly simplifies the problem of deriving principles, since we do not have to first find out how the meaning evolved over time,<sup>85</sup> and *then* derive principles from that “meaning history”. We can focus on the single meaning of the earlier revelation and get right to the task of deriving principles.

### *Conclusion*

This paper dealt with two challenges related to Paul’s use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10. The negative side of the question was focused on Paul’s alleged misuse or abuse of the OT text. The paper showed by a critical examination of the main interpretive approaches and a careful exegesis of the verses that Paul does indeed use the Deuteronomy 25:4 passage in a straightforward, plain, literal sense. The principle he draws from it is valid for all time and is not new to the present age. The OT law, though out-moded in a sense for the Christian, is still relevant in another sense, namely in its exemplary and exhortational character.

The positive side of the question focused on the examination of Paul’s methodology in order to discern some ways to successfully draw principles from the OT Scriptures. While none of us has the advantage of being carried along by the Holy Spirit (2 Peter 1:19-21), Paul’s statements regarding the purpose of the OT scriptures gives us assurance that we can draw principles from them. His examples of literal use, stable meaning, and his appeal to multiple texts to confirm the principle are also helpful. Further work on the positive side of the question is necessary to better specify how to derive principles, and to show examples.

---

<sup>85</sup> We saw the example before in Brewer, “A Literal Interpretation” where the rabbinic history of the interpretation had to be understood before anything else could be done. This is not at all necessary.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott-Smith, G. *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*. Edinburgh, Scotland: T&T Clark, 1936. Paperback edition 1999.
- Archer, Gleason L. *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Gregory Chirichingo. *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1983.
- Aland, Barbara, et al. *The Greek New Testament*, Fourth Revised Edition. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft and United Bible Societies, 1998.
- Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Revised and edited by Frederick W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New York: Harper, 1968.
- Bock, D. L. "Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 142 (July-September 1985): 209-223.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 143 (October-December 1985): 306-319.
- Bray, Gerald. *1-2 Corinthians*. In *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament*, Vol. VII. Downers Grove, IL: 1999.
- Brewer, David I. "1 Corinthians 9.9-11: A Literal Interpretation of 'Do not Muzzle the Ox,'" *New Testament Studies* 38:4 (October 1992): 554-565.
- Bruce, F. F. *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Calvin, J. *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. Calvin's New Testament Commentaries. Translated by John W. Fraser. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. In *Sacra Pagina*, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Comparative Study Bible. (Contains NIV, Amplified, KJV, and NASB). Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999.

- Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Combs, William W. *Greek Exegesis of 1 Cor 8-16*. Class notes, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, Fall 2004.
- Craigie, P.C. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. In *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Deere, Jack S. "Deuteronomy." In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary, Old Testament*. Edited by John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck. Colorado Springs, CO: Cook Communications, 1985.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*. Translated by William E. Wilson. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Ellis, E. E. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.
- Enns, Paul. *The Moody Handbook of Theology*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1989.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. In *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Douglas Stuart, *How to Read the Bible for All Its Worth*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993.
- Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. In *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Godet, Frederic Louis *Commentary on First Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977.
- Griffiths, P. "The Sensus Plenior Vs. Authorial Intent." Seminar in Hermeneutics, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, April 6, 1986.
- Grosheide, F. W. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. In *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953.
- Guralnik, David B., ed., *Webster's New World Dictionary*. Second College Edition. Prentice Hall Press, 1986.
- Hanson, Anthony T. *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Hays, Richard B. *First Corinthians*. In *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997.
- Hirsch, E. D. *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.
- Hodge, Charles. *An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

- Hodges, Zane C. and Arthur L. Farstad. *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*. Second ed., Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1985.
- Howe, F. R. Review of *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, by Anthony T. Hanson. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 133 (April-June 1976): 179-180.
- Ironside, Harry A. *Addresses on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1958.
- Jamieson, Robert, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown. *A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- Johnson, E. "Author's Intention and Biblical Interpretation." In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy and the Bible*. Edited by E. D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- Johnson, S. Lewis. *The Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980.
- Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. "A Response to Author's Intention and Biblical Interpretation." In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy and the Bible*. Edited by E. D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Peter H. Davids, F.F. Bruce, and Manfred T. Brauch. *Hard Sayings of the Bible*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Legitimate Hermeneutics." In *Inerrancy*. Edited by N. L. Geisler. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Current Crisis in Exegesis and the Apostolic Use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10," in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 21:1 (March 1978): 3-18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1985.
- Kalland, Earl S. *Deuteronomy*. In vol. 3 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelain. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.
- Klein, William W., Craig L. Blomberg, and Robert L. Hubbard, Jr. *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1993.
- Lenski, R. C. H. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1935.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Second ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Lowery, David K. "1 Corinthians." In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary, New Testament*. Edited by John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck. Colorado Springs, CO: Cook Communications, 1983.

- MacArthur, John. *1 Corinthians*. In *The MacArthur New Testament Commentary*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1984.
- MacDonald, William. *Believer's Bible Commentary*. Nashville: TN: Thomas Nelson, 1995.
- Mare, W. Harold. *1 Corinthians*. In vol. 10 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "The Problem of New Testament Exegesis." In *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 17:2 (Spring 1974): 67-73.
- McConville, J.G. *Deuteronomy*. In *Apollos Old Testament Commentary*. Edited by David W. Baker and Gordon J. Wenham. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002.
- McCune, Rolland D. "Systematic Theology I." Class notes, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, Fall 2002.
- Merrill, Eugene H. *Deuteronomy*. In *The New American Commentary*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. Second ed. Stuttgart, Germany: German Bible Society, 1994.
- Moffat, James. *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy. Third ed., 2002. Accessed December 3, 2004, available from <http://www.bartleby.com/59/3>, Internet.
- Nicole, Roger. "New Testament Use of the Old Testament." In *Revelation and the Bible*. Edited by Carl F. H. Henry. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958.
- Orr, James. *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
- Orr, William F., and James Arthur Walther. *1 Corinthians*. In *The Anchor Bible*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.
- Pratt, Richard L., Jr. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. In *Holman New Testament Commentary*. Edited by Max Anders. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2000.
- Radmacher, E. D. "A Response to Author's Intention and Biblical Interpretation." In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy and the Bible*. Edited by E. D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984. p. 433-437.
- Ramm, Bernard. *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, Third Revised ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970.

- Snodgrass, Klyne. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New." In *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*. Edited by David Alan Black and David S. Dockery. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2001.
- Sprague, Peter. "An Evaluation of the New Testament's Use of the Old Testament." Seminar in Hermeneutics, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, Spring 1984.
- Stanley, Christopher D. "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations in the New Testament." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Terry, Milton. *Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.
- Thayer, Joseph H. *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1977, based on the fourth edition published by T&T Clark 1901.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. In *The New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Trail, Ronald. *An Exegetical Summary of 1 Corinthians 1-9*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1995.
- Trinitarian Bible Society, The. *Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΦΗΚΗ, The New Testament: The Greek Text Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611*. London: England, Trinitarian Bible Society, undated (but it was published in 1976).
- Waltke, B. K. "Is it Right to Read the New Testament into the Old?" *Christianity Today*, September 2, 1983, p. 77.
- Wilderspin, John F. "The Hermeneutics of NT Writers in Their Use of the OT." Seminar in Theology, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, April 22, 1986.
- Zuck, Roy B. *Basic Bible Interpretation*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1991.

**For Further Reference (Not available to the Author)**

- Lee, G. M. "Studies in Texts: 1 Corinthians 9:9-10." *Theology* 71, Mr. 1968, p. 122-123.
- Thackeray, H. St.-J. *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*. London: Macmillan, 1900.



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BDAG	Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3 <sup>rd</sup> ed.
BKCOT	<i>Bible Knowledge Commentary</i> , volume on the New Testament.
ESV	<i>English Standard Version</i> .
ISBE	<i>International Standard Bible Encyclopedia</i> .
KJV	<i>King James Version</i> .
MT	<i>The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text</i> .
NASB	<i>New American Standard Bible</i> .
NET	<i>New English Translation</i> .
NICNT	<i>New International Commentary on the New Testament</i> .
NIGTC	<i>New International Greek Testament Commentary</i> .
NIV	<i>New International Version</i> .
NKJV	<i>New King James Version</i> .
NLT	<i>New Living Translation</i> .
TR	<i>Textus Receptus, from H KAINH DIAQHKH, The New Testament, The Greek Text Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611, Trinitarian Bible Society</i> .
UBS4	<i>United Bible Societies, The Greek New Testament, Fourth Revised Edition</i> .

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (FOR MY EDIFICATION)

Introduction .....	1
Context and Text.....	3
Connection of 9:8-10 to Context of 1 Corinthians .....	3
Text of 1 Corinthians 9:8-10.....	7
Survey of Explanations of Paul's Use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10.....	8
Allegorical/Contradiction .....	8
Proverbial.....	10
Human-Contextual .....	11
Rabbinic Legislative .....	12
Eschatological/Christological .....	14
Lesser-to-Greater.....	15
Literal/Principial.....	16
Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 9:8-10.....	17
Verse 8 .....	18
Verse 9 .....	19
The Two Questions in 9:9-10.....	22
The Meaning of <b>pavntw</b> " in the Second Question.....	23
The Principle of the OT Injunction.....	23
Verse 10 .....	24
The Meaning of <b>o@ti</b> in 1 Corinthians 9:10.....	25
The Message of the Section .....	26
Related Passages .....	28
1 Timothy 5:18 .....	28
Luke 10:7, Matthew 10:10.....	28
Hermeneutics of Old Testament Usage in the New Testament .....	29
General Hermeneutical Guidelines.....	29
Method of Extracting OT Principles .....	30
Positively .....	30
Negatively.....	31
Form of Continuing Principles .....	31
What About When the Bible Does not Specify .....	31
Guidelines from 1 Corinthians 9:8-10 .....	33
Conclusion.....	34
BIBLIOGRAPHY **=GET .....	35
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	40

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY .....43

## ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott-Smith, G. *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*. Edinburgh, Scotland: T&T Clark, 1936. Paperback edition 1999.

Take 1 Cor. 9:10 as in “altogether, by all means” and mentions often in strong affirmations.

Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Revised and edited by Frederick W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

On **pavntw**”, adverb, “pertaining to strong assumption, by all means, certainly, probably, doubtless.” They translate our verse under this heading as “or is he (not) certainly speaking in our interest?” #2 defn says “pertaining to thoroughness in extent, totally, altogether.” #3 defn says “expression of inevitable conclusion in view of data provided, of course.” #4 defn says “expression of lowest possible estimate on a scale of extent, at least. 1 Cor. 9:22 they fit here, as in “though by any and all means.” #5 defn with negating marker, not at all or by no means. See 1 Cor. 5:10.

Thayer, Joseph H. *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1977, based on the fourth edition published by T&T Clark 1901.

He takes this as doubtless, surely, certainly and mentions Luke 4:23, Acts 17:21, 21:22, 28:4, 1 Cor. 9:10. “But when the negative precedes, the force of the adverb is restricted: ou pavntws then means “not entirely, not altogether...not in all things, not in all respects.”

Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New York: Harper, 1968.

See p. 205-6. Re. v. 9: “Attempts to show that Paul did not mean that God did not care about the animals break down on the next clause: **Or is he not speaking simply (pavntw) on our account?** The only interpretation that is not forced is that in the Old Testament law God had in mind not oxen, but Christian preachers and their needs. This does not mean that Paul would have denied the truth...that God is concerned even over the fall of a sparrow; but it was quite different truth that he found in the Old Testament and expressed here.” p. 205-6. He denies the lesser-to-greater argument that “God cares for oxen, therefore so much more for men.” p. 206. Folly—he doesn’t prove this statement. He translates v. 10 gar as “yes” in answer to the question. But is the question rhetorical or not?

This is ridiculous. Paul would have been informed about the OT teaching on this and Jesus' teaching as well that God does care for the sparrows and that is our basis for understanding that he cares for us.

Bock, D. L. "Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 142 (July-September 1985): 209-223.

Goes through 1) Kaiser's approach of human=divine intent; 2) S. Lewis Johnson's approach of divine intent/human words; 3) Longenecker's approach based on history of interpretation; and 4) Waltke's canonical process approach. Some problems listed with each.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Evangelicals and the Use of the Old Testament in the New." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 143 (October-December 1985): 306-319.

More evaluation and stating of his own position, which is closer to #2 above.

Bray, Gerald. *1-2 Corinthians*. In *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament*, Vol. VII. Downers Grove, IL: 1999.

p. 82, 9:9. Origen: "God's care was not only for the oxen but moreso for the apostles, for whose sake he uttered these words." ON FIRST PRINCIPLES 2.4.2.

p. 82, 9:9: Chrysostom: "Why does Paul mention this, when he could have used the example of the priests? The reason is that he wanted to prove his case beyond any shadow of doubt. If God cares about oxen, how much more will he care about the labor of teachers?" HOMILITES ON THE EPISTLES OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS 21.5

p. 82, 9:9: Fulgentius: "These animals accomplish their life and purpose in this world according to the incomprehensible will of the Creator. They render no account of their deeds because they are not rational.. 'Is God concerned about oxen?' Human beings, however, because they have been made rational, will render an account to God for themselves and for all the things which they have received for us in this present life." TO PETER ON THE FAITH 42. What does that mean?

p. 82, 9:10: Ambrosiaster: The whole of Scripture applies to us by way of analogy." COMMENTARY ON PAUL'S EPISTLES.

Brewer, David I. "1 Corinthians 9.9-11: A Literal Interpretation of 'Do not Muzzle the Ox,'" *New Testament Studies*, 38:4 (October, 1992), p. 554-565.

I have copied and highlighted this one. p. 556, fn. 15 he deprecates Paul: after dealing with 'surely' as a helpful meaning of pantws, he says, "it still leaves the question as to why Paul wrote in such a dangerously ambiguous manner." He makes no decision on pantws, saying that it can be translated either 'surely' or 'altogether.'

Bruce, F. F. *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Didn't find anything helpful here.

Calvin, J. *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. In *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries*, trans. John W. Fraser. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Why did Paul use this particular text? "when far clearer illustration were available for him in the law, for example Deut. 24.15, 'The wages of the hired servant shall not be with you all night'. But anyone who will pay closer attention to this, will realize that there is more force about this text, in which the Lord asks us to care for cattle, for from this it can be seen, by inferring from the less to the greater, that, when He wants the dumb animals to be treated well, He requires much greater equity to be shown by men in their dealings with each other. When he says that 'God does not care for the oxen', we must not misunderstand him, as if his intention is to put oxen outside the providence of God, since God does not neglect even the tiniest sparrow. Again, we must not make the mistake of thinking that Paul means to explain that commandment allegorically; for some empty-headed creatures make this an excuse for turning everything into allegory, so that they change dogs into men, trees into angels, and convert the whole of Scripture into an amusing game." p. 187.

"But what Paul actually means is quite simple: though the Lord commands consideration for the oxen, He does so, not for the sake of the oxen, but rather out of regard for men, for whose benefit even the very oxen were created. Therefore that humane treatment of oxen ought to be an incentive, moving us to treat each other with consideration and fairness." He quotes Prov. 12:10 regarding the life of the beast; "God is not concerned about oxen, to the extent that oxen were the only creatures in His mind when He made the law, for He was thinking of men, and wanted to make them accustomed to being considerate in behaviour, so that they might not cheat the workman of his wages. For the ox does not take the leading part in ploughing and threshing, but man, and it is by man's efforts that the ox itself is set to work. Therefore, what he goes on to add, 'he that plougheth ought to plough in hope' etc., is an interpretation of the commandment, as though he said, that it is extended, in a general way, to cover any kind of reward for labour." p. 187-8.

This is excellent stuff. It points out that those who deride this as allegory don't even bother to look at the whole context of Scripture in which God does care for the other animals; this forces our hand on the interpretation of **pavntw**". It is a horrifying idea to even think that God does not care for animals. He does—the Psalms, Proverbs, etc., sermon on the mount, etc. Matt. 6:26, 28, 30; 10:29, 31; Luke 12:6-7; Prov. 12:10;

Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. In *Sacra Pagina*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington, S.J., Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999.

Translates 9:10 as "Doesn't he really speak for our sake?" Kind of neat. Here also they take Paul as not defending his apostleship so much as serving as an example to the church (p. 328). Mistakenly says that the Corinthians should give up their right to eat food offered to idols. Looks at the whole section as Hellenistic rhetoric/diatribes. Argues from the ox in a lesser to greater fashion.

He takes the interpretation of Deut 25:4 to be an example of *gezera shawah* (see p. 165 where this is described as a comparison of like with like, at 3:19). This is discussed on p. 332. . He takes the “that” in verse 10 as beginning a quote THAT “whoever plows should plow in hope...” and then says this is a quote from an unknown “scriptural” source. Further details later on in the commentary: he takes this as an example of minor premise to major, lesser to greater, the *qal wa-homer* (from Hillel). Regarding not being concerned for oxen, the answer to the question is ‘no’ but not that God hates animals, but rather that the law is not concerned with trivia (p. 339-340).

The “really” is key – either as “entirely” will deny the literal sense of the text, or “surely” or “really” will uphold it and use it and just show the subordination of that value to the value of ministers. The *gezera shawah* principle is used to show that “if animals are to receive a just reward for their labors, *a fortiori* humans are entitled to a just recompense for theirs.” (p. 340).

Still, he takes the whole of ch. 9 as a “rhetorical digression” (p. 357).

Craigie, P.C. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. In *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

The passage “does not appear to have any particular relationship to its immediate context.” (p. 313). This is in contrast to Merrill, McConnville. Kalland also seems not to make any connection between this verse and the surrounding context. “It expresses concern for the animal” (see 5:14). Footnote 4 has this: “Thus this passage is used in the NT to illustrate the principle that ‘the laborer is worthy of his hire’; 1 Tim. 5:18; cf. 1 Cor. 9:9. For a more detailed study of this law in Deut., with particular reference to the history of its interpretation, see G. Lisowsky, ‘Dtn. 25:4,’ in F. Maass, ed., *Das ferne und nahe Wort*. BZAW 105 (1967), pp. 144-152.” So he sees this used by Paul literally for illustrative purposes.

Deere, Jack S. “Deuteronomy.” In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary, Old Testament*. John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck, eds. Colorado Springs, CO: Cook Communications, p. 259-324.

“Paul’s use of this verse (1 Cor. 9:9) did not imply that God did not care about oxen. Paul meant that if God cares about a working ox, how much more He cares about human laborers, especially those laboring for His kingdom.” p. 306.

Deissmann, Adolf. *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*. Trans. William E. Wilson, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957. See p. 99, 102, 240.

Paul frequently “continued to use the Law as authority quite in the manner of his fathers.” p. 99. He cites 1 Cor. 9:9 here.

He gives numerous examples that, in his view, constitute Paul using allegorical interpretation and doing “great violence of interpretation. Instances of such violence are, for example...the application of the words about the ox, which was not to be muzzled while

threshing, to the Apostles.” p. 102. This allegorical method allowed interpretation “to get beyond the letter” despite “the tyranny of the letter.” p. 102.

Ellis, E. E. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957; reprinted Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981. p. 11-16, 21f, 25, 31, 46-47, 49, 73, 90, 116, 125, 127-8, 134, 150, 152, 174, 185.

Deals with nature of quotations 11-16. Pg. 31, fn 7 mentions Harnack's contention that Paul's quotations in 1 Corinthians 1-4, 9 are simply ad hominem, namely to satisfy their idea of ingenious exegesis. This source is in German.

Mentions that Rabbis interpreted 25:4 as allowing a woman, based on following context, to object to a levirate marriage. Hmmm. So Ellis says, “One instance of *a fortiori* which arises in connexion with an OT quotation is found in 1 Cor. 9:9. Some have interpreted Paul as ruling out the literal meaning of the OT altogether here [he cites J. Moffat, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, London, 1938, p. 117 and C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, London, 1932, p. 180]. The question largely hangs on whether *pavntw*" (v. 10) is taken as ‘entirely’ or as ‘undoubtedly’. In view of the other NT usage, the character of Pauline typology, and general Jewish interpretation, the latter meaning denoting an *a fortiori* argument is much to be preferred.” The literal meaning is necessary.

He tries to categorize many of Paul's quotations. Very helpful. Our text falls under the ‘ethical’ category. He takes our text as one of a group which are “no more than analogies or application of principles” p. 134.

Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. In *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Excellent discussion, pp. 406-409 with lots of good footnotes to follow.

Hays, Richard B. *First Corinthians*. In *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997.

Takes chapter 9 as dual purpose: example of chapter 8, and killing another bird with same stone, namely apostolic defense. Have to tie into chapter 8 else 9:24-27 are inexplicable, he says. But again, Fee's differences must be noted here.

“This is often cited as an example of arbitrary proof-texting on Paul's part, but closer observation demonstrates a more complex hermeneutical strategy at play here. First of all, Paul is operating with an explicitly stated hermeneutical principle that God is really concerned about human beings, not oxen, and that the text should be read accordingly (vv. 9-10). Second, a careful look at the context of Deuteronomy 25:4 lends some credence to Paul's claim about this particular text...” He then goes on to synthesize some ideas about dignity, justice for humans, 25:4 oddly placed, and thus human affairs are the point of 25:4. “Third, once one allows the figurative reading of Deuteronomy 25:4, it functions as an elegant metaphor for just the point that Paul wants to make...” that is, don't treat the



oxen in a cruel way. He takes “our sake” for the church in Paul’s time, not just human laborers in general. “Paul claims that the text addresses the church of his own time directly, in an oracular fashion, metaphorically instructing them to provide financial support.” “This is for Paul not a derived sense of the text, but its fundamental meaning, now eschatologically disclosed.” This is all on p. 151. He refers to Hays, *Echoes*, 165-168 for this hermeneutical strategy. I think I see what he is saying—he defines the meaning in a non-literal way.

I would think it wiser to say that the text in Deut does not address Paul’s time directly until the Holy Spirit inspires its use in this context! Everyone who does this to the text unwittingly (perhaps) uses the literal meaning to establish their derived principle. Strange...

Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. In *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.

He takes chapter 9 as an example of Paul which shows how he does not use his rights, per chapter 8. What follows the initial part of chapter 9, in which are rational arguments, is then an appeal to authority, in Hellenistic fashion. Argues from lesser to greater, p. 409.

Points to Conzelmann who says that Paul does violence to Deuteronomy (1975: 154-55), p. 409 in Garland by using Jewish exegetical procedures that God is concerned with higher things than those perhaps mentioned directly in the law.

Translating *pavntw* as surely, doubtless, assuredly, especially, simply “allows Paul to hold to the literal meaning of the text while emphasizing its application to humans.” p. 410. He takes it that Paul followed was like later rabbis, not Philo allegorical.

“Paul was either familiar with this traditional argument [light to heavy] that eventually made its way into the Mishnah...or he drew the inference himself.” p. 411. He cites Brewer as defending the view that Paul is making up new law here based on reasoning that a contemporary rabbi would do.

Griffiths, P. “The Sensus Plenior Vs. Authorial Intent.” Seminar in Hermeneutics, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, April 6, 1986.

Definition of *sensus plenior* (spleen) from Raymond E. Brown, 1955: “that additional, deeper meaning, intended by God but not clearly intended by the human author, which is seen to exist in the words of a biblical text (or group of texts, or even a whole book) when they are studied in the light of further revelation or development in the understanding of revelation.” This is from Raymond E. Brown, *The Sensus Plenior of Sacred Scripture* (Baltimore: St. Mary’s University [Roland Park], 1955), p. 92 in Roland E. Murphy, “Book Reviews,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (1955), 17:502. This all is on p. 1.

Griffiths outlines problems such as double meaning (univocal nature of language). Appeals to Hirsch to find author’s willed meaning. Spleen is against the standard usage of language. He quotes Hirsch: “It is a task for the historian of culture to explain why there

has been in the past four decades a heavy and largely victorious assault on the sensible belief that a text means what its author meant.” p. 16. Meaning becomes what the text means to any given reader (p. 17). Idea that a text cannot mean what it never meant. This is a basic rule of exegesis given by Fee and Stuart in their book. There are those who appeal to “the text is what matters” not the author (p. 19). There are those who say the author’s meaning is inaccessible (like Marshall below) (p. 19). There are those who say that the author does not know what he means. (p. 20).

He concludes: “First and foremost the text can never mean what it never meant. Secondly, the author’s intended meaning is that which is a verbal expression of the divine will. Thirdly, the Bible is to be interpreted as any other piece of literature would be treated. In other words God speaks in human language, using human thought patterns, to human beings. Fourthly, the author’s verbal expression is contained in a specific historical-grammatical literary context. Fifthly, the interpreter of today must follow the normal procedures of finding the sensible meaning of that text. Sixthly, the exegetical procedures of Jesus and the Biblical authors is limited in their feasibility and assistance that they can grant to today’s interpreter. This is due to the uniqueness of their position of inspiration and all that that entails.” p. 20-21.

One question from me: The author’s intended meaning comes to us in the text itself. Doesn’t he try to shoot this down with “the text is what matters” argument above? Does he have a naturalistic view of the Bible when he says that it is to be treated as any other book? Did God intend it that way? I think what he is saying is you treat it hermeneutically as any other book; you do not treat it as a common book but you treat it at least as well as a normal book in the sense of letting the author speak for himself. No extra-Biblical spirit-talking-to-me-told-me-this about the text kind of stuff.

Hanson, Anthony T. *Studies in Paul’s Technique and Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

See p. 161. He initially doubts whether this is allegory. He confirms that Paul uses many figures in support of his point. “all the other figures are used as analogies, which are only valid if they are understood literally in the first place.” p. 162. The words for muzzle are interchangeable. “The older editors tend to attempt to vindicate Paul from the charge of dismissing the literal meaning. Thus Robertson and Plummer say that Paul does not mean that God has no care for oxen, but that there is also a higher meaning, relating to the support of the ministry. They point out quite rightly that much hinges on how we translate the word *pavntw*” (‘entirely’ in RSV). It could mean ‘doubtless’, in which case Paul is merely claiming that the second meaning must be understood as well as the first. Or it could mean ‘entirely’, in which case the literal meaning is excluded... Evans says: ‘God does care for the oxen, but of course he cares also for the human labourers.’ Goudge appears to try to have it both ways; of course Paul does not deny that God cares for the oxen, but he does seem to say here that this particular passage refers not to oxen but to human labourers.” p. 162. Starting on page 163: Some change the text to add an *ou* before *pavntw*”. Deuteronomy is not concerned with mundane details, others say. Anyway, he goes on ad nauseum with the positions. Some: Paul could NOT rule out the literal meaning. Some: the law is interpreted spiritually. Barret of course says that God had in mind not oxen, but Christian workers (what a stretch!).

He then goes to rabbinic background. Ties in with levirate law by juxtaposition.

He concludes, “Did Paul use allegory in 1 Cor. 9:9? We may answer with some confidence: not consciously. It was, as we have seen, a very familiar text used by the rabbis in a variety of contexts. The analogical use of it would be more familiar to Paul than the literal.” p. 166. He claims Paul did not study this text. “But he has not reached the stage where the literal meaning has disappeared, as had happened a generation later. Formally, therefore, it is an example of allegory, but we may acquit Paul of deliberately designing an allegorical use of the text.” p. 166.

So he has it both ways! No but yes, and incriminates Paul as stupid in the process.

Gives me the idea that the translation could say something like “Did God mean for this to apply to oxen?”

Hirsch, E. D. *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.

Classic stuff here. Banishment of the author in chapter 1. He argues against idea that

1) the meaning of a text changes, even for the author himself, 2) it does not matter what an author means, only what his text says, 3) the author’s meaning is inaccessible and 4) the author does not know what he means. This is more on hermeneutics and does not deal with our text per se.

p. 8: “*Meaning* is that which is represented by a text; it is what the author meant by his use of a particular sign sequence; it is what the signs represent. *Significance*, on the other hand, names a relationship between that meaning and a person, or a conception, or a situation, or indeed anything imaginable... Significance always implies a relationship, and one constant, unchanging pole of that relationship is what the text means. Failure to consider this simple and essential distinction has been the source of enormous confusion in hermeneutic theory.”

Hodge, Charles. *An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

v. 8: “to speak as men are wont to speak, to utter their thoughts, or principles, or to use illustrations derived from their customs.” p. 157. The word of God “sanction[s] the same principle.” He refers to Is. 28:28, 41:15, Hosea 10:11.

v. 9: “It is perfectly certain that God does care for oxen; for he feeds the young ravens when they cry...” Job 38:41, Ps. 147:9, Matt. 6:26, Luke 12:24. p. 157. “This, therefore, the apostle cannot intend to deny. He only means to say that the law had a higher reference. Although the proximate end of the command was that the labouring brute should be treated justly, yet its ultimate design was to teach men the moral truth involved in the precept. If God requires that even the ox, which spends his strength in our service, should not be defrauded of his reward, how much more strict will he be in enforcing the application of the same principle of justice to his rational creatures.” p. 157-8.

v. 10: *pavntw*" he takes strongly as "assuredly, as in Luke 4:43, Acts 18:21, 21:22, etc. otherwise "this would make the apostle assert that he command in question had exclusive reference to men." p. 158. intention was to "enforce the principle that labour should have its reward, so that men may labour cheerfully." p. 158.

"Some of the ancient, and not a few of the most distinguished modern commentators assume that Paul gives an allegorical interpretation to the passage in Deuteronomy. They understand him to say that the passage is not to be understood of oxen, but of us, ministers. 'This command was given on account of us ministers, that we ploughers might plough in hope, and we threshers might thresh in hope.' But this is entirely foreign from the manner of the New Testament writers. They never argue except from the true historical sense of Scripture." p. 158.

Howe, F. R. Review of *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology*, by Anthony T. Hanson. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 133 (April-June 1976): 179-180).

Summarizes the book by saying, "The basic conclusion reached by the author is that the modern interpreter cannot agree with the method of interpretation adopted by Paul when he dealt with some crucial issues in the Old Testament, but the modern interpreter can and indeed must agree with the intention of Paul." p. 179. Hanson believes that "the final criterion of judgment as to the theological use of the Old Testament will be a Christological criterion. 'In this respect we can use Christ as the screen through which alleged knowledge of God recorded in the Old Testament must be passed. What is not compatible with Christ is thereby rejected and eliminated. What is compatible with Christ is now seen in what Christians must regard as its true light...' (p. 276)." Hanson is way off in his theology anyway.

Ironside, Harry A. *Addresses on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1958 (sixth printing).

p. 253. "He then uses an apt illustration from the law of Moses." He ties that to the admonition following that he that plows should plow in hope. Note the illustrative use. He doesn't deal with the problem that most interpreters touch on here. BUT, later on p. 254 he says "Just as the ox finds its food in the work it is doing, so the Lord has appointed that His servants should be cared for by those who receive benefit from the ministry that they give." This is an analogical use.

Jamieson, Robert, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown. *A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments*. Vol. 6. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.

p. 306: "'Is it for oxen that God careth? Sure not.' God does care for the lower animal (Ps. xxxvi. 6; Matt. x. 29), but it is with the ultimate aim of the welfare of *man*, the head of creation. If humane consideration is shown for the lower animal, still more ought to be for man; the human (spiritual as well as temporal) laborer is worthy of his hire. 10. altogether—join with "saith." It would be untrue that God saith it *altogether* (in the sense of *solely*) for *our* sakes. But it is true that He *by all means saith it* for our sakes as the ultimate object in the lower world. Else translate 'mainly' or 'especially.'"

Johnson, E. "Author's Intention and Biblical Interpretation." In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy and the Bible*. Edited by E. D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984. p. 407-429.

Here we have references plenior on top of a singular sense (p. 427). Basically sensus plenior, however, as others have pointed out. The authorial will of God goes beyond the human authorial will (quoted from S. Lewis Johnson p. 50). He points out on p. 426 that the possibility of human authorial ignorance is very possible. "The human and divine author share the defining sense of the passage. This defining sense sponsored the writing of the text by the human author. God, however, in authoring the revelation not only originates the defining sense and all the textual particularly through the human author but at the same time is aware of all the implications of all possible reference." p. 426.

Johnson, S. Lewis. *The Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980. See particularly chapter 3, "1 Corinthians 9:7-10: The Question on Pauline Hermeneutics." p. 39-51.

"Paul... 'who got more out of the Old Testament Scriptures than the Holy Spirit put in them.' p. 39. Johnson is strong on typology and that typological fulfillments are common in the NT.

Quotes Moffatt's deprecating comment on Paul's use of the oxen. He basically says Paul misses the main point of the text in his desire to get to the higher, allegorical, mystical meaning of the text. Barrett says that Paul thinks God does NOT care for the animals. He leans hard on the *pavntw*" word there "or is he not speaking simply (*pavntw*") on our account?"

"It cannot be said that the inspiration the Bible teaches is of the verbal-plenary mold if the apostle erroneously handles the Scriptures." p. 41. Instead of looking at it negatively, I would like to come at it from the positive angle—how can we get at the application of such OT texts?

He lays out the three-pronged ultimate goal of his study: "First, do passages of Scripture often have more than one meaning? Second, is the work of the biblical interpreter finished when he has come to the meaning intended by the original human author? And, finally, if we are able to establish the principle that the Old Testament, for example, may contain meanings beyond the ken of the original human author, are we justified in practicing this principle in our study of other parts of the Old Testament?" p. 42.

He takes 1 Cor. 9 as illustration of the principle of ch. 8. This has been debunked elsewhere, particularly Fee. He sees three grounds for Paul's argument: example of others, common right, and teaching of the Bible. Does Paul deny care to the ox? He quotes from Godet on this (2:12, or about p. 439-440 in the combined edition by Kregel that I have). "When Paul asks if God *takes care for oxen*, it is clear that he is not speaking of God as Creator, but of God as giving the law (ve. 8), *in ferenda lege*, as Calvin says; for in the domain of creation and Providence 'He does not neglect even the smallest sparrow' (Calvin)."

Johnson points out the “or” in verse 10 and ties it together into the translation. He takes *pavntw* to be purely, entirely, certainly, surely. He likes the latter. He takes the opposite of oxen as men in general, not just apostles. But the context is oxen working, and here we have ‘men working’ in the sense of Paul. So his argument doesn’t hold up too well to me.

Quotes Godet 2:13 at length. Godet says that Paul does not arbitrarily allegorize but “applies, by a well-rounded *a fortiori*, to a higher relation what God has prescribed with reference to a lower relation.”

Johnson goes back now to the OT context of Deut. 25:4. The point of the surrounding context, he says, is to “inculcate in the hearts of God’s people a sense of *moral justice* and *equity*. Quotes Godet again 2:11 to support that the text is really directed toward men to treat other men working fairly. He explains the proverbial statement approach, in which the text was used figuratively from the very first.

He deals with the readings. I need to be familiar with these differences and just comment on them at least. The two verbs *khwvsei* and *fimvsei* are questioned but mean basically the same thing. It is clear that Paul meant them to mean the same anyway, so there is no real problem here.

Moffat and Barrett say that Paul did not care for the literal sense at all, p. 47. The word *pavntw* again comes up. He goes through what it means with negatives (not at all, 1 Cor. 16:12, Rom. 3:9), and with affirmations (by all means, certainly, probably, doubtless, at least—1 Cor. 9:22 for this last one). BDAG he suggestions says “or is he (not) certainly speaking in our interest?” “Since the clause does have the nuance of a strong affirmation, the sense of “surely” fits well. Then the following clause follows naturally, “Yes, indeed [gar], for our sake it was written.” p. 47-48. “Thus the apostle acknowledges that the Old Testament text, while not exclusively for men, does have an application to them. The literal meaning is not excluded, but the text is given a further spiritual or moral sense. In one sense, the passage is seen as referring to God, not as *the* Creator who cares for His creation...but as the Law-giver. As such it had a significance beyond the oxen, namely that of moral justice to men. This viewpoint is in harmony with the apostle’s words in 1 Corinthians 10:6, 11.” p. 48. He cites Ps. 104:14, 21, 27; 145:9, Matt. 6:26, 10:30.

He bows to the possibility of a proverbial use. He also states idea that 25:4 could have been used so often in a practical application way that this was the normal way to use it.

“To sum up, it is likely that Paul has used the Old Testament passage analogically, although the proverbial use may not be completely ruled out. There is no evidence that the literal sense of the Old Testament text was of no significance to Paul.” p. 48-9.

Some points: 1) we are dealing with the Word of God here; 2) “It is also clear from this use of the Old Testament in the New that there may exist more than one sense in the same Scripture.” Ho hum. “Passages written of specific historical situations may indeed express principles that pertain to other situations also...it does seem true to the interpretation of these passages to affirm that many texts have a meaning that goes beyond their

normal historical sense, valid though that surely is.” p. 49. 3) He agrees with Hirsch’s meaning/significance deal, but the authorial will is God’s will. “It would seem, then, that in interpreting a text we should not be surprised to find that the authorial will of God goes beyond the human authorial will, particularly in those sections of the Word of God that belong to the earlier states in the historical process of special revelation.” p. 50.

This seems a bit strange to me. How can we, humans, without inspiration, claim to know more about a text than its author!?! He takes Packer’s strictures:

“the *sensus plenior* which texts acquire in their wider biblical context remains an extrapolation on the grammatico-historical plane, not a new projection onto the plane of allegory. And, though God may have more to say to us from each text than its human author had in mind, God’s meaning is never less than his. What he means, God means.” quoted from Packer’s “Biblical Authority, Hermeneutics, and Inerrancy,” in *Jerusalem and Athens: Critical Discussions on the Theology and Apologetics of Cornelius Van Til*, ed. E. R. Geehan (Hutley, N.J., Presbyterian and Reformed, 1971, pp. 147-48).

He gives the whole univocal nature of language up, it seems, and says that to do keep it is to reject authorial will. He gives two approaches to Scripture: to approach for the purposes of Christian theology, and to approach it for purely historical purposes. The first one is the one that must command the other.

“Paul found a valid moral sense in the passage from Deuteronomy 25:4 and, although he stressed this sense of the text, it was really there! It is only the careless student who fails to see it, too.” “Thus the work of the biblical interpreter is not necessarily finished when he has come to the meaning intended by the original human author. Payne is right when he said, ‘Intention should guide exegesis only tentatively and as the text opens it up. Ultimately the *text* is the source from which the exegete draws meaning.’” Philip B. Payne, “The Fallacy of Equating Meaning with the Human Author’s Intention,” *JETS* 20 (September, 1977): 243. Wow. How does McCune handle that? Basically the human authors did not understand what they wrote.

Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. “A Response to Author’s Intention and Biblical Interpretation.” In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy and the Bible*. Edited by E. D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984. p. 441-447.

“The apostle argued that the law itself contained the same principle he was propounding even though it did not offer the same application, viz. the right of the laborer for the gospel to expect a worthy financial remuneration. When Moses wrote, ‘You shall not muzzle the mouth of the ox that tramples the corn,’ Paul announced triumphantly that ‘these things were written for our sakes’ and therefore pastors and workers in the cause of the gospel were owed a similar reimbursement for their efforts. God was not only concerned for oxen in the Deuteronomic legislation; he was even more vitally concerned about the attitudes, sensitivities and graciousness of the owners and users of oxen. Accordingly, a passage has always one and the same meaning even though it may have manifold applications.”

The whole approach of single meaning, authorial intent is critical to hold on to the inerrancy that has been fought for.

Kaiser, Walter C., Jr., Peter H. Davids, F.F. Bruce, and Manfred T. Brauch. *Hard Sayings of the Bible*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996. See p. 751.

There is nothing in here about this at all.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Legitimate Hermeneutics." In *Inerrancy*. Edited by N. L. Geisler. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979. p. 117-147.

"No definition of interpretation could be more fundamental than this: *To interpret we must in every case reproduce the sense the Scriptural writer intended for his own words.*" It is not relative! He is following Hirsch closely here. He interprets the Bible as other books. This is probably too naturalistic, but again, "treated at least as well as" is the way to say it better. Principles of interpretation are native to man. The personal reception and application of an author's words is a distinct and secondary act from the need first to understand his words. He parks on the perspicuity of Scripture, progressive revelation.

p. 133: widespread school of thought that says "that leading rabbinical practice in New Testament times allowed peshet, midrashic, or multiple senses in interpreting biblical passages." Sensus plenior. Some try to restrict this by saying that the authors had a "revelatory stance" i.e. they were inspired, but many do not follow this and try to apply the same principles themselves. He takes analogy of Scripture as invalid to use as a "type of 'divining rod' to unlock previous revelations." "We certainly recognize that a passage may have a fuller *significance* than what was realized by the writer. We also wholeheartedly agree that the *subject* to which the Old Testament prophets made individual contributions was wider by miles than what they ever dreamed of. But the whole revelation of God as revelation hangs in jeopardy if we, an apostle, or an angel from heaven try to add to, delete, rearrange, or reassign the sense or meaning that a prophet himself received." p. 135.

"Terry quoted when he says "that 'the moment we admit the principle that portions of Scripture contain an occult or double sense, we introduce an element of uncertainty in the Sacred Volume, and unsettle all scientific interpretation. [quoted from Terry's Hermeneutics, p. 383. Footnote 41: "He there cites Own and Ryle as supporting his view to the effect that "if Scripture has more than one meaning, it has no meaning at all." p. 459. There is one definite sense and our job is to discover it. Gets into the whole area of double meaning then on p. 136ff.

I should get this book.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Current Crisis in Exegesis and the Apostolic Use of Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:8-10," in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 21:1 (March 1978), pp. 3-18.

Issue of meaning vs. significance; Hirsch argues for this but then abandons the principle that meaning is going back to what the author intended; he takes the "meaning-for-the-



interpreter” position, going to a total subjectivism. Many have adopted historical-critical method.

His footnote 49 is significant for other references to the idea about the “subordinate lesson.”

Overall an excellent paper on my topic. Very helpful in many areas. Lists approaches used to this particular text.

---

and Gregory Chirichingo. *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1983.

Exhaustive listing of OT quotes in NT, with Masoretic Text, LXX, NT, and comments. I should have all these texts in mine as well. He gives a good paragraph saying about the two different verbs used, and that 1 Cor 9:9 is doubtful due to p46, A, B2, C, and D1 read as 1 Tim. 5:18 and the LXX.

Kalland, Earl S. *Deuteronomy*. In vol. 3 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.

“This law concerning threshing animals occurs only here in the OT, but the apostle Paul twice quoted it to illustrate that ‘the thresher threshes...in the hope of sharing in the harvest’ (1 Cor 9:9-10; 1 Tim 5:18). Paul was not saying that God is unconcerned about oxen but rather that the Deuteronomic law can be applied to human beings as well...” (p. 149)

Klein, William W., Craig L. Blomberg, and Robert L. Hubbard, Jr. *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1993. See p. 31, 60, 88, 127, 282.

In chapter on history of interpretation. pp. 28- . Jesus literal fulfillment of OT was fundamental to hermeneutics of apostles. However, “the apostles did not limit themselves to the literal interpretation of OT prophecies. They applied three other interpretive approaches.” 1) typological interpretation where they “find represented in OT events, objects, and ideas divinely-inspired types (i.e., patterns or symbols) that anticipate God’s activity later in history.” There seems clearly to be the idea of divine intention here. “The earlier event/object/idea repeats itself in the later one.” p. 29. Used to connect OT to NT – convince Jews of similarities. 2) Literal-contextual interpretation, which “interpreted OT scriptures according to their normal meaning...straightforward OT quotations.” p. 30. I personally don’t buy the idea that this is a different method other than “literal interpretation” as suggested above by starting to list three additional methods! 3) Principle/application. They did not take an OT passage literally; rather, they interpreted it by applying its underlying principle to a situation different from, but comparable to, the one in the original context.” “Paul’s defense of his right to earn a living from the ministry of the gospel provides a classic example (1 Cor 9:9; cf. 1 Tim 5:17-18). Apparently this practice needed justification because Jewish custom prohibited rabbis from receiving payment for their services. He quotes Deut 25:4...arguing that God actually had Christian clergy, not real oxen, in mind. This is true, Paul says, because ‘when the plowman plows and the thresher threshes, they ought to do so in hope of sharing in the harvest’ (v. 10). The principle is: if human labor benefits anyone, it should at least benefit those who per-

form it. Paul applies the principle to payments to Christian ministers and thus provides a scriptural basis for this practice.”

Again, I would modify their understanding of the third point as well. The literal interpretation of the original OT quotation is necessary to get a principle out of it to use in later principial form. You could say the same for the typological deal. It is not possible to find in the meaning of Deut 25:4 “Christian” ministers, particularly since the Christian church was a mystery not yet revealed. The words give no clue to that end.

“Laws that are no longer literally valid still teach important timeless truths.” p. 282. Footnote 103 adds Deut 25:4 to the list presented in the body of the text. Me: “Valid” seems to mean “binding” in the sense of “binding today.” This law is “invalid” in that sense, but the principle it shows, care for the oxen, would behoove us to carry on in our personal life so as not to bring displeasure from God.

Marshall, I. Howard. “The Problem of New Testament Exegesis.” In *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 17:2 (Spring 1974), p. 67-73.

See esp. p. 72. “Third, our aim is to discover what the text meant in the mind of its original author for his intended audience. Exegesis seeks for an interpretation of a passage which will account satisfactorily for all the features of that passage, both on its own and in its context. This context includes both the historical environment of the New Testament and also the literary environment in which it occurs, in the example above, the Johannine literature.” p. 72. This gives you the idea that “historical setting” rises to equality with “textual context.” He then talks about “how far can we go beyond the meaning intended for the original readers and reach a meaning for ourselves?” This is crazy—not at all. There is only one meaning, right? “It could be that in Scripture too there was a meaning different from that intended by the author.” Or, p. 72-73, “A more traditional Christian might prefer to argue for a *sensus plenior* in Scripture. Divine inspiration may have given to a passage a deeper meaning of which the author himself was unconscious.” He admits that It may, however, be argued that regaining the original meaning is impossible, alike for the exegete and the congregation.” Sounds smart, but is dumb. p. 73.

Lenski, R. C. H. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1935.

pp. 355ff. Paul uses himself as an example of chapter 8. With this agree Grosheide, MacArthur, and the Anchor Bible. This is how they connect the two chapters. However, he doubts that there was any question about Paul's apostleship in Corinth. Paul sees much more in the OT text than concern for beasts; chiefly the law concerns us.

Three efforts of interpretation (pp. 366-367). 1) complete allegory, where God said oxen but did not mean oxen, but us. 2) Paul uses legitimate allegory, removing the historical sense, converting it into allegory by means of application and deducing greater from lesser. This is questionable. 3) Full historical sense of the law regarding oxen to stand, merely applying it to us.

He points out that “us” is apostles, not men in general. “He goes back to the underlying basic principle. Back of this simple law, back of a large number of simple divine statements, back of simple question or complex questions asked for instance by the Corinthians, a basic principle will always be found... Paul is far removed from changing the actual sense of God’s law concerning the oxen that thresh. He needs that very sense, because he gives an exposition of that very sense. What is the principle laying back of this law, what principle requires a law of this nature in the case of oxen? Paul names that principle: the worker shall participate in the fruit of his work. Or, he shall work with the hope of participation. This applies to every worker, even to the oxen that thresh... And this is true in the case of every worker, including, of course, the apostles and their work.

The Lord’s command must be from Matt. 10:10 or Luke 10:8.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Points out several ways that Paul uses OT, in his estimation:

1) Literalist; 2) Midrashic, including several categories such as lesser to greater, analogy, contextual, etc.; 3) Allegorical. On p. 109 he says “1 Cor 9:9-10 is certainly allegorical.” In this way, Longenecker presumes that Paul was “subordinating the literal sense and elaborating an additional meaning that spoke to the situation being addressed.” Certainly sounds like *sensus plenior*. “In 1 Cor 9:9-10 he seems to leave the primary meaning of the injunction in Deut 25:4...to insist that these words were written for a reason not obvious in the passage itself.” He says the same of Gal. 4:21-31 regarding the allegory there.

The point resolves down to how to translate **pavntw** in the passage. If “altogether” or “entirely” then the literal meaning of the passage is abandoned. If “undoubtedly” or “surely” then the literal sense is subordinate but not rejected.” p. 109-110. He points to Thackeray for support of this **pavntw** business. In this way, the argument is a *qal wa-homer* (light to heavy) kind of argument and “the application made pointedly subordinates the literal meaning of the injunction, Paul’s use of Deut 25:4 passes over into the category of allegorical interpretation.

One question: is Paul’s point to show how to interpret the law? Not really, it is not a method text. I doubt whether Paul is subordinating the literal meaning, is he? It seems it has to be strengthened to make the point, if anything.

4) Peshet. This has to do with mysteries. Not sure on it.

Lowery, David K. “1 Corinthians.” In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary, New Testament*. John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck, eds. Colorado Springs, CO: Cook Communications, p. 505-549.

Chapter 9 illustrates chapter 8. Points out that Luther took it that since oxen cannot read, the text was *obviously* not written for them! Lowery goes back, like Zuck to the context of 25:4 and makes it a proverbial expression of remuneration.

MacDonald, William. *Believer's Bible Commentary*. Nashville: TN: Thomas Nelson, 1995. See pp. 1774-1780.

Also takes ch. 9 as linked with 8 as an example of chapter 8. But he focuses on the doubts of Paul's apostolic authority. He takes it that "our welfare was in His mind when these words were written." "[God] didn't cause these things to be written in the OT merely for the sake of dumb animals. There was a spiritual principle involved to be applied to our life and service." It seems he is taking the Luther approach (see Lowery above). However, I wonder if the principle is more directly harvested (sorry for the pun!) from other texts in the Pentateuch about not holding back a worker's wages, and this simply serves to show the same principle on the very low end of the totem pole? Something like that. This statement basically says that there was another intent behind the text, not discoverable in the text itself? Or does it?

Both MacDonald here (p. 1778) and Lowery above take the "weak" in 9:22 to be the overscrupulous. The change in the verb "win" that is thus made is not supportable, it seems to me.

Mare, W. Harold. *1 Corinthians*. In vol. 10 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.

Speaks of ch. 9 as an application (example) of proper use of Christian freedom. Fee takes this view apart on p. 393 (and before, see footnote 7).

Mare takes vv. 7-10 as "illustrations supporting the proposition that God's servants have the right to be supported with food and drink and other necessities of life as they labor in the work." (p. 242). "The reason for the command, Paul says, is not just God's care for the cattle (cf. Matt 6:26-29), but because by it he wants to teach us a lesson about God's care for us (v. 10).

McConville, J.G. *Deuteronomy*. In *Apollo's Old Testament Commentary*, ed. David W. Baker and Gordon J. Wenham, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002.

Interprets verse 4 in context of "'fairness to one's fellow as regards both his substance and his dignity', applies even to the convicted criminal (1-3) and to the domestic animal (4)." (p. 367). Ties provision for ox to poor people's ability to take from other's crops (23:25-26; 24:19-22). Related to Ex. 23:11 regarding wild animals. "Paul interprets the command allegorically to refer to the right of the apostle to have his living from the gospel." p. 369.

Merrill, Eugene H. *Deuteronomy*. In *The New American Commentary*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994.

Casts this and the previous sections in light of “protecting” the dignity of persons and this in light of the 9<sup>th</sup> commandment to lie against him by making them to appear something less than they were (p. 325). Seems a stretch!

He notes the dominion mandate. “The prohibition here (Deut 25:4) about muzzling the working ox reflects the spirit of mercy that pervades all of God’s dealings with his creation, human or otherwise. The purpose clearly was not only to provide for the ox itself but to make the point by *a fortiori* argument that if a mere animal was worthy of humane treatment, how much more so was a human being created as the image of God. Paul, in fact, cited this very text twice in making a plea for the support of those involved in Christian ministry (1 Cor 9:9-14; 1 Tim 5:17-18).” p. 326. (I need to define *a fortiori*).

“To fail to show mercy to God’s lowest creatures is to open the door to disregard of human life as well.” (p. 326).

I do note, as Pastor Saxe pointed out, that most articles dealing with this issue make NO mention of the role of the Holy Spirit in the process of inspiration and how Paul had a few more faculties than we might have.

\*\*Moffat, James. *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.

Pratt, Richard L., Jr. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. In *Holman New Testament Commentary*, ed. Max Anders. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2000.

Law had deeper moral principle undergirding it. He summarizes it as “when the plowman plows and the thresher threshes, they ought to do so in the hope of sharing in the harvest. Takes defense of apostleship view about halfway, but parks on “the weak” and the fact that the strong are indeed right. But in fact (Fee, Combs) they are wrong!

Radmacher, E. D. “A Response to Author’s Intention and Biblical Interpretation.” In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy and the Bible*. Edited by E. D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984. p. 433-437.

“Simple logic seems to demand that the author must be the sole determiner of meaning.” p. 435. In this case, the author is God and his prophet.

Ramm, Bernard. *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Revised ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970.

Makes Paul’s use typological. “The care given the treading oxen of the Old Testament is typical of the care to be given the servants of Christ (1 Cor. 9:9).” p. 265.

Nicole, Roger. “New Testament Use of the Old Testament.” In *Revelation and the Bible*. Edited by Carl F. H. Henry. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958. p. 137-151.

I will not be focusing on the exact form of the quotation as in some papers, like this one, that deal with the “looseness of the quotation” problem from LXX or Hebrew, the need for translation, lack of punctuation, etc.

“It has been widely acknowledge that, in spite of certain difficult passages, the New Testament interpretation of the Old manifests a strikingly illuminating understanding of Old Testament Scripture.” p. 149. Well it should—the authors were inspired! He then quotes C. H. Dodd, “In general...the writers of the New Testament, in making use of passages from the Old Testament, remain true to the main intention of their writers” (According to the Scriptures, London, Nisbet, 1952, p. 130).

He makes an important note on p. 149 as well: “...the doctrine of verbal inspiration requires that we should accept any New Testament interpretation of an Old Testament text as legitimate...” Duh!

This is in his section discussing meaning of OT passages. “It has been urged at times that the New Testament writers have flouted the proper laws of hermeneutics, have been guilty of artificial and rabbinical exegesis, and thus have repeatedly distorted the meaning of the Old Testament passages which they quote.” p. 148-9. This seems worse than slight wording problems, though he says that most quotes are verbally accurate. “Few Christians, it is hoped, will have the presumption of setting forth their own interpretation as normative, when it runs directly counter to that of the Lord Jesus or of his apostles.” p. 149.

Snodgrass, Klyne. “The Use of the Old Testament in the New.” In *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery, eds. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2001.

The whole book barely makes mention of the Deut. 25:4 quotation in 1 Corinthians, and not at all in 1 Tim. 5:18. Klyne Snodgrass’ article in there mentions several presuppositions regarding OT usage in the NT (pp. 209-229). Included is “eschatological fulfillment”. He claims that Christians saw themselves already in the end times and that the OT viewed in such a light were, “therefore, texts that were descriptive of the reality they experienced.” This is basically an allegorical approach but more precisely the eschatological approach. He mentions 1 Cor. 9:10 here.

He goes over the peshet, midrash, testimonia, corporate solidarity, correspondence in history/typology, and the Christological focus of the church.

Note that these are mainly historical in that they attempt to describe various approaches to the interpretation of scripture that are found throughout Jewish and Christian history, but do not deal with what God left us—the inspired text per se. As such, the approaches are outlined and one or more is selected as the way in which Paul thought of the OT text in his use of it. I don’t think this is a valid approach. It tells us how men dealt with the Bible, and then make that the explanation for the right way to do it instead of appealing to the Bible and its teachings for a way to interpret.

Sprague, Peter. "An Evaluation of the New Testament's Use of the Old Testament." Hermeneutics Seminar, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, Spring 1984.

Wants to answer question as to what aspects of NT exegesis (in this paper, "exegesis" means NT usage of OT) are repeatable and thus normative for the present. Lists approaches used in general (Jewish hermeneutics, basically).

He does destroy the allegorical approach, but midrashic and pesher interpretation he accepts fully. I'm not so convinced. On page 39 he attributes "their own, sometimes incorrect, methods" to NT writers!

His bibliography has a treasure trove of stuff in it.

Stanley, Christopher D. "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations in the New Testament." IN *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, eds. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, p. 18-27.

Makes the incredible statement "A more adequate explanation would view the New Testament authors as working consciously but unreflectively within the bounds of contemporary literary conventions that shaped the way quotations might be handled. In the case of the apostle Paul, such a view of his activities finds support in his often-noted lack of reflection on the broader hermeneutical issues implied in his own use of Scripture." p. 27. This view is attenuated somewhat by the following statement that in a few places, such as 2 Cor. 3:7-18, Rom. 4:23-24, 15:4, and 1 Cor. 9:10, 10:11, Paul offers a hint as to the principles that guided his 'Christian' reading of the Jewish Scriptures...though "even these statements illuminate only a fraction of his explicit appeals to Scripture." p. 27. Each author has his own way of doing OT quotation, but "we should remember that the author is simply following the accepted literary standards of the day." p. 27.

Terry, Milton. *Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.

p. 609 mentions some of the Jewish stuff in a bad light: "The study of the ancient Jewish exegesis is, therefore, of little practical value to the one who seeks the true meaning of the oracles of God." p. 609. He is speaking of Hagadah, Halachah (legal exegesis confined to the Pentateuch that aimed "by analogy and combination of specific written laws, to deduce precepts and rules on subjects which had not been formally treated in the Mosaic Code." Hagadic exegesis "was extended over the entire Old Testament Scriptures, and was of a more practical and homiletical character. It aimed, by means of memorable sayings of illustrious men, parables, allegories, marvelous legends, witty proverbs, and mystic interpretations of Scripture events, to stimulate the Jewish people to pious activity and obedience." p. 607. Basically the Midrashic tradition was to find deeper meanings underneath the literal sense.

He makes an awesome point on p. 629 regarding the fact that Jesus condemned "the current Halachic and Hagadic tradition of the elders, which in some instances nullified the commandments of God..." See Matt. 15:1-9; Mark 7:1-13). He said the Sadducees did not understand the Scriptures and power of God. He points out a supposed error of think-

ing Elijah was coming back literally. “Paul makes mention of his proficiency in Judaism...and his excessive zeal for the traditions of his fathers, for which he was noted before his conversion (Gal. i, 13, 14); but after it pleased God to give him the revelation of his grace in Jesus Christ he denounced ‘Jewish fables and commandments of men who turn away from the truth’ (Titus i, 14), and also ‘foolish questionings and genealogies and strife and fightings (or controversies) about the law’ (Titus iii, 9).” p. 629. He carries this one.

“When the New Testament writers adduce a passage from the Old Testament they evidently assume that they are making use of the oracles of God, and nowhere can it be shown that they put upon the language quoted a farfetched or irrelevant idea.” p. 630.

I noted on p. 511 that he takes the “accommodation” idea that I thought about earlier in the week and applies it like I did—to the NT quotes of the OT. In other words, that the NT writers accommodate the OT passage to their own need—i.e. “it has been held by many that all the Old Testament quotations, even the Messianic prophecies, have been applied in the New Testament in a sense different more or less widely from their original import.” p. 511. “Herein we observe a true sense in which the words of Scripture may be accommodated to particular occasions and purposes. It is found in the manifold uses and applications of which the words of divine inspiration are capable. This is not, strictly speaking, a manifold *fulfillment* of Scripture, though it may be affirmed that a forcible and legitimate application of a passage is truly a fulfillment of it.” p. 512. Of Psalm 78:2 “dark sayings” quoted in Matthew 8:35. The evangelist says “that Jesus made use of parables in order that these words might be fulfilled.” “The words of the psalmist prophet herein found a new and higher application, but in no different sense than that in which they were first used.” p. 512.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. In *The New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000. See p. 685-688 especially.

9:8. “On the level of purely human example.” p. 685.

9:9 – muzzle textual deal. Thiselton follows Hays and Fee, mostly Hays. The idea is “human sensitivity and humane compassion toward the suffering or defenseless (e.g. the immediate preceding context concerns the plight of widows, orphans, and victims of punishment.” He takes it that the me tew expresses a hesitant question (is it perhaps...) rather than a question which invites an emphatically negative answer. He avoids exclusivity in translating pavntw". p. 686. Next page--Hays suggests the law finds it time and primary referent in the financial arrangements pertaining to his own ministry. But Thiselton backs off the “true and primary referent” idea. He sees Deut written more for humans than animals. “Scripture ultimately exists for those upon whom the end of the ages has come.” “Thus Paul can accord value to the OT in its proper context, while seeking that which transcends the immediate context.” He cites Aageson [*Written Also for Our Sake: Paul and the Art of Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster/Knox, 1993), 49; cf. 49-53] who uses “also” in his title to indicate a big portion of his idea. p. 687.



Trail, Ronald. *An Exegetical Summary of 1 Corinthians 1-9*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1995.

See copies I made.

Waltke, B. K. "Is it Right to Read the New Testament into the Old?" *Christianity Today*, September 2, 1983, p. 77.

Points out Jowett's 1859 essay in which he said that "Scripture has one meaning—the meaning which it had in the mind of the Prophet...who first uttered or wrote, to the hearers or readers who first received it." Kaiser, he says, concurs, "In no case must...*later* teaching be used exegetically (or in any other way) to unpack the meaning...of the individual text which is the object of our study."

He then takes the "church's traditional view" which is "The New Testament has priority in 'unpacking' the meaning of the Old Testament." This is the analogy of Scripture idea. He takes this right away and says that the church fulfills OT promises (replacement theology). He mistakenly says, "The Christian doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Scripture demands that we allow the Author to tell us at a later time more precisely what he meant in his earlier statements." This is fine on the surface, but what it seems that he *means* is that the author must be allowed to *change* the meaning of what he earlier said. It is fine to bring more precision to the earlier meaning, but this does not basically change the earlier meaning. Not only that, but the doctrine of the canon "demands that we use the New Testament in deciding the meaning of the Old." No final meaning can be arrived at apart from the other books.

Wilderspin, John F. "The Hermeneutics of NT Writers in Their Use of the OT." Theology Seminar, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, April 22, 1986.

Great point on Luke 24:25-27 that "there was not a need for some later interpreter to give a fuller sense to the OT...They did indeed understand what they wrote." I don't buy his interpretation of Acts 3:18 at all.

Basically he is suggesting that under inspiration, anything can happen (see his conclusion).

Zuck, Roy B. *Basic Bible Interpretation*. Victor Books, 1991. See p. 70, 254, 263-5.

p. 70 he just uses these verse to demonstrate Biblical authors' view of inspiration. P. 254 is in his ch. 11, The use of the OT in the NT. P. 263-5 gets into it more: I noticed while reading his work that the sowing/reaping analogy he carries on into later verses fit well with his use of the oxen in the farming situation. In other words, the oxen derives benefit from the harvest; so should Paul, a little more significant than the ox himself, as well as the other apostles. This further demonstrates that Paul is using Deut in a literal fashion here.

I need to investigate how is "care about oxen" question is formulated. However, to solve the supposed problem, Zuck goes back to Deuteronomy context and tries to put the whole

surrounding context together. He extracts from surrounding texts the “fairness” doctrine and the “kindness” doctrine. He then makes 25:4 to be a proverbial statement actually referring to people instead of animals, so that Moses was speaking of people and not animals. Thus Paul is correct in his usage. There seems to be a lot of circumlocution here!

McCune mentioned Braithwait, who wrote a dissertation on some of the bigger picture stuff with regard to the law.