

THE EPISTLES OF ST PAUL.

II.

THE THIRD APOSTOLIC JOURNEY.

I.

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

ANALYSIS.

I. INTRODUCTION. i. 1—9.

- i. Salutation. i. 1—3.
- ii. Thanksgiving. i. 4—9.

II. BODY OF THE LETTER. i. 10—xv. 58.

i. *Divisions.* i. 10—iv. 21.

- (a) He describes and deprecates these divisions. i. 10—16.
- (b) The unhealthy craving after *σοφία*. God's folly triumphant over man's wisdom. The true and the false wisdom contrasted. The wisdom of God spiritually discerned. The Corinthians incapacitated by party spirit from discerning it. i. 17—iii. 3.
- (c) Their preference of Paul or of Apollos criminal. Paul and Apollos only human instruments. Human preferences worthless: the divine tribunal alone final. iii. 4—iv. 5.
- (d) Contrast between the self-satisfied temper of the Corinthians and the sufferings and abasement of the Apostles. This said not by way of rebuke but of fatherly exhortation. His own intentions respecting them. The mission of Timothy and his own proposed visit. iv. 6—21.

ii. *The case of incest.* v. 1—vi. 20.

- (a) The incest denounced. The offender to be cast out of the Church. Reference to the Apostle's letter in which he had recommended them to treat similar offences in the same way. v. 1—13.
- (b) [Episode. The Corinthian brethren apply to heathen courts to decide their disputes. This is monstrous.] vi. 1—9.
Altogether their spirit, whether of sensuality or of strife and overreaching, is inconsistent with heirship in the kingdom of heaven. vi. 10, 11.

- (c) The distinction between license and liberty. Fornication and Church-membership a contradiction in terms. The members of Christ cannot be made the members of an harlot. vi. 12—20.
- [(i) and (ii) are the result of reports received by St Paul. Now follow two answers to questions raised in a letter from the Corinthians.]
- iii. *Marriage.* vii. 1—40.
- (a) To marry, or not to marry? The Apostle's answer. vii. 1, 2.
- (b) About those already married. Mutual duties of husband and wife. vii. 3—7.
- (c) About the unmarried, the widows, the separated. Let them remain as they are. vii. 8—11.
- (d) On the marriage relations of the believer wedded with the unbeliever. Let them not do any violence to their conjugal duties. vii. 12—16.
- And generally, do not be eager to alter the condition of life in which God has placed you. vii. 17—24.
- (e) On virgins specially. Are they to be given in marriage or not? The case to be decided on the same principles as before. Two principles to be kept in view: (1) to preserve continence, (2) to keep the soul disentangled 'because of the present necessity.' vii. 25—38.
- (f) On widows specially. vii. 39, 40.
- iv. *Meats offered to idols.* viii. 1—xi. 1.
- (a) Meats offered to idols are indifferent in themselves: they are only important as they affect (1) our own consciences, (2) the consciences of others. viii. 1—13.
- (b) [Episode on Apostolic claims. St Paul asserts (1) his claim to support, and his disinterested renunciation of the claim: (2) his freedom and yet his accommodation to the needs of all: (3) his preaching to others and his discipline of self. ix. 1—27.
- This is an interruption to the argument, suggested we know not how. Perhaps the letter was broken off. Something then may have occurred meanwhile; some outward event or some inward train of thought, of which when the letter was resumed the Apostle must first disburden himself, before he took up the thread where he had dropped it.]
- (c) The Israelites a type to us. All like you had the same spiritual privileges. They all were baptized like you: they all partook of their Eucharistic feast. And yet some perished for their fornication and idolatry. x. 1—12.
- (d) Therefore be on your guard against the abuse of this liberty. Do not entangle yourselves in idolatry. Do not cause offence to any. x. 13—xi. 1.

- v. *Regulations affecting Christian assemblies.* xi. 2—xiv. 40.
- (a) The women to be veiled. xi. 2—16.
 - (b) Disorders at the Lord's Table to be checked. xi. 17—34.
 - (c) Spiritual Gifts. xii. 1—xiv. 40.
 - (1) There are different kinds of gifts, each having its proper place. But there is one source of all, and we are members of one body. xii. 1—31.
 - (2) Charity is better than all. xiii. 1—13.
 - (3) The superiority of prophecy over tongues. xiv. 1—25.
 - (4) Due regulation in the exercise of spiritual gifts. Edification the end of them all. xiv. 26—40.
- vi. *The Resurrection of the dead.* xv. 1—58.
- (a) Evidence for the Resurrection of the dead. xv. 1—34.
 - (1) Testimony to Christ's Resurrection. xv. 1—11.
 - (2) Christ's Resurrection involves man's Resurrection. xv. 12—28.
 - (3) Testimony of human conduct to a belief in the Resurrection. Baptisms for the dead. Sufferings of the Apostles. xv. 29—34.
 - (b) Difficulty as to the manner of the Resurrection. xv. 35—49.
 - (c) Triumph of life over death. xv. 50—58.

III. CONCLUSION. xvi. 1—24.

- i. Collections for the saints in Judæa. xvi. 1—4.
- ii. The Apostle's intended visit to Corinth. Mission of his delegates. xvi. 5—14.
- iii. Recommendations and greetings. xvi. 15—20.
- iv. Farewell charges. xvi. 21—24.

CHAPTER I.

I. INTRODUCTION, i. 1—9.

i. *Salutation* (i. 1—3).

BESIDES the standard commentaries on this Epistle, the following contributions to the study of some of its problems from German periodical literature chiefly will well repay investigation: Klöpffer *exegetisch-kritische Untersuchungen über den zweiten Brief des Paulus an die Gemeinde zu Korinth*, Göttingen, 1869, Hausrath *der Vier-Capitel-Brief an die Korinther*, Heidelberg 1870, Weizsäcker *Paulus und die Gemeinde in Korinth* in the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1876 xxi. p. 603 sq., Delitzsch on Lightfoot's *Hor. Hebraic.* in the *Zeitsch. f. Luth. Theol.* 1877 p. 209 sq., Hilgenfeld *die Christus-Leute in Korinth* in the *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.* 1865 viii. p. 241 sq., 1872 xv. p. 200 sq., *die Paulusbrieve und ihre neusten Bearbeitungen* *ibid.* 1866 ix. p. 337 sq., *Paulus und die Korinth. Wirren* *ibid.* 1871 xiv. p. 99 sq., *Paulus und Korinth* *ibid.* 1888 xxxi. p. 159 sq., Holsten *zur Erklärung von 2 Kor.* xi. 4—6 *ibid.* 1873 xvii. p. 1 sq., Heinrici *Christengemeinde Korinths* *ibid.* 1876 xix. p. 465 sq., Holtzmann *das gegenseitige Verhältniss der beiden Korintherbriefe* *ibid.* 1879 xxii. p. 455 sq., Curtius *Studien zur Geschichte von Korinth* in *Hermes* 1876 x. p. 215 sq. There are also articles by Dickson in the *Academy* ii. p. 37, and by P. Gardner in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* ix. p. 47 sq. (*Countries and Cities in Ancient Art*, esp. p. 61 sq.).

1. On the general form and special modifications of the supercriptions and greetings of St Paul's Epistles see the notes on 1 Thess. i. 1, 2.

κλητὸς ἀπόστολος] 'a called Apostle'; i.e. one whose apostleship is due not to himself, but to God. The translation of the E. V. 'called to be an Apostle' is as near as the English idiom will permit. The expression is not to be regarded as polemical, that is to say, as directed against

those who denied St Paul's apostleship. For in this case the words employed would probably have been much stronger, as in Gal. i. 1 *ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου*. That this is so may be seen (1) from a comparison with the opening of the Epistle to the Romans, where the same expression is used and no polemical meaning can be attributed to it, inasmuch as St Paul had no adversaries to attack in that Epistle; and (2) from the parallelism with the clause following, *κλητοῖς ἁγίοις* (ver. 2). His apostleship and their churchmembership were both alike to be traced to the same source, to the merciful call of God, and not to their own merits. There is the same parallelism in the opening words of the Epistle to the Romans, where *Παῦλος δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κλητὸς ἀπόστολος* (ver. 1) is followed by *ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ* (ver. 6).

This preliminary consideration disposed of, we may say further that the phrase *κλητὸς ἀπόστολος* is here opposed not so much to human authorisation or self-assumption, as to personal merit. Both ideas indeed have their correspondences in the Pauline Epistles. For a reference to God as the source of all honours and privileges we may compare Rom. ix. 16 *οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεῶντος Θεοῦ*. But a closer parallel, as it seems to me, occurs in the context of the passage from the Romans, *οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος* (Rom. ix. 11). This feeling of self-abasement, though pervading all St Paul's Epistles, is especially strong in those belonging to this chronological group. On the other hand, a strong polemical sense would be more in place in the second group than in the first. The significance of *κλητὸς* is still further enforced by the words following, *διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ*. See the note on Eph. i. 1.

Bengel sees a double direction in St Paul's language, combining these two last views: 'Ratio auctoritatis, ad ecclesias; humilis et prompti animi, penes ipsum Paulum. Namque mentione *Dei* excluditur auctoramentum humanum, mentione *voluntatis Dei*, meritum Pauli.' But for the reasons above stated, the assertion of authority, if it is to be recognized at all, must be quite subordinate and secondary.

Σωσθένης] The mention of Sosthenes naturally takes our thoughts back to the scene recorded in the Acts (xviii. 12—17) where the name occurs (ver. 17). By identifying the Sosthenes of the Acts with the Sosthenes of this Epistle, the notices of him hang together. He was a Jew by birth and ruler of the synagogue at Corinth. At the time when St Paul was brought before Gallio, he had either actually declared himself a Christian, or at least shown such a leaning towards Christianity as to incur the anger of his fellow-countrymen, who set upon him and beat him. It is not improbable that he retired from Corinth in consequence: and it may be conjectured that the hostility with which he was regarded there was a special inducement to St Paul to recommend him favourably to the Corinthians in this unobtrusive way, by attaching his name to his own in the opening salutation. It is of course impossible according to

this view that he could have been one of the Seventy in accordance with an early tradition given by Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 12). But patristic writers exercised so much ingenuity in making up the list of the Seventy (comp. the list published in the works of Hippolytus) that such a tradition is worthless. Thus e.g. Silas is distinguished from Silvanus, and Luke is included in the number (Hippol. *Spur.* in Migne *P. G.* x. p. 955). See also Tillemont i. p. 26, and Baronius, *s. ann.* 33, i. p. 113 (1738).

We may at least infer that Sosthenes was well known to the Christians of Corinth, both from the position which his name occupies and from the designation *ὁ ἀδελφός*. The definite article implies some distinction, something more than 'one of the brotherhood.' The term appears to have been used in those cases where the person named, though distinguished, had no claim to a higher title, as e.g. Apostle. Thus for instance it is applied to Apollos (1 Cor. xvi. 12), Timothy (2 Cor. i. 1, Col. i. 1, Philem. 1, Heb. xiii. 23), and Quartus (Rom. xvi. 23).

Sosthenes may or may not have been St Paul's amanuensis. The fact of his name occurring here proves nothing. For instance, Tertius (Rom. xvi. 22) is not named in the heading of the Roman letter. Again Timothy and Silvanus (1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1) were not probably amanuenses of the Epistles to the Thessalonians. On the degree of participation in the contents of the letter implied by his being thus mentioned, see the note on 1 Thess. i. 1. In this letter Sosthenes is named and apparently disappears at once. St Paul immediately returns to the singular (*εὐχαριστῶ* ver. 4) and loses sight of him.

2. *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ*] On this expression see the notes to 1 Thess. i. 1, ii. 14.

ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] The authority of the best Greek MSS. must decide the question whether these words shall precede or follow the clause *τῇ οὐσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ*. In a case like this, where for purposes of interpretation there was every temptation to change the order, no great stress must be laid on the versions and citations from the fathers. But even if we decide in favour of the more awkward arrangement of interjecting *ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* between *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ* and *τῇ οὐσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ*, the dislocation is quite characteristic of St Paul. The mention of God as the source of spiritual blessings does not satisfy the Apostle, unless supplemented by the parallel mention of Christ as the *medium* of that life. Consequently grammar is disregarded in his anxiety not to postpone this reference to our Lord. Again, there was another reason for inserting the words thus early. The expression *ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ* might be applied equally well to the Jews; and consequently, whenever St Paul uses it, he is careful to guard against this ambiguity. See 1 Thess. ii. 14, Gal. i. 22. There was therefore a double motive for the insertion of some such clause as *ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ.*, and the eagerness of the Apostle to bring this in has disturbed the sequence of the sentence. This parallel reference to the Source from Whom, and the Means through

Whom is too frequent in St Paul, where he has occasion to use terms like *ἐκκλησία ἐκλεκτοὶ κλητοὶ* and the like, to need special illustration. See however the notes on 1 Thess. i. c.

A somewhat similar instance of the disturbance of grammatical order occurs just below in *αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν* (ver. 2).

κλητοῖς ἁγίοις] corresponds to *κλητὸς ἀπόστολος*, as in Rom. i. 7. See the note on ver. 1.

On the words *κλητὸς, ἐκλεκτὸς* and the corresponding substantives, as used by St Paul, see the notes on 2 Thess. i. 11 and Col. iii. 12. In this connexion words such as *ἡγιασμένοις, ἁγίοις* denote the consecrated people, the Christians, as they denoted the Jewish people under the old dispensation. Compare 1 Pet. ii. 9, where many terms formerly applied to the Jews are transferred to the Christians. See also the note on Phil. i. 1.

The ascription of 'holiness' to a community guilty of such irregularities as that of Corinth, reiterated in the words *ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χ. Ἰ. κλητοῖς ἁγίοις*, is strikingly significant of St Paul's view of the Christian Church, and of his modes of appeal. He addresses the brethren not as the few, but as the many. He delights to take a broad and comprehensive ground. All who are brought within the circle of Christian influences are in a special manner Christ's, all who have put on Christ in baptism are called, are sanctified, are holy. Let them not act unworthily of their calling. Let them not dishonour and defile the sanctity which attaches to them. He is most jealous of narrowing the pale of the Gospel, and this righteous jealousy leads him to the use of expressions which to the 'unlearned and unstable' might seem to betoken an excessive regard for the outward and visible bond of union, and too much neglect of that which is inward and spiritual.

The same liberal and comprehensive spirit is traced in his remarks on the alliance of the believer and unbeliever (vii. 12 sq.), and in his illustration drawn from the practice of baptism (xii. 2 sq.).

σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις] 'as also to all those who invoke.' This clause cannot be attached to *κλητοῖς* in the sense of 'saints called together with all that invoke etc.' For though this construction would obviate considerable difficulty in interpreting what follows, it is grammatically harsh, if not untenable, and would require a participle for *κλητοῖς*, or at all events a different order of words.

There still remains the difficulty of interpreting *σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις κ.τ.λ. ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ*. A comparison with the opening of the second Epistle, *σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὄλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ* would suggest the restriction of 'every place' to 'all the churches of Achaia': but though the expression *ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ* elsewhere (e.g. 1 Thess. i. 8, 2 Cor. ii. 14) must be taken with certain natural limitations, still the very definite restriction to 'every place in Achaia' receives no sanction from such examples. We must suppose then that St Paul associates the whole Christian Church with the Corinthians in this superscription. This

association would refer more especially to the benediction which immediately follows, but in some degree also to the main contents of the letter, which, though more special and personal than perhaps any other of St Paul's Epistles, yet founds its exhortations on great general principles applying to all alike. It perhaps arose out of the idea of unity prominent in the Apostle's mind, and was suggested by the dissensions which divided the Corinthian Church.

For a similar superscription compare the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna on the death of Polycarp...*τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παροικουσῇ ἐν Φιλομηλίῳ καὶ πάσαις ταῖς κατὰ πάντα τόπον τῆς ἀγίας καὶ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παροικίας, ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη κ.τ.λ.* See also the close of St Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, 'Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν Ἰησ. Χρ. μεθ' ὑμῶν καὶ μετὰ πάντων πανταχῇ τῶν κεκλημένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. (§ 65).

ἐπικαλουμένους τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου] A phrase which in the O. T. e.g. Gen. iv. 26, xiii. 4 etc., is applied to Jehovah, and therefore seems to imply a divine power and attributes. For the expression *τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου* see the notes on 2 Thess. i. 12, Phil. ii. 9, 10, and generally for the application to our Lord of phrases applied in the O. T. to God see on 2 Thess. i. 7, 9. The practice is illustrated by the testimony of Pliny (*Ἐρ.* xcvi.) 'carmen Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem.'

αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν] Is this clause to be taken with *ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ* or with *τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν*? The former is the interpretation adopted by most modern commentators after the Vulgate, which translates it 'in omni loco ipsorum et nostro,' as also do some other ancient versions. But all possible interpretations of the words so connected are extremely harsh. Thus it is explained by some to mean 'both in Achaia (*αὐτῶν*) and in Asia' (*ἡμῶν*, for St Paul was writing from Ephesus); by others 'in every part of Achaia, which Achaia belongs to us, as well as to them, inasmuch as we are their spiritual teachers.' Other interpretations are still more arbitrary.

It is better therefore to attach *αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν* to *τοῦ Κυρίου*, as taking up the foregoing *ἡμῶν*. This is the view of all the Greek commentators, from a sense, I suppose, of the fitness of the Greek. The words are an after-thought, correcting any possible misapprehension of *ἡμῶν*. 'Our Lord, did I say—their Lord and ours alike.' There is a covert allusion to the divisions in the Corinthian Church, and an implied exhortation to unity. The particle *τε* after *αὐτῶν* if genuine (as is probably not the case) would assist this interpretation; but even in its absence this is far less harsh than the alternative construction.

3. *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*] See notes on 1 Thess. i. 1.

ii. *Thanksgiving* (i. 4—9).

4. *εὐχαριστῶ κ.τ.λ.*] On the thanksgivings at the openings of St Paul's Epistles and on the Hellenistic use of the word *εὐχαριστῶ* see the

notes on 1 Thess. i. 2. In this instance St Paul bears in mind a subject which will occupy a prominent place in the body of the Epistle, the spiritual gifts of the Corinthians.

δοθείση, ἐπλουτίσθητε] *'which was given...ye were enriched.'* The aorists point back to the time of their baptism into the Christian Church, and generally of their admission to the privileges of the Gospel. The phrase **ὅτι ἐν παντί ἐπλουτίσθητε** is an epexegetis of **ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι τῇ δοθείση**.

ὅτι] *'in that,'* used after **εὐχαριστῶ**, as in Rom. i. 8, 2 Thess. i. 3.

ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν αὐτῷ] *'in Christ Jesus,' 'in Him';* not as the E.V. *'by Jesus Christ,' 'by Him.'* God is represented here, as generally, as the *'Giver of all good gifts.'* Christ is the medium through whom and the sphere in which these gifts are conferred. It is by our incorporation in Christ that they are bestowed upon us.

5. **ἐν παντί λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνῶσει**] The distinction between these words is differently given, as follows. (1) **λόγος** is the lower, **γνώσις** the higher knowledge, a distinction which is without sufficient foundation. (2) **λόγος** refers to the gift of tongues, **γνώσις** to that of prophecy. But the restriction to *'special gifts'* seems not to be warranted by the context: see the conclusion of the note. (3) **λόγος** is the teaching of the Gospel as offered to the Corinthians, **γνώσις** their hearty acceptance of the same. But against this view it may be urged that the words **τῇ χάριτι τῇ δοθείση, ἐπλουτίσθητε ἐν παντί κ.τ.λ.**, as well as the parallelism of **λόγος** with **γνώσις**, point to some personal and inward gift, as the meaning of **λόγος**. (4) **λόγος** is the outward expression, **γνώσις** the inward conviction; as the E.V. *'all utterance and all knowledge.'*

The last is probably the correct interpretation. Not only were the Corinthians rich in the knowledge of the truths of the Gospel, but they were also gifted with the power of enunciating them effectively. St Chrysostom says (*ad loc.*) **καὶ νοῆσαι καὶ εἰπεῖν ἰκανοί**, perhaps having in his mind the expression which Thucydides uses of his teacher Antiphon (viii. 68) **κράτιστος ἐνθυμηθῆναι γενόμενος καὶ ἂν γνοίῃ εἰπεῖν**. This distinction of **λόγος** and **γνώσις** is partially illustrated by 2 Cor. viii. 7, xi. 6 **εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνῶσει**. The order here need not stand in the way of this interpretation; for though **γνώσις** is prior to **λόγος**, and so might be expected to stand first, it is reserved for the last as being of superior and essential importance.

St Paul is doubtless alluding in part to the special gifts of the Spirit, which seem to have been bestowed so lavishly on the Corinthian Church (see chaps. xii, xiv). And thus **λόγος** would include the gift of tongues, **γνώσις** the gifts of discerning spirits and interpreting tongues (comp. especially 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2 **ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ...κἀν ἔχω προφητείαν καὶ εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γνῶσιν κ.τ.λ.**). Thus the **λόγος** of the Corinthians comes prominently forward in speaking of the gift of tongues—the **γνώσις** in condemning their divisions and rebuking

their self-sufficiency. St Paul here gives thanks for their use: he afterwards condemns their abuse.

But it would be a mistake to confine the allusion to these. It is obvious from the context that the Apostle is referring chiefly to those more excellent gifts, the spiritual graces which make up the Christian character. In the same spirit in which he has addressed his Corinthian converts 'as sanctified in Christ Jesus,' he goes on to express his thankfulness for their advance in true holiness. He loses sight for a moment of the irregularities which had disfigured the Church at Corinth, while he remembers the spiritual blessings which they enjoyed. After all deductions made for these irregularities, the Christian community at Corinth must have presented as a whole a marvellous contrast to their heathen fellow-citizens—a contrast which might fairly be represented as one of light and darkness. See further on *χάρισμα* (ver. 7). On the distinction between *γνώσις* and *σοφία* see the note on Col. ii. 3, and compare 1 Cor. xii. 8.

6. *καθώς*] 'according as,' 'in this respect that,' 'inasmuch as,' and so almost equivalent to 'seeing that.' It explains the manner of *ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε κ.τ.λ.* For this use of *καθώς* introducing an epexegetis of what has preceded, compare 1 Thess. i. 5.

τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ] 'the testimony borne to Christ' by the Apostles and preachers; and thus equivalent to 'the Gospel as preached to you,' *Χριστοῦ* being the objective genitive. Compare 2 Tim. i. 8 *μὴ οὖν ἐπαισχυνθῆς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν*, Rev. i. 2, 9, and see the note on ii. 1 below.

ἔβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν] This might mean either (1) 'received confirmation in your persons,' i.e. commended itself to others by the effect it produced on your character; or (2) 'was confirmed in you,' 'produced a deep conviction in your hearts.' The latter sense is to be preferred, as being more in accordance with the use of *καθώς* as explained above, and also as better adapted to the statement *ὅς και βεβαιώσει ὑμᾶς* which follows.

7. *ὥστε*] is best attached to what immediately precedes. Otherwise *καθώς...ἐν ὑμῖν* is to be treated as parenthetical, and *ὥστε* referred to the previous clause *ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε*. But this is not so good. It is more in St Paul's manner thus to string the clauses together one after the other.

μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι] 'so that ye fall short in no spiritual gift.' The expression signifies more than *μηδενὸς χαρίσματος*. The latter would mean 'not to be without any gift' (comp. Rom. iii. 23); the former 'not to possess it in less measure than others.' For the wish compare James i. 4, 19, and Ign. *Pol.* 2 *ἵνα μηδενὸς λείπη και παντὸς χαρίσματος περισσεύης*.

χαρίσματι] The term *χάρισμα*, though sometimes applied especially to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit (such as tongues etc.), is not so confined. It includes all spiritual graces and endowments. The greatest

χάρισμα of all the Apostle declares elsewhere to be eternal life (Rom. vi. 23). That it is here used in this wider sense, is clear from the context, which shows that St Paul is dwelling especially on moral gifts, as for instance on holiness of life.

It would probably be correct to say that St Paul himself was conscious of no such distinction as that of the ordinary and extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. At all events in his enumeration he classes together those endowments which we commonly speak of as miraculous and special, and such as belong generally to the Christian character. See chap. xii. And in some cases, as for instance the χάρισμα of 'prophesying,' it is difficult to say where the non-miraculous ceases and the miraculous begins; or to point to any distinction in kind between its manifestation in the Apostolic times and its counterpart in later ages of the Church.

ἀπεκδεχομένους] 'as you eagerly expect.' The significance of this clause in connexion with the context is best illustrated by 1 Joh. iii. 2, 3 'we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him...and every man that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure'; and by 2 Pet. iii. 11, 12 'what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting the coming of the day of God.' In other words, the very expectation is productive of that advance in Christian grace and knowledge which was spoken of before. The word ἀπεκδέχεσθαι does not necessarily signify 'awaiting hopefully, desiring'; but the double preposition implies a degree of earnestness and an intensity of expectation which is quite inconsistent with the carelessness of the godless. Hence it is never used in the New Testament in reference to the coming of Christ, except of the 'faithful.' See Rom. viii. 23, 25 (and comp. ver. 19), Gal. v. 5, Phil. iii. 20, and especially Heb. ix. 28 ἐκ δευτέρου χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας ὀφθήσεται τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις εἰς σωτηρίαν.

8. ὅς καί.]-i. e. 'Who also will go on with this process of strengthening even unto the end, so that ye may be blameless.' This relative is referred either to Θεός or to Χριστός as its antecedent. The latter is to be preferred, as immediately preceding, while Θεός must be sought far back in the sentence. And then again a new subject seems to be introduced in Θεός below (verse 9). The repetition of τοῦ Κ. ἡμ. Ἰησ. Χρ., where we might expect αὐτοῦ, is no valid argument against referring ὅς to Χριστός. Such a repetition of the substantive has its parallel even in classical Greek, and is common in the New Testament. See 1 Thess. iii. 13, 2 Tim. i. 18, Gen. xix. 24; and compare Winer § xxii. p. 180 sq. There is a special fascination in that 'name which is above every name,' leading St Paul to dwell upon it, and reiterate it. Compare also in this respect ver. 21.

ὅς καὶ βεβαιώσεται] to be referred to ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν, on which see the note. Compare also 2 Cor. i. 10 ἐββύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ βύσεται εἰς ὃν ἠλπικαμεν ὅτι καὶ ἐτι βύσεται, Phil. i. 18 ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω· ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρήσομαι.

ἕως τέλους] with a reference to ἀπεκδεχομένους.

ἀνεγκλήτους] 'so that ye may be blameless': proleptic. See the instances given on 1 Thess. iii. 13 **ἀμέμπτους**.

ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ] See the notes on 1 Thess. v. 2, 4, and compare iv. 3 below, **ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπινης ἡμέρας**.

9. The sequence of thought is as follows. 'The fact that you have been called through God to a communion with Christ, is an earnest assurance to you that Christ will bring this good work to a favourable issue. For reliance can be placed on God. This calling was not intended to be illusory or vain.' Here again St Paul takes the broad and comprehensive view of God's dealings. See the notes above on *vv.* 2, 4. For the same thought compare Phil. i. 6 'Being confident of this very thing that He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ'; and see the notes on the verse.

πιστὸς ὁ Θεός] Compare 1 Cor. x. 13, 2 Cor. i. 18, 1 Thess. v. 24 **πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς ὃς καὶ ποιήσει**, 2 Thess. iii. 3.

δι' οὗ] 'through Whom,' not as E.V. 'by whom,' which is ambiguous, 'by' being here an archaism. We may speak of God the Father, either as the source from whom, or the means, instrumentality through which all things arise and are. Compare Rom. xi. 36 **ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα**. He is at once beginning, middle and end. Most commonly He is regarded as the Source (**ἐξ οὗ**); but sometimes as the Means (**δι' οὗ**) as here and Heb. ii. 10 **ἔπρεπεν γὰρ αὐτῷ, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα κ.τ.λ.** Compare Gal. i. 1 and note. Whenever God the Father and Christ are mentioned together, origination is ascribed to the Father, and mediation to Christ in things physical as well as spiritual. See especially 1 Cor. viii. 6 **εἰς Θεός, ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἰς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ**. This distinction is as precise in St Paul as in St John, though dwelt upon more fully by the latter. We should nowhere find such an expression as **ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα** applied to Christ.

The preceding note suggests two remarks. (1) It is important to observe how early and with what exactness the doctrine of the person of Christ was maintained. The genuineness of this Epistle is not questioned even by the severest negative criticism, and yet here it is as distinctly stated as in the Fourth Gospel, which that same criticism condemns as the forgery of a later age. (2) We should not fail to observe the precision with which St Paul uses the preposition, as a token of his general grammatical accuracy.

κοινων(αν)] including both spiritual communion with Christ in the present life and participation in His glory hereafter, without which this communion would be incomplete. The **κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ** is coextensive in meaning with the **βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ**. On the uses of the word in St Paul's Epistles see the note on Phil. i. 5 **ἐπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον**.

2. BODY OF THE LETTER, i. 10—xv. 58.

i. DIVISIONS, i. 10—iv. 21.

(a) *He describes and deprecates these divisions (i. 10—17).*

10. παρακαλῶ δέ] The participle is slightly corrective. 'Though I have commended your progress in the Gospel, yet I must rebuke you for your divisions.'

ἀδελφοί] i.e. 'ye who profess to be held together in the bond of brotherhood.' The repetition of the term in the following verse, ἀδελφοί μου, points to its significance here. For the use of this term in similar appeals compare Gal. vi. 1, 18 (with the notes). See also especially 1 Cor. vi. 5, 6.

διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν 'I. X.] The exhortation to unity is still further strengthened. 'I intreat by that one name which we all bear in common, that ye assume not divers names, as of Paul, and Apollos etc.' For the adjuration comp. 2 Thess. iii. 6.

ἵνα] It is difficult in this passage, as elsewhere, to discriminate between the two senses of ἵνα as denoting the purpose, design, or simply the object, consequence. Compare the notes on 1 Thess. ii. 16, v. 4.

τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε] We have here a strictly classical expression. It is used of political communities which are free from factions, or of different states which entertain friendly relations with each other. Thus τὸ αὐτὸ λέγειν is 'to be at peace,' or 'to make up differences'; see Thuc. iv. 20 ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμῶν ταῦτ'α λέγοντων, v. 31 Βοιωτοὶ δὲ καὶ Μεγαρήs τὸ αὐτὸ λέγοντες ἡσύχαζον, Aristot. *Polit.* ii. 3, 3, Polyb. ii. 62, v. 104 etc. Here the second idea to make up differences is the prominent one, and is carried out in *κατηρτισμένοι* below, where the same political metaphor is used. On the application of classical terms relating to the body politic to the Christian community by the N. T. writers, see the note on τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν 1 Thess. ii. 14.

The marked classical colouring of such passages as this leaves a much stronger impression of St Paul's acquaintance with classical writers than the rare occasional quotations which occur in his writings. Compare especially the speech before the Areopagus (Acts xvii.). The question of St Paul's general education is discussed in *Biblical Essays*, p. 201 sq., see especially p. 205 sq.

σχίσματα] This is said to be the earliest passage in which the word occurs of a 'moral division' (Stanley *Corinthians* ad loc.). It is here used as almost synonymous with ἐριδες, and in a later passage (1 Cor. xi. 18) it is distinguished from αἰρέσεις, the latter denoting a more complete separation than σχίσματα. See the passage. The word does not occur

elsewhere in the N. T. in this sense, except in St John's Gospel (vii. 43, ix. 16, x. 19). In St Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians it occurs frequently, as might be expected, with more or less of reference to this Epistle. See §§ 2, 49, 54 and especially § 46 ἵνα τί ἔρεις καὶ θυμοὶ καὶ διχοστασίαι καὶ σχίσματα πόλεμὸς τε ἐν ὑμῖν, where the words are arranged in an ascending scale. Θυμοὶ are 'outbursts of wrath,' διχοστασία is weaker than σχίσμα, as it is stronger than στάσις: as στάσις develops into διχοστασία, so διχοστασία widens into σχίσμα. See the notes on this passage, and on Gal. v. 20, 21. The word is apparently not found elsewhere in the Apostolic Fathers.

κατηρησμένοι.] On this word see the note on 1 Thess. iii. 10. It is especially appropriate here with reference to σχίσματα (Matt. iv. 21, Mark i. 19).

ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῖ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ.] Of these words νοῦς denotes the frame or state of mind, γνώμη the judgment, opinion or sentiment, which is the outcome of νοῦς. The former denotes the general principles, the latter the special applications of those principles. The form νοῖ is peculiar to St Paul in the N. T., but not uncommon with him (Rom. vii. 25, xiv. 5 1 Cor. xiv. 15). It is confined to late writers (Winer § viii. p. 72).

11. ὑπὸ τῶν Χλόης.] The expression may mean either (1) 'the children,' or (2) 'the servants,' or (3) 'the relations of Chloe.' We learn a good deal of the social condition of the early Christians from their names. Judging from her name, Chloe was probably a freedwoman. At least the name does not denote any exalted rank. Compare Horace *Od.* iii. 9. 9 'me nunc Thressa Chloe regit.' Chloe is an epithet of the Goddess Demeter (Aristoph. *Lysistr.* 835, compare εὐχλοος Soph. *O. C.* 1600); and it is not improbable that, as a proper name, it was derived from this use. Slaves and by consequence freedmen seem very frequently to have borne the Greek names of heathen divinities. Compare the instances of Phœbe (Rom. xvi. 1), of Hermes (xvi. 14), and of Nereus (xvi. 15).

Perhaps however the name is to be referred to the primary meaning of the word, as in the case of Stachys (*στάχυς*) (Rom. xvi. 9) and Chloris. On either supposition it would point to a servile origin, from which class a large number of the early converts to Christianity appear to have been drawn. Compare ver. 26, and see the notes ὄν Cæsar's household in *Philippians*, p. 171 sq.

The position of importance occupied by women in the Christian Church, even at this early date, is a token of the great social revolution which the Gospel was already working. See *Philippians*, p. 55 sq. for the development of this feature in Macedonia especially.

It is possible that Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus (xvi. 17) are included in οἱ Χλόης; but there is no ground for the supposition, and all such identifications are hazardous.

12. λέγω δὲ τοῦτο ὅτι.] 'I refer to the fact that,' 'my meaning is this

that'; not as E.V., 'now this I say that.' Compare Gal. iii. 17 1 Thess. iv. 15, and see [Clem. Rom.] ii. §§ 2, 8, 12 *τοῦτο λέγει* 'he means this.'

ἑκαστος ὑμῶν] i.e. 'there is not one of you, but has his party leader. The whole body is infected with this spirit of strife.'

Ἀπολλῶ] The name Apollos is contracted either from Apollonius, or Apollodorus, probably the first. So at least it is written in full in Codex D (Acts xviii. 24), and the variation seems to point to some very early tradition. Apollos was an Alexandrian (Acts i. c.), and the name Apollonius was common in Alexandria, probably owing to the fact 'that the first governor left by Alexander in his African province was so called' (Arrian *Anab.* iii. 5). On the contracted names in -*ως* and -*ας*, so frequent in the N. T., see Winer § xvi. p. 127, and the note on 1 Thess. i. 1 *Σιλουανός*. This particular contraction is found elsewhere, though rarely; see Conybeare and Howson, p. 364.

We first hear of Apollos residing at Ephesus about the time of St Paul's first visit to Corinth (A.D. 52, 53). Here he is instructed in the Gospel by Aquila and Priscilla. From Ephesus he crosses over to Corinth, where he preaches to the Corinthians and makes a deep impression upon the Corinthian Church. After his departure St Paul arrives at Ephesus, and remains there three years (from A.D. 54 to 57). See Acts xviii. 24—xix. 1. There is no notice of the return of Apollos from Corinth to Ephesus; but he was with St Paul or in the neighbourhood when this Epistle was written, i.e. about or after Easter 57 (see xvi. 12). For his subsequent movements see Tit. iii. 13; and on the subject generally Heymann in *Sächs. Stud.* (1843), II. p. 222 sq., Pfizer *de Apollone doctore apostol.* Altorf (1718), Bleek *Hebr.* p. 394 sq., Meyer on Acts xviii. 24 and Stanley *Corinthians* ad loc.

Κηφᾶ] The Aramaic word כֵּפָא corresponding to the Greek Πέτρος (John i. 42). St Paul seems to have employed both forms indifferently. In this Epistle he always speaks of Κηφᾶς; in the Epistle to the Galatians, sometimes of Κηφᾶς (Gal. i. 18, ii. 9, 11, 14) sometimes of Πέτρος (Gal. ii. 7, 8). Here, as repeating the language of the Judaizers, he would naturally use Cephas.

The question occurs, had St Peter been at Corinth before this time? Apollos had been there, but there is no indication that St Peter had been. In ix. 5 there is an allusion to him which points to his moving about at this time. The Romanist story of St Peter's twenty-five years episcopate at Rome (A.D. 42 to 67), if true, would cover the time of St Paul's imprisonment at Rome, and also the period of the Epistles to and from Rome, so that the entire absence of any allusion to his being at Rome at this time is quite inexplicable, if he were there. Besides, St Paul speaks (Rom. xv. 20) as though no Apostle had previously visited it. It does not seem at all necessary that St Peter should have been at Corinth in order that his name should be taken by a party. He was naturally head of the

Church of the circumcision. See the essay entitled 'Saint Peter in Rome' in *Apostolic Fathers*, Part I., vol. II. p. 481 sq. (1890).

Observe the delicacy evinced by St Paul in treating of this subject. His ascending scale is Paul, Apollos, Cephas, Christ. He places himself in the lowest grade, next, that teacher who was especially associated with him, and highest of human instructors the Apostle who was represented as his direct antagonist. Again, when he wants to enforce the opposition between the servant and the master, between the human instrument and the divine source, he selects his own name, as the meanest of all, and therefore the best antithesis: *μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός· μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*; so also in iii. 5 (*τί οὖν ἐστὶν Ἀπολλῶς; τί δέ ἐστιν Παῦλος;*) there is no mention of Cephas. His well-known friendly relations with Apollos allowed him, both here and in iv. 6, as it were to take liberties with his name. On the other hand, a true gentlemanly feeling led him to abstain from appearing to depreciate Cephas, his supposed adversary. This is an instance of his fine appreciation of what was due to his fellow-men.

In the Epistle to the Galatians, where it was necessary for him to assert his Apostleship, his language is different.

13. *μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός;*] Lachmann omits the note of interrogation, as is done apparently in most of the ancient versions. Yet the sentence is more forcible taken interrogatively. Nor does the absence of *μὴ* in one clause, whilst it is present in the other, form any objection to this way of taking it. The form of the interrogative is purposely varied, because the reply suggested in each case is different. *Μὴ* interrogative implies a negative answer, whereas the omission of *μὴ* allows an affirmative answer. 'Has Christ been divided?' This is only too true. 'Was Paul crucified for you?' This is out of the question. On *μὴ* interrogative as implying a negative answer see Winer § lvii. p. 641. The opposition in the form of the interrogative would have been still stronger, if St Paul had written *οὐ μεμέρισται*;

In what sense did the Apostle mean that Christ had been divided? Christ is here identified with the body of believers. Thus 'Has Christ been divided?' is in effect 'Have you by your dissensions rent Christ's body asunder, tearing limb from limb?' Compare 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13 'For as the body is one, and hath many members and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.' Compare also xii. 27. This passage seems to leave no doubt as to the interpretation here; and so Clement of Rome evidently understands it, for speaking of the later factions at Corinth, he says (§ 46) *ὡς ἵνα τί διεσκομεν καὶ διασπῶμεν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ*; with an evident reference to St Paul's language here. Immediately afterwards he alludes directly to this Epistle *ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου...ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπολλῶ κ.τ.λ.* For an equally strong instance of the use of the

metaphor see Hebr. vi. 6 ἀνασταυρούοντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.

Some would give to μεμέρισται the sense of 'assigned as a share' ('Has Christ become the badge of a party?'), in which case the words would refer solely to the section described as ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ. It does not appear however that μερίζειν absolutely could well have this meaning; though in certain connexions, as in the construction μερίζειν τινὶ τι, it would be natural enough.

μη Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη] 'surely Paul was not crucified for you.' The appeal is not simply to their gratitude towards one who has laid down his life for them, but to their sense of justice. 'You were not purchased by the blood of Paul, you have not become the property of Paul.' Compare 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20, vii. 23, where this idea of ownership is brought out. The idea will of course be more strongly implied here if the reading is ὑπέρ, than if περι. The balance of evidence is slightly in favour of ὑπέρ.

εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου] 'into the name of,' not 'in the name of' as in the E. V. The preposition implies both 'subjection to and communion with' another. The phrase is sometimes ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι (Acts ii. 38 v. l.), sometimes ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι (Acts x. 48), but more frequently the stronger εἰς τὸ ὄνομα (Matt. xxviii. 19, Acts viii. 16, xix. 5).

It is unsafe to infer from such expressions as this (comp. Acts x. 48, xix. 5 and *Hermas V.* iii. 7. 3 θέλοντες βαπτισθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου) that the formula of baptism in the name of the Trinity (as commanded Matt. xxviii. 19) was dispensed with, and the name of Jesus alone pronounced. Baptism in or into the name of Jesus is to be regarded as an abridged expression to signify Christian baptism, retaining the characteristic element in the formula. Justin Martyr at least recognises only baptism in the name of the Trinity (*Apol.* i. § 61, p. 94 A) and see *Clem. Recogn.* iii. 67, Tertull. *c. Praxean* § 27. Certain heretics however baptized solely in the name of Christ, and in the discussion on rebaptism it was a question whether such baptism was valid. See a full account in Bingham's *Christian Antiquities*, xi. c. iii. § 1 and comp. Neander *Pfl. u. Leit.* § 276, *Ch. Hist.* (Bohn's translation) II. pp. 430, 446 sq., who however leans to the opinion that baptism in the name of Christ alone is intended in these passages of Scripture, as did St Ambrose also *de Spir. Sanct.* i. 3.

14. Κρίσπον] The ruler of the synagogue whose whole household was converted, probably among the earliest Corinthian converts. Crispus (like Cincinnatus, etc. referring originally to the hair) is a common Roman cognomen, and occurs frequently also as a Jewish name. See the passages cited by Lightfoot and Wetstein here.

Γαῖον] St Paul (Rom. xvi. 23) speaks of Gaius as 'mine host and of the whole Church,' so that he would appear to have lodged with him during his (now approaching) third visit to Corinth. Several persons

of the name appear in the N. T. It was an ordinary prænomen among the Romans, and being common to several distinguished members of the Imperial family, like Julius, Claudius etc., was probably more in vogue than ever at this epoch. Whether this is the same with the Gaius addressed in 3 John, it is impossible to say. They are both commended in similar terms for their hospitality: comp. 3 John 5, 6. But the Gaius of St John seems to be spoken of as a younger man or at least a young disciple, whereas the Gaius of St Paul cannot have been either when St John wrote. The correct pronunciation and probably the correct form in Latin is Gaius, as it is always written in Greek. The same character in Latin originally stood for C and G: comp. Donaldson *Varron*. vii. § 3, p. 291.

15. *ὅτι μὴ τις εἴπῃ*] is to be connected with the whole sentence *εὐχαριστῶ...ἐβάπτισα*, not with *οὐδένα ἐβάπτισα* alone. 'I am thankful it was so, that no one may have it in his power to say.' It is not meant that St Paul at the time abstained from baptizing, foreseeing this result, but that afterwards he was glad that it was so. 'Providentia Dei regnat sæpe in rebus, quarum ratio postea cognoscitur' Bengel.

εἰς τὸ ἑμὸν ὄνομα] as certain heretics actually did, or are reputed to have done, e.g. Menander (in Pseudo-Tertull. *adv. omn. Hær.* c. 1.) and others. See the references in Bingham, XI. c. iii. § 5.

ἐβαπτίσθητε] the correct reading, not *ἐβάπτισα*.

16. The verse was an afterthought. He was perhaps reminded of the omission by his amanuensis, who may have been Stephanas himself or one of his household, for they were with him at the time (1 Cor. xvi. 15, 17). Perhaps Fortunatus and Achaicus were members of his household. The house of Stephanas is spoken of in 1 Cor. i. c. as the first-fruits of Achaia. This will account for their being baptized by the Apostle's own hand.

On the undesigned coincidences between the Acts and Epistles lurking under these names see Paley *Hor. Paul.* III. § 8.

17. *οὐ γὰρ ἀπίστευε*] Baptism might be performed by a subordinate. It presupposed no extraordinary gifts on the part of the performer, for its efficacy consisted in the spirit of the recipient and the grace of God, *ἡ γὰρ προαίρεσις τοῦ προσιόντος λοιπὸν ἐργάζεται τὸ πᾶν, καὶ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάρις*: but successful preaching requires special gifts.

Hence we find that our Lord did not baptize Himself, but left this work to His disciples (John iv. 1, 2). And the Apostles followed this precedent, as St Peter (Acts x. 48), and St Paul here. St Paul was generally attended by one or more of the brethren, who ministered to him and on whom this office would devolve (Acts xiii. 5 *εἶχον Ἰωάννην ὑπηρέτην*, xix. 22 *δύο τῶν διακονούντων αὐτῷ Τιμόθεον καὶ Ἑραστον*, both phrases pointing to a recognised position, more or less official).

οἱκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου] St Paul is eager to obviate any misapprehension which might arise from his exaltation of the ordinance of preaching. There were many members of the Corinthian Church who would eagerly seize hold of this concession as they would regard it. It is not as a mere

display of rhetoric, or of logical subtlety that he exalts it. This might require special gifts, but not the gifts of the Spirit.

It is questioned whether *ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου* refers to the form or the matter of the teaching. So far as it is possible to separate the two, this question is best answered by determining against which party the implied rebuke is directed. We can scarcely be wrong in assuming this to be the party which affected to follow Apollos the man of eloquence (*ἄνηρ λόγιος*, Acts xviii. 24). If so, the reference must be mainly to form, through the natural tendency of the Corinthian mind to attach too much importance to the graces of diction: for the substance of Apollos' teaching cannot have differed from that of St Paul in any such degree as to have been exaggerated into a party question. The *σοφία λόγου* then will refer not only to the luxuriant rhetoric, but also to the dialectic subtleties of the Alexandrian method, which we find to an exaggerated degree in the writings of Philo and some of the Alexandrian fathers.

κενωθῆ] 'be emptied,' i.e. 'dwindle to nothing, vanish under the weight of rhetorical ornament and dialectic subtlety.' For *κενοῦν* compare I Cor. ix. 15, 2 Cor. ix. 3.

(b) *The unhealthy craving after σοφία. God's folly triumphant over man's wisdom* (i. 18—ii. 5).

18. Through this incidental allusion to preaching St Paul passes to a new subject. The dissensions in the Corinthian Church are for a time forgotten, and he takes the opportunity of correcting his converts for their undue exaltation of human eloquence and wisdom. He returns from this digression to his former theme almost imperceptibly at the beginning of the third chapter. The link of connexion in both cases is equally subtle.

ὁ λόγος γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] The connexion is as follows: 'For the preaching with which we are concerned—the preaching of the Cross—is the very antithesis to *σοφία λόγου*. It has no triumphs of rhetoric or subtleties of dialectic to offer to those whose hearts are set on such trifles. To such it appears to be but foolishness: and this is a sign that they are on the way of destruction.' On the repetition of *λόγος* see note ii. 6 *σοφίαν*.

ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ] here used as co-extensive with the preaching of the Gospel, just as *ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ* in the previous verse denotes the substance of the Gospel. This expression shows clearly the stress which St Paul laid on the death of Christ, not merely as a great moral spectacle and so the crowning point of a life of self-renunciation, but as in itself the ordained instrument of salvation.

ἀπολλυμένοις, σωζομένοις] 'those who are in the path of destruction, of salvation.' 'In the language of the New Testament salvation is a thing of the past, a thing of the present, and a thing of the future. St Paul says sometimes "Ye (or we) were saved" (Rom viii. 24), or "Ye have been saved" (Ephes. ii. 5, 8), sometimes "Ye are being saved" (I Cor. xv. 2),

and sometimes "Ye shall be saved" (Rom. x. 9, 13). It is important to observe this, because we are thus taught that *σωτηρία* involves a moral condition which must have begun already, though it will receive its final accomplishment hereafter. Godliness, righteousness, is life, is salvation. And it is hardly necessary to say that the divorce of morality and religion must be fostered and encouraged by failing to note this, and so laying the whole stress either on the past or on the future—on the first call or on the final charge.' *On a Fresh Revision*, p. 104, ed. 3 (1891). For *ἀπολλυμένοις* compare 2 Cor. ii. 15, iv. 3, 2 Thess. ii. 10; for *σωζόμενοις* 2 Cor. ii. 15, Acts ii. 47; see also Luke xiii. 23 *εἰ ὀλίγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι*. Comp. also Clem. Rom. § 58, *Clem. Hom.* xv. 10, *Apost. Const.* viii. 5, 7, 8. The idea of final acceptance or rejection is obviously excluded in the present tense: nor is it at all necessarily implied by the past tense, if we remember that the knowledge of God is in itself *σωτηρία*, and those who are brought to that knowledge are *σεσωσμένοις*; just as they are said to belong to the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, though they may not attain to the blissful consummation of their salvation, and may be excluded from the future kingdom of Christ by falling away. For St Paul's way of speaking compare the note on ver. 2 *ἡγιασμένοις* and ver. 9 *κοινωνία*.

τοῖς δὲ σωζόμενοις ἡμῶν] This order, which is somewhat unnatural, is adopted in order to bring out the opposition between *οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι* and *οἱ σωζόμενοι* sharply. At the same time it serves to smooth down the prominence of *ἡμῶν*.

δύναμις Θεοῦ] The direct opposition to *μωρία* would require *σοφία Θεοῦ*, but the word *δύναμις* is instinctively substituted to show that it is not the intellectual excellence so much as the moral power of the doctrine of the Cross on which the Apostle lays stress. At the same time, inasmuch as *μωρία* involves the notion of vainness, inefficiency, *δύναμις* is no unnatural opposition.

19. *ἀπολω κ.τ.λ.*] A quotation from Isaiah xxix. 14. By this appeal to Scripture St Paul enforces the two points, which are brought out in the preceding verse: *first*, the opposition between the wisdom of the world and the power of God, and *secondly*, the destruction of the wise of this world. Compare *ἀπολω* with *τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις* of ver. 18.

The passage is taken from the LXX. with this difference that St Paul has substituted *ἀθετήσω* for *κρύψω*. In the Hebrew the sentence is in a passive form: 'the wisdom of their wise shall perish etc.' The spirit of the application here is in exact accordance with the original context of the passage. The opposition there is between the *ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας* (ver. 13, a passage cited by our Lord Matt. xv. 8, 9) and the power of God which shall be exerted to the ruin of those who trust in human teaching. The original reference however is to a temporary calamity, the invasion of Sennacherib; and the application which St Paul makes of the passage, in a spiritual and more comprehensive sense, is after the common analogy of the New Testament writers.

σοφίαν, σύνεσιν] On the distinction between these two terms see the note on Col. i. 9. They are explained in Arist. *Eth. Nic.* vi. 7, 10. The first is a creative, the second a discerning faculty.

20. ποῦ σοφός; κ.τ.λ.] These words are a loose paraphrase of Isaiah xxxiii. 18. They are certainly not intended as a quotation, for the language diverges too much both from the Hebrew and LXX. The original passage describes the overthrow of Sennacherib, who had attacked the people of God. It runs in the LXX. *ποῦ εἰσιν οἱ γραμματικοί; ποῦ εἰσιν οἱ συμβουλευόντες; ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀριθμῶν τοὺς τρεφομένους μικρὸν καὶ μέγαν λαόν;* perhaps translated from a corrupt text. The meaning of the Hebrew is given in Bishop Lowth's translation: 'Where is now the accomptant? where the weigher of tribute? where is he that numbereth the towers?' The annihilation of the officers of Sennacherib's army is intended by these words. In place of these St Paul substitutes the leaders in the world of thought, who war against the 'spiritual Israel. From this it will be seen that the passage in Isaiah will not aid us to the interpretation of the individual words *σοφός*, *γραμματεὺς*, *συνζητητής*, the form of the sentence only being the same and the general application analogous, while the similarity of *γραμματικοί* of the LXX. in Isaiah and *γραμματεὺς* in St Paul is merely accidental, or at best suggested the paraphrase by its appeal to the ear.

σοφός, γραμματεὺς, συνζητητής] Two explanations of these words deserve consideration. *First*, *σοφός* is the general term including both the Jewish and Greek teachers, *γραμματεὺς* is the Jewish scribe, *συνζητητής* the Greek philosopher. But against this interpretation it may be urged (1) that *σοφός* more fitly designates the Greek philosopher than *συνζητητής*, being the word specially reserved for this meaning among the Greeks themselves; see Theodoret (ad loc.) *καλεῖ σοφὸν τὸν τῆ Ἑλληνικῆ σταμυλία κοσμούμενον*, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. 3. 23, p. 329, and above all Rom. i. 23 *φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν*. Compare also the Jewish proverb quoted by Lightfoot (*H. H.* ad loc.) 'Cursed is he that herdeth hogs, and cursed is he that teacheth his son Grecian wisdom.' (2) This interpretation seems to require *τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* to be taken with all three words, whereas the repetition of *ποῦ* separates the clauses. For these reasons it is better, *secondly*, to take *σοφός* as the Greek philosopher, *γραμματεὺς* as the Jewish scribe, and *συνζητητής τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* as the comprehensive term, a general expression comprehending both, *τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* being confined to the last of the three. The use of *σοφία* just below in the phrase *τῆν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου*, as including both, is not a sufficient reason for discarding this interpretation. A stronger argument in favour of this explanation might be drawn from ver. 22, where *σοφία* is used of the Greeks alone.

Both these senses recognise a special mention of Jew and Greek severally, and this seems to be required by the sequel *ἐπειδὴ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι... καὶ Ἕλληνες* (ver. 22). This in itself is decisive in favour of rejecting

other distinctions, as for instance that σοφός is the ethical and metaphysical philosopher, γραμματεὺς the historian and literary man, συζητητής the naturalist and man of science—a distinction which has quite a modern smack. Moreover γραμματεὺς can only be a learned man when applied to the Jewish scribe: in the ordinary Greek vocabulary it denotes a civil officer, 'a town-clerk' or 'secretary,' e.g. Acts xix. 35; Eccus. xxxviii. 24 σοφία γραμματέως ἐν εὐκαιρία σχολῆς is not an exception.

The Jewish writers (see the passages in Wetstein) included in their general picture of the corruption of the age at the time of Messiah's coming the failing of Rabbinical wisdom, apparently with a reference to Isaiah xxxiii. 18. With regard to the heathen, we have here the germ of the thought which St Paul afterwards expands so strikingly in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, especially vv. 21, 22 ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία· φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν, καὶ ἤλλαξαν κ.τ.λ. See also the notes on οὐχὶ ἐμώρηνεν ὁ Θεὸς below and on ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ in the next verse. For a similar instance of an expansion see xv. 56.

τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου] On this expression, as opposed to ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων or αἰὼν ἐκείνος 'Messiah's reign,' compare Usteri *Paul. Lehrb.* p. 327 sq. The phrase had a temporal meaning, as originally employed by the Jews; but as St Paul uses it, it is rather ethical in its signification, there being no sharp division in time between 'the age of the world' and 'the age of Messiah.'

οὐχὶ ἐμώρηνεν ὁ Θεὸς] 'did not God render vain'; and this in two ways, (1) by exhibiting its intrinsic worthlessness and corrupt results, and (2) by the power of the Cross set in opposition to it and triumphing over it, as explained in the following verse. The process of this μωραίνειν in the case of the Gentiles is portrayed in the passage from the Romans quoted above. The hand of God is there distinctly recognised, διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις κ.τ.λ. 'While the reason strove to raise itself,' remarks Neander, 'above Polytheism, it was betrayed into Pantheism only to fall at last into scepticism.' Yet it is rather their moral degradation, as resulting from their idolatry, that St Paul must have had in his mind, as the passage in the Epistle to the Romans shows.

τοῦ κόσμου] Omit τούτου, which has been introduced to conform to τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου above; κόσμος is in itself 'the existing order of things,' and needs no specification like αἰὼν. We never find ὁ κόσμος ὁ μέλλων. Κόσμος is used as synonymous with αἰὼν, as in 1 Cor. iii. 18, 19: compare also 1 Cor. ii. 6 with ii. 12 and Eph. ii. 2, where we have κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. So far as there is any difference between the two words, αἰὼν would seem, like 'sæculum,' to refer to the prevailing ideas and feelings of the present life, and κόσμος to its gross, material character; and the two would be contrasted, though not so sharply, in the same way as 'the world' and 'the flesh.'

21. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ] explaining the manner of ἐμώρηνεν in the preceding verse.

ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ] is explained in two ways. (1) 'When the world failed to recognise God in the works of His wisdom': σοφία denoting the wisdom of God as displayed in the works of creation to the Gentiles and in the Mosaic dispensation to the Jews. Or (2) 'when owing to the wise dispensation of God the world failed to recognise Him etc.' The first interpretation produces indeed a stronger resemblance to Rom. i. 18 sq. of which this passage is the germ; compare especially ver. 20 τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα καθοράται κ.τ.λ., and see Wisd. xiii. 1. But everything else is in favour of the second rendering. For *first*, it is harsh to attribute to σοφία a concrete sense, as 'the works of His intelligence': *secondly*, the position of ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ points to it, as giving the explanation of οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος κ.τ.λ.: and *thirdly*, the sense suits the context better, as accounting for ἐμώρηνεν ὁ Θεός which idea it assists the following εὐδόκησεν διὰ τῆς μωρίας in carrying out. Even the corruption of the world was in a certain sense God's doing, inasmuch as He permitted it with a providential end in view: comp. Rom. xi. 32.

ὁ κόσμος] here includes Jew as well as Gentile. The Pharisee, no less than the Greek philosopher, had a σοφία of his own, which stood between his heart and the knowledge of God.

διὰ τῆς σοφίας] is taken either of 'the wisdom of God,' or of 'the wisdom of the world.' The latter is probably correct, as it presents the same opposition to διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος which runs through the context.

τοῦ κηρύγματος] 'of the thing preached,' 'the proclamation'; not τῆς κηρύξεως. It refers therefore to the subject, not to the manner of the preaching. There is only the very slightest approach in classical writers to this sense of the words κηρύσσειν, κήρυγμα etc., as denoting 'instruction,' 'teaching.' The metaphor, if it can be called a metaphor, is perhaps derived from the Jewish theocracy, and involves the notion of heralding the approach of a king (Matt. iii. 1, iv. 17), or of proclaiming an edict of a sovereign. But it seems to be very rarely used in a sense approaching to this, even in the LXX.

22. The following verses (22—25) contain a confirmation and amplification of the assertion in ver. 21, in its twofold bearing. They maintain *first*, that the preaching of the gospel is directly opposed to the wisdom of the world, whether displayed in the sign-seeking of the Jews, or the philosophical subtleties of the Greeks (the σοφία *par excellence*); and *secondly*, that this foolishness of God triumphs over the wisdom of the world.

καὶ Ἰουδαίου...καὶ Ἕλληνας] i.e. 'the Jews no less than the Gentiles have gone astray.' Compare Rom. iii. 9 προηρυσάμεθα γὰρ Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας πάντας ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι. The particles καὶ...καὶ correspond to each other, and attach the two sentences together. The absence of a

μέν in this clause, answering to ἡμεῖς δέ, is to be accounted for by supposing that the Apostle had not cast the form of the latter part of the sentence in his mind, when he commenced it.

Ἰουδαῖοι, Ἕλληγες] The absence of the article shows that they are spoken of rather with a view to their attributes than to their individuality, 'Jews as Jews,' 'Greeks as Greeks.'

σημεῖα] the correct reading, for which the received text has σημεῖον. The whole force of the passage here comes from the meaning 'miraculous sign' as applied to σημεῖον. Compare Matt. xii. 38 sq., xvi. 1 sq., John ii. 18, vi. 30, incidents to which St Paul may be alluding indirectly, though doubtless the Apostles were frequently met by the Jews with the demand 'give us a sign,' as our Lord had been. It is not difficult to conjecture in what sense the Jews asked for 'signs.' Signs were vouchsafed in plenty, signs of God's power and love, but these were not the signs which they sought. They wanted signs of an outward Messianic Kingdom, of temporal triumph, of material greatness for the chosen people. See *Biblical Essays*, p. 150 sq. for Jewish expectation of signs to be wrought by the Messiah, and the references in Wetstein on Matt. xvi. 1. With such cravings the gospel of a 'crucified Messiah' (Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον) was to them a stumbling-block indeed.

Ἕλληγες σοφίαν] This characteristic of the Greeks was noted by Anacharsis in Herod. iv. 77, Ἕλληγας πάντας ἀσχόλους εἶναι πρὸς πᾶσαν σοφίην. He excepts however the Lacedaemonians.

αἰτοῦσιν, ζητοῦσιν] The same accurate appreciation of the difference between Jew and Gentile as regards the reception of the Gospel, which dictated the whole passage, is visible in these words. All the terms are carefully chosen. The importunity of the Jews is expressed by αἰτεῖν, the curious speculative turn of the Greeks by ζητεῖν.

23. An instructive commentary on this passage is furnished by the different arguments which Justin Martyr employs in combating Jewish and Greek assailants in the Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho. See Blunt *Church in the First Three Centuries* (1861), p. 120 sq.

The Jews looked to material, outward privileges, the Greeks sought satisfaction for their intellectual cravings. The preaching of the Cross commended itself to neither. It is a moral and spiritual power.

ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν] 'but we preach,' i.e. 'we do not discuss or dispute.'

Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον] 'a crucified Messiah,' not as the E. V., 'Christ crucified.' The expression is a sort of oxymoron. It is not so much the person as the office which is denoted here by Χριστός. By suffering He was to redeem; by suffering He was to make many perfect. His Messiahship and His Cross were necessarily connected. To the Jew however Χριστὸς ἐσταυρωμένος was a contradiction in terms: to the Greek it would be simply meaningless. The great difficulty of the Jews in overcoming the idea of a crucified Messiah appears from the very first.

See Acts xxvi. 23, where St Paul states that one of the main theses which he had to maintain was that the Christ was to suffer. Consequently we find that the Apologists in arguing with the Jews had to explain this difficulty (Ariston of Pella in Routh *R. S.* I. p. 95, Justin Martyr *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 69, p. 323 C, Tertull. *adv. Judaeos* § 10). On this point see further in *Galatians*, p. 152 sq. An illustration of this difficulty we have in the fact that the later Jews, recognising the prediction of the prophets that the Messiah should suffer, were driven to the expedient of supposing two Christs, both a suffering and a glorified Redeemer, called respectively Ben Joseph and Ben David. There is no trace however of this distinction until Christian arguments from prophecy forced it upon Jewish apologists. See Bertholdt *Christol.* § 17, p. 75 sq., Gfrörer *Jahr. des Heils* II. p. 318 sq., and compare Stanley, p. 51. With regard to the general abhorrence of the Cross by the Gentiles see Cicero *pro Rabirio*, c. 5 'nomen ipsum crucis absit non modo a corpore civium Romanorum, sed etiam a cogitatione, oculis, auribus,' comp. *Verr.* v. 64. That this 'stumbling-block of the cross' existed not only in the apostolic age but that it continued for generations later appears from many indications. Thus Lucian (*de morte Peregr.* c. 13) speaks of our Lord as 'the gibbeted sophist,' τὸν ἀνεσκολοπισμένον ἐκείνον σοφιστήν; but perhaps the best illustration of the popular feeling is the well-known caricature of a slave falling down before an ass hanging on a gibbet with the inscription Ἀλεξαμενος σεβετε θεον, found in the Paedagogium on the Palatine, and now in the Museo Kircheriano. So Celsus (*Orig. c. Cels.* iv. 7) speaks of the Christians as 'actually worshipping a dead man' (ὄντως νεκρὸν σέβοντας), a *reductio ad absurdum* in his opinion. The Emperor Julian after his apostasy uses similar language. See also the note on Phil. ii. 8.

σκάνδαλον] Σκάνδαλον corresponds to σημεία, μωρίαν to σοφίαν. Instead of finding signs or tokens of the approach of Messiah's Kingdom, finger-posts guiding them thereto, they found a hindrance to their belief in that approach.

24. αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς] 'but to the believers themselves,' whatever it might be to others. 'Though they see that those around them regard the cross as a stumbling-block or as foolishness, yet they themselves know it to be' etc. This is the force of αὐτοῖς, which is added because the passage is expressed from the standpoint of the believer. The meaning of αὐτοῖς would have been more clear if St Paul had said αὐτοῖς δὲ ἡμῖν, but he avoids the first person because he wishes no longer to restrict the application to the preachers (ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν) of whom he has been speaking hitherto. Αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς cannot mean, 'to them, viz. the called'; first, because this is very questionable Greek, and secondly, because there is nothing nearer than τοὺς πιστεύοντας (ver. 21) to which to refer the pronoun. On τοῖς κλητοῖς see ver. 2 above.

Χριστὸν] The repetition of this word is emphatic. 'Christ crucified'

of the former clause is now 'Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God.'

δύναμιν] corresponds to *σημεία* of ver. 22, as *σοφίαν* does to *σοφίαν*. The analogy between *δύναμις* and *σημεία* will appear, if we remember that the signs, which the Jews sought, were manifestations of kingly power.

The terms *δύναμις* and *σοφία* applied to our Lord are suggested by what has gone before. He is the reality of that power of which the Jews were pursuing the shadow, of that wisdom for which the Greeks were substituting a counterfeit. At the same time they have a deeper meaning. They appeal to the theosophy of the day, and declare Christ to be the Eternal Word of God. For both *δύναμις* (*Θεοῦ*) and *σοφία* (*Θεοῦ*) are synonyms for *Λόγος* in the phraseology of Jewish speculators. For *δύναμις* in the sense of an emanation of the Godhead see Acts viii. 10, for *σοφία* see Luke xi. 49.

25. *τῶν ἀνθρώπων*] St Paul in abridging the comparison is only following a common Greek idiom: e.g. Eur. *Med.* 1342, 3 *λέαναν, οὐ γυναικα, τῆς Τυρσηνίδος Σκύλλης ἔχουσαν ἀγριωτέραν φύσιν*. See Jelf, *Gr.* § 781 d, Winer, § xxxv. p. 307. At the same time the expression here is more forcible than if it had been written in full *τῆς σοφίας (τῆς ἰσχύος) τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. The very foolishness of God is wiser than men and all that is in man.

Tertullian's comment is 'Quid est stultum Dei sapientius hominibus, nisi crux et mors Christi? Quid infirmum Dei fortius homine, nisi nativitas et caro Dei?' (*c. Marcion.* v. 5). The separation however in this comment is not justified by the text.

26. 'Is not this in accordance with your own experience? Thus not only in the means of redemption, but in the persons of the redeemed, is the weakness of God declared to be stronger than men. Not only is the power of God seen in the effect of the preaching of a crucified Messiah: it is evidenced also in the fact that preachers and believers alike are chiefly drawn from the weak and the despised of the world.'

βλέπετε γάρ] '*for look at your calling*,' the circumstances under which ye were called to Christianity. Not an indicative but an imperative mood: compare viii. 9, x. 12, 18, xvi. 10, Phil. iii. 2 and frequently in St Paul. The passage is more vigorous when thus taken: 'excitat quasi torpentes ad rem ipsam considerandam' says Calvin. And the emphatic position of *βλέπετε* seems to require it. Otherwise the order would probably have been *τὴν κλήσιν ὑμῶν βλέπετε*, as in 2 Cor. x. 7 *τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον βλέπετε*.

τὴν κλήσιν ὑμῶν] '*the manner of your calling*'; here and elsewhere with a special reference to their station in life at the time of their calling. This idea however is not contained in the word *κλήσις* itself, but is derived from the context, as also in vii. 20. *Κλήσις* in itself never signifies a 'vocation' or 'calling in life.' It is the calling to the know-

ledge of the Gospel, and it may or may not, according to the context, have reference to the circumstances under which the calling took place. On the Pauline interchange of κλήσις and ἐκλογή see on Col. iii. 12 ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, and compare 1 Thess. i. 4, 2 Thess. i. 11. It will be observed here that St Paul uses the verb ἐξελέξατο in ver. 27 as corresponding to the substantive κλήσιν.

ὅτι] 'how that.' For this construction compare the note on 1 Thess. i. 5 (a passage which is mistranslated in the E. V.). It is the ὅτι, which introduces the idea of manner or circumstances into κλήσις.

κατὰ σάρκα] should probably be taken with all three words σοφοί, δυνατοί, εὐγενεῖς. The position of the qualifying phrase after the first of the three is much more in favour of this conjuncture than if it had been placed after the last, as for instance in ver. 20. Besides it applies equally well to all three. There is a spiritual δύναμις and a spiritual εὐγένεια, as well as a spiritual σοφία. The Bereans are examples of this spiritual nobility (οὗτοι ἦσαν εὐγενέστεροι τῶν ἐν Θεσσαλονίκη Acts xvii. 11). Lastly, τοῦ κόσμου is repeated with the opposites of all three in the next verse.

οὐ πολλοί] 'not many.' The phrase is not equivalent to οὐδείς, for there were some few exceptions. In the Church of Corinth Erastus 'the chamberlain of the city' (Rom. xvi. 23) might perhaps be reckoned among the δυνατοί. That the majority of the first converts from heathendom were either slaves or freedmen, appears from their names. Compare especially the salutations in the last chapter of the Roman Epistle (see on this *Philippians*, p. 171 sq.), and the remarks of Merivale, *History of the Romans* (1858), vol. vi. p. 265 sq.

The sentence is elliptical and a verb must be understood from the context. The reference however in οὐ πολλοὶ κ.τ.λ. is probably to be confined neither to the teachers as such, nor to the taught as such (as different commentators have maintained); but to be extended to the converts generally. Accordingly some less precise term is needed than ἐκλήθησαν or ἐξελέχθησαν, though in one sense ἐκλήθησαν is applicable, for teachers and taught alike are 'called.' On the brachylogies of St Paul see the note on ver. 31, and on this passage Dr Ainslie in the *Journal of Philology* (1868) II. p. 158.

This fact of the social condition of the early Christians is the constant boast of the first Apologists as the glory of Christianity. See especially Justin Martyr *Apol.* ii. 9 Χριστῷ οὐ φιλόσοφοι οὐδὲ φιλόλογοι μόνον ἐπέισθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χειροτέχναι καὶ παντελῶς ἰδιῶται καὶ δόξης καὶ φόβου καὶ θανάτου καταφρονήσαντες, ἐπειδὴ δύναμις ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀρρήτου Πατρὸς κ.τ.λ.; and Origen *c. Cels.* II. 79 καὶ οὐ θαυμαστὸν εἰ τῶν φρονιμῶν· ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀλογωτάτων καὶ τοῖς πάθεσιν ἐγκειμένων...ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν καὶ σοφία τοῦ Πατρὸς, διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα πεποιήκεν καὶ ἔτι ποιεῖ κ.τ.λ.

27, 28. ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.] Μωρὰ, ἀσθενή, ἀγενή καὶ τὰ ἐξουθενημένα are the

opposites of σοφοί, δυνατοί, εὐγενείς. See the note on the reading καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα below. The omission of the words ἵνα καταισχύνη τοὺς σοφοὺς, καὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεός in some uncial MSS. probably arises out of a confusion due to the repetition of the same words ἐξελ. ὁ Θεός. Origen is guilty of a different error. He omits from the first to the third ἐξελ. ὁ Θεός. The neuters (e.g. τὰ μωρὰ for οἱ μωροὶ) are adopted in preference to the masculines, as sinking the individuality and conveying an idea of meanness in the objects, and thus bringing out the point of the contrast more strongly.

The repetition of ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεός is emphatic. The effect is the same as in the reiteration of κλητὸς ver. 1 (where see the note). St Paul is penetrated with the intense conviction that our calling is not of ourselves but of God; and expresses himself accordingly. Thus he is already preparing us for the precept with which he closes the paragraph, Ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν Κυρίῳ καυχάσθω.

28. τὰ μὴ ὄντα] The omission of the particle καὶ before τὰ μὴ ὄντα is justifiable on external authority alone, though the evidence in its favour (N³BC³D³L) is considerable. It is however not found in N³AC¹D¹FG and several of the early fathers. Certainly the sense gains by the omission. The three classes which are the opposites to σοφοί, δυνατοί, εὐγενείς have been already enumerated (though in the last the supplementary clause ἵνα καταισχύνη τὰ εὐγενῆ is not expressed and has to be supplied by the reader). The strong expression τὰ μὴ ὄντα is now added as at once a climax and a summary of what has gone before.

The negative μὴ is generally explained here as denoting not the objective fact (τὰ οὐκ ὄντα) but the subjective impression, 'things reputed non-existent.' So apparently Winer § lv, p. 608. This however would weaken the force of the contrast, and it is probable that it denotes simply the class-attributes, 'such things as are not,' according to its ordinary usage. Compare Xen. *Anab.* iv. 4. 15 οὗτος γὰρ ἐδόκει καὶ πρότερον πολλὰ ἤδη ἀληθεύσαι τοιαῦτα, τὰ ὄντα τε ὡς ὄντα καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς οὐκ ὄντα, where the sense is obvious and has nothing to do with the subjective impression. See also Jelf, *Gr.* § 746. 2, and Eur. *Troad.* 608 (cited by Alford) Ὁρῶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν, ὡς τὰ μὲν πυργοῦσ' ἄνω τὰ μηδὲν ὄντα, τὰ δὲ δοκοῦντ' ἀπόλεσαν. In fact τὰ μὴ ὄντα is much more usual than τὰ οὐκ ὄντα in the sense of 'things not existing.'

καταργήσῃ] 'annihilate, reduce to non-entity.' This strong expression is substituted for the weaker καταισχύνη, as the opposition to τὰ μὴ ὄντα requires.

29. ὅπως μὴ καυχῆσθαι πᾶσα σὰρξ] 'that no flesh may boast,' 'that all flesh may be prevented from boasting.' Compare Acts x. 14 οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινὸν 'I have always avoided eating everything common,' Rom. iii. 20 οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. In such cases the negative is attached closely to the verb which it immediately precedes. This seems to be scarcely a classical usage of πᾶς with the negative,

and the analogy of the classical *οὐ πάνυ* (with which on the other hand compare *οὐ πάντως* Rom. iii. 9) is apparent, rather than real. It is a common Hebraism, and the corresponding Hebrew (כְּלִבְיָשׁ), showing that *πάσα σὰρξ* are to be regarded as one word, assists to explain how *πάσα* is unaffected by the negative which refers solely to the verb.

ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ] The preposition conveys an idea of boldness and independence. As Bengel says; 'Non *coram* illo, sed *in* illo gloriari possumus.' See ver. 31.

30. 'Nay, so far from there being any place for boasting, ye owe your existence as Christians to Him, as the Author of your being.'

The words *ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* are differently taken. Either (1) 'From Him ye have your being (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐστὲ*), ye are born of Him in Christ Jesus,' 'ye are His children in Christ Jesus.' So Chrysostom (*ἐκείνου παῖδες ἐστε διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦτο γενόμενοι*), and in the same way the other Greek commentators. Compare xi. 8, 12, xii. 15. Or (2) 'For it is His doing (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ*) that ye are in Christ Jesus, are members of Christ (*ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*).' The latter of these interpretations is open to two objections; *first*, that the sense attributed to *ἐξ αὐτοῦ* is unusual at least in the New Testament, and *secondly*, the emphatic position of *ἐστὲ* would scarcely be explicable, for the natural order would certainly be *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐστε*. It was probably from an instinctive feeling of the requirements of the Greek that the Greek commentators seem all to have adopted the other interpretation. For the sentiment and even the form in which it is expressed, compare Gal. iii. 26 *πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ἐστὲ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. If the idea of a regeneration and spiritual sonship appears most frequently in St John, it was certainly not unknown to St Paul.

ἐστέ] Possibly an allusion to the preceding *τὰ μὴ ὄντα* 'you, who were not, now are.' But in any case, *ἐστε* is here best taken as a predicate, and accented, as in Lachmann's edition.

ἐγενήθη] 'became' (i.e. by His incarnation); not 'was made.' See the note on I Thess. i. 5 *ἐγενήθημεν*. 'He showed us the way to all true knowledge, the knowledge of God and of our own salvation. He by taking upon Him our nature was manifested to us as the impersonation of all wisdom,' or perhaps better 'the representative of the wise dispensation of God.'

ἀπὸ Θεοῦ] To be taken with *ἐγενήθη σοφία*, not with *σοφία* alone. St Paul accumulates words to intensify the leading idea of the sentence that everything comes of God.

δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμός καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις] 'that is to say, righteousness and sanctification and redemption.' These three words are an exegesis of *σοφία*. Owing to the absence of any connecting particle between *σοφία* and *δικαιοσύνη*, and especially considering the interposition of *ἀπὸ Θεοῦ*, it is impossible to coordinate the four words, as is done in the English version and by many commentators.

The connecting particles *τε καὶ...καὶ* perhaps imply a close connexion between *δικαιοσύνη* and *ἀγιασμός*, whereas *ἀπολύτρωσις* stands rather by itself. 'By becoming wisdom He became both righteousness and sanctification and also redemption.' Compare Hom. *Od.* xv. 78 *ἀμφοτέρων, κῦδος τε καὶ ἀγλαΐη, καὶ ὄνειρα*, Herod. vii. 1 *καὶ νέας τε καὶ ἵππους καὶ σίτον καὶ πλοῖα*: and see Jelf, *Gr.* § 758, Hartung, *Partikeln.* i. 103.

The order of the words *δικαιοσύνη, ἀγιασμός* is what might be expected. *Δικαιοσύνη* is used in its peculiar Pauline sense as 'righteousness before God,' 'justification'; differing however from *δικαίωσις* (Rom. iv. 25, v. 18) in that the latter is the verdict of God which pronounces a man righteous. *Ἀγιασμός* is the natural following up of *δικαιοσύνη* and is illustrated by Rom. vi. 19 *παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἀγιασμόν*. On the terminations *-σύνη, -σις, -σμός* see 1 Thess. iii. 13. On the other hand we are scarcely prepared to find *ἀπολύτρωσις* following these words which we might expect it to precede, as e.g. Rom. iii. 24 *δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. But 'redemption' is really used in two ways. Calvin very justly says, 'Redemptio primum Christi donum est quod inchoatur in nobis, et ultimum quod perficitur'; and here the word is used not so much of the initiative act (the death of Christ, cf. Eph. i. 7), as of redemption consummated in our deliverance from all sin and misery. In this sense it is almost equivalent to *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* and is therefore rightly placed last. For the sense of *ἀπολύτρωσις* see especially Eph. iv. 30 *εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως* and compare Rom. viii. 23, Eph. i. 14.

This is the earliest indication in St Paul's Epistles of the doctrine which occupies so prominent a place in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, and in St Paul's teaching generally. See *Biblical Essays*, p. 224 sq.

31. *ἵνα καθὼς γέγραπται κ.τ.λ.*] 'in order that it may be according to the language of Scripture.' The sentence is frequently explained as an anacoluthon, as if St Paul had retained the imperative mood of the original (*καυχάσθω*) instead of substituting *καυχήσεται*. But it is more in accordance with St Paul's usage to regard it as an ellipsis *ἵνα (γένηται) καθὼς γέγραπται κ.τ.λ.* His ellipses are often very abrupt (see the instances collected on 2 Thess. ii. 3), and have occasioned much trouble to the transcribers, who are at much pains to supply them. See a note in *Journal of Philology* iii. p. 85. Of the ellipsis of a verb after *ἵνα* we have examples in Rom. iv. 16 *διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως ἵνα κατὰ χάριν*, Gal. ii. 9 *ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν*, 2 Cor. viii. 13 *οὐ γὰρ ἵνα ἄλλοις ἀνεῖς, ὑμῖν θλίψις*. Whichever explanation is given, the sentence in form very much resembles Rom. xv. 3 *ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται*. Οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδίζοντων σὲ ἐπέπεσον ἐπ' ἐμέ, and 1 Cor. ii. 9 below.

ὁ *καυχώμενος κ.τ.λ.*] is not a direct quotation, but abridged from Jeremiah ix. 23, 24 *μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ*,

ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνιέν και γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ἔλεος, combined with 1 Sam. ii. 10 μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ και μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ δυνατός ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ και μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος συνιέν και γινώσκειν τὸν Κύριον και ποιεῖν κρίμα και δικαιοσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς. It will be observed that the three classes, the wise, the strong and the wealthy, correspond roughly to the three enumerated in the passage above in ver. 26, and the reference is peculiarly apt here.

St Paul repeats the words ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν Κυρίῳ καυχάσθω in 2 Cor. x. 17, and St Clement of Rome (§ 13) quotes the passage from the LXX. with the conclusion thus ἀλλ' ἢ ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν Κυρίῳ καυχάσθω, τοῦ ἐκζητεῖν αὐτὸν και ποιεῖν κρίμα και δικαιοσύνην, words which, though diverging considerably from the corresponding passage in Jeremiah, approach nearly to the conclusion of 1 Sam. ii. 10 given above.

The resemblance of St Clement's language to St Paul may be explained in two ways; either (1) St Paul does not quote literally but gives the sense of one or other passage (1 Sam. ii. 10 or Jer. ix. 23 sq); and Clement, writing afterwards, unconsciously combines and confuses St Paul's quotations with the original text; or (2) a recension of the text of Jeremiah (or Samuel) was in circulation in the first century which contained the exact words ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν Κυρίῳ καυχάσθω. The former is the more probable hypothesis. Iren. *Haer.* iv. 17. 3 quotes Jer. ix. 24 as it stands in our texts. In neither passage does the Hebrew aid in solving the difficulty. In 1 Sam. ii. 10 it is much shorter than and quite different from the LXX. Lucifer *de Athan.* ii. 2 (Hartel, p. 148) quotes it 'non gloriatur sapiens in sua sapientia...nec gloriatur dives in divitiis suis, sed in hoc gloriatur qui gloriatur, inquirere me et intelligere et scire in Deum gloriari, quia ego sum Dominus qui facio misericordiam et judicium et justitiam super terram.' As Cotelier (on Clem. Rom. § 13) remarks, he seems to have read ἐκζητεῖν with Clement, for he has 'inquirere' three times in this context, but the coincidence may be accidental. On the other hand Antioch. Palæst. *Hom.* xliii. (*Bibl. Vet. Patr.* p. 1097, Paris 1624) quotes directly from 1 Sam. ii. 10 and betrays no connexion with Clement's language. For St Paul's quotations see further on ii. 9.

CHAPTER II.

1. 'And this divine rule was illustrated in my case also. Just as God has ordained the weakness of the cross as the means of salvation (i. 22—25), just as He has chosen the weak of this world as the objects of salvation (i. 26—31), so I too observed the same rule among you.' And this in two ways (introduced by *καὶ γὰρ*). 'Humility characterised my preaching (ii. 1, 2). Humility was stamped upon my person and penetrated my feelings (ii. 3).'

ἔλθων...ἦλθον] Perhaps the aorist *ἔλθων* is to be explained by supposing that the sentence was begun with the idea of ending it *οὐ καθ' ὑπεροχὴν κ.τ.λ. κατ' ἡγήγελλον*, and the form was abruptly changed after *ἀδελφοί*. For repetitions however somewhat analogous to this see Jelf, *Gr.* §705. 3, and better still Matth. §558, especially the instance from Plato *Euthyd.* p. 288 D *τίνα ποτ' οὖν ἂν κτησάμενοι ἐπιστήμην ὀρθῶς κησαίμεθα*. At all events it is not to be compared with the Hebraism *ἰδὼν εἶδον*.

οὐ καθ' ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας] 'not in excess of eloquence or wisdom,' i.e. not in excellence of rhetorical display or of philosophical subtlety. The two are united lower down in ver. 4 *ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγους*. 'Corinthia verba' was a proverbial expression for elaborate language (Wetstein on 1 Cor. ii. 4). The phrase here is better taken with *καταγγέλλων* than with *ἦλθον*.

καταγγέλλων] A present participle, instead of the future which generally accompanies verbs of motion to express the object of the verb (Matth. §566. 6). As we find however that this exception occurs so frequently in the case of *ἀγγέλλειν* and its compounds, we are led to look for the explanation in the special meaning of this verb, which is not so much 'to announce, declare,' as 'to bear tidings.' Compare Xen. *Hell.* ii. 1. 29 *ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐπλευσεν ἀγγέλλουσα τὰ γεγονότα*, Thucyd. i. 116 *οἰχόμενα περιαιγγέλλουσαι βοηθεῖν*, Eur. *Med.* 372; and so Acts xv. 27 *ἀπεστάλκαμεν...αὐτοὺς...ἀπαγγέλλοντας*.

τὸ μαρτύριον] 'the testimony.' He spoke in plain and simple language, as became a witness. Elaborate diction and subtlety of argument would

only discredit his testimony. The various reading *μυστήριον*, though strongly supported (NAC Syr. Memph. and some fathers), has probably crept in from ver. 7.

τοῦ Θεοῦ] *Τοῦ Θεοῦ* here is perhaps the subjective genitive, 'the testimony proceeding from God,' as *τοῦ Χριστοῦ* in i. 6 (*τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*) is the objective genitive, 'the testimony borne to Christ.' The expression of St John (1 Joh. v. 9) 'This is the witness of God which He hath testified of His Son' links the two together. It is the testimony borne by God (*τοῦ Θεοῦ*) to Christ (*τοῦ Χριστοῦ*).

Μαρτυρία and *μαρτύριον* differ as 'the giving evidence' and 'the evidence given.' But it is not easy in this case to separate the *ἔργον* from the *ἐνέργεια*.

2. *οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινά τι εἰδέναι*] 'I had no intent, no mind to know anything.' It does not mean therefore 'I steadfastly excluded all other knowledge,' but simply 'I did not trouble myself about the knowledge of anything else.' For this sense of *κρίνειν* compare vii. 37, 2 Cor. ii. 1, Acts xv. 19, Rom. xiv. 13. The other rendering 'I determined not to know' (E.V.) cannot be supported by the analogy of the common idiom *οὐ φημί* ('I non-say it,' 'I say no to it'); unless it can be shown that *οὐ κρίνω* is commonly so used. Thus e.g. *οὐ λέγω* would not be equivalent to *οὐ φημί*. *Οὐκ εἶω* again presents no correspondence, it being simply a softened expression for 'I forbid.' It is not necessary to understand *ἐξείναι* with *οὐκ ἔκρινα* ('I did not judge it allowable'), as Lobeck contends (*Phryn.* p. 753).

τι εἰδέναι] in a pregnant sense, 'to exhibit the knowledge of, recognise'; resembling its use in 1 Thess. v. 12 (see note there) and ver. 12 below. The reading of the received text *τοῦ εἰδέναι τι* is a legitimate construction in late Greek (cf. Acts xxvii. 1 *ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν ἡμᾶς*), but is destitute of textual support here.

Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν] i.e. both the Person (*Ἰησοῦν*) and the office (*Χριστόν*) of our Lord.

καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρώμενον] i.e. and Him too not in His glory, but in His humiliation; that the foolishness of the preaching might be doubly foolish, and the weakness doubly weak. The Incarnation was in itself a stumbling-block; the Crucifixion was much more than this.

3. *καγὼ*] 'as in my ministerial teaching, so also in my own person, weakness was the distinguishing mark.' For the repetition of *καγὼ... καγὼ* compare Juvenal *Sat.* i. 15, 16 'et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus, et nos Consilium dedimus Sullae.'

ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ] The meaning of *ἀσθένεια* should not be arbitrarily restricted to any one form of weakness. Whatever enhanced in the Apostle's mind the contrast between the meanness and inability of the preacher, and the power and efficacy of the Gospel, would be included under *ἀσθένεια*. Thus it would comprehend (1) the physical malady, under which he was labouring at the time (see Gal. iv. 13 *ἀσθένεια τῆς*

σαρκός), which is in all probability the same as 'the thorn in the flesh' mentioned 2 Cor. xii. 7 and in reference to which see *Galatians* p. 186 sq: (2) the meanness of his personal appearance (2 Cor. x. 10) with which he was taunted, and which perhaps was the result of his complaint: (3) his inability as a speaker, whether this arose from imperfection of the physical organs or from some other cause (see again 2 Cor. x. 10): (4) a sense of loneliness, from which we may suppose him suffering before the arrival of Silvanus and Timotheus (Acts xvii. 15, xviii. 5 *ὡς δὲ κατῆλθον...συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ* i.e. perhaps 'he grew more bold'), analogous to the feelings which oppressed him at a later date during the absence of Titus (2 Cor. ii. 13): (5) his unprotected condition, when assailed by persecution: and (6) his general inability to deliver his message worthily.

ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ πολλῷ] Each word is an advance upon the other. The sense of weakness produced fear. The fear betrayed itself in much trembling. Φόβος καὶ τρόμος is a not unfrequent combination in St Paul, 2 Cor. vii. 15, Eph. vi. 5, Phil. ii. 12. See the note on the last named passage. Here the expression denotes the Apostle's nervous apprehension that he might not fulfil his ministry aright: i.e. fear and trembling in the sight of God rather than of man.

ἐγενόμην] may be taken either (1) with ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ κ.τ.λ. 'I manifested weakness and fear, in my intercourse with you'; or (2) with πρὸς ὑμᾶς 'I arrived among you in weakness and fear.' There is the same ambiguity of construction in 1 Thess. i. 5 (see the note on that passage). Here probably the former is the preferable construction, not only as being the more usual, but also as better suited to the context.

4. λόγος, κήρυγμα] are not to be distinguished as his private and public instruction respectively: nor yet exactly as the form and the matter of his preaching; though the latter is not far from the right distinction. While κήρυγμα (not 'my preaching' as E.V., which would be κήρυξις, see on i. 21) signifies the facts of the Gospel, e.g. the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection etc.; λόγος is the teaching built upon this, whether in the way of exhortation or of instruction.

πειθοίς] '*persuasive, plausible.*' The word *πειθός*, which is equivalent to *πιθανός*, is not found elsewhere in Greek literature, but was probably a colloquial form. Thus the word unconsciously illustrates the very fact which the Apostle states. It is formed on the analogy of *φείδος* (from *φείδομαι*), which is apparently found only in the comic writers, *βοσκόσ* from *βόσκω*, etc. Eusebius and Origen (though not consistently) quote the passage ἐν *πειθοί σοφίας λόγων*, and so apparently do some versions. On *πειθός* see the references in Meyer, also Lobeck *Phryg.* p. 434, Winer § xvi. p. 119. The whole expression includes both the rhetorical (*λόγοις*) and the philosophical (*σοφίας*) element, the two together producing *πειθός* (so ver. 1 *ὑπεροχὴ λόγου ἢ σοφίας*). The received text inserts *ἀνθρωπίνης* before *σοφίας* without sufficient authority.

ἐν ἀποδείξει κ.τ.λ.] Here ἀπόδειξις 'demonstration' is opposed to πειθῶ (in πειθείς) 'plausibility'; and πνεῦμα καὶ δύναμις to λόγοι σοφίας. Of these last, πνεῦμα is opposed to λόγος as the inward spirit to the mere superficial expression; and δύναμις to σοφία as moral power to intellectual subtlety. Δύναμις is not to be taken in the sense of 'miracle-working.' There is the same opposition, and in very similar language, in 1 Thess. i. 5 τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν λόγῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ.

It is questioned whether πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως is a subjective or an objective genitive, i.e. whether it is 'the demonstration which comes of spirit and of power,' or 'the demonstration which exhibits spirit and power.' The former is the more probable meaning; both because the form of the substantive ἀπόδειξις (a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον in the N.T.) rather points to this, and also (which is a stronger reason) because the parallelism with σοφίας λόγοις seems to require it.

We are reminded by these words of the criticism of Longinus (Fragment 1. ed. Weiske p. 113), who describes St Paul as πρῶτον...προϊστάμενον δόγματος ἀναποδείκτον. It was moral, not verbal, demonstration at which he aimed. See Loesner *Obs.* p. 363 on Col. ii. 1, and compare the expression of Ignatius (*Rom.* § 3) οὐ πεισμονῆς τὸ ἔργον ἀλλὰ μεγέθους κ.τ.λ.

5. **ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων**] The preposition denotes the object of their faith, 'that your faith may not repose in the wisdom of men.' For this use of πίστις with ἐν compare Rom. iii. 25 διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, Gal. iii. 26, Eph. i. 15, 1 Tim. iii. 13, 2 Tim. i. 13, iii. 15.

The true and the false wisdom. The former is spiritually discerned (ii. 6—16).

6. 'Though we eschew the wisdom of men, yet we have a wisdom of our own which we communicate with the perfect.' For the manner in which the word σοφία is taken up here, compare λόγος in i. 17, 18 οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου...ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ κ.τ.λ.

ἐν τοῖς τελείοις] Τέλειος is properly that of which the parts are fully developed, as distinguished from ὀλόκληρος, that in which none of the parts are wanting. See James i. 4 where the words occur, Trench *N.T. Syn.* §xxii, p. 74 sq, and the passages quoted on 1 Thess. v. 23. Hence it signifies 'full-grown,' and accordingly τέλειος is used by St Paul as opposed to νήπιος or παιδία, though in a moral sense as τέλειοι ἐν Χριστῷ. Compare xiv. 20 τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, ταῖς δὲ φρεσὶ τέλειοι γίνεσθε, Eph. iv. 13, Phil. iii. 15, Heb. v. 14. That it is used in this sense here will appear also from iii. 1 ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ. The distinction is somewhat the same as that which St John makes, dividing his hearers into πατέρες and νεανίσκοι or παιδία (1 Joh. ii. 13, 14). Pythagoras also is said to have distinguished his disciples as τέλειοι and νήπιοι.

But besides this meaning of 'full development,' the term here most

probably bears the collateral sense of 'initiated' according to its classical usage, illustrating ἐν μυστηρίῳ below. See this side of the question treated fully in the notes on Col. i. 28 διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ, a passage where, as here, both μυστήριον and σοφία occur in the context.

These words have been the subject of much dispute. On the one hand they have been adduced to justify the distinction of an exoteric and an esoteric doctrine, as though there were certain secrets withheld from the generality. This idea of a higher and a lower teaching seems early to have gained ground even among orthodox writers, and Clement of Alexandria (Eus. *H.E.* v. 11) especially says that Christ communicated the inner γνῶσις to a few chosen disciples. This distinction became the starting-point of Gnosticism: see Lechler *Ap. Zeit.* p. 500 and note on Col. i. c. The difference between γνῶσις and σοφία is discussed on Col. ii. 3.

On the other hand several modern commentators, seeing how entirely opposed this system of religious castes is to the genius of Christianity and to the teaching of St Paul elsewhere, have avoided any semblance of it here, by putting a forced construction on the passage σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις 'we teach a doctrine which is wisdom in the judgment of the perfect.' But to say nothing of the harshness of this construction, it is clear from the whole context, especially iii. 1, 2, that St Paul was speaking of an actual distinction in the teaching addressed to the less and the more advanced believer. What is implied by the contrast between 'babes' and 'grown men' may be seen from iii. 1. It is the distinction of less or greater spirituality. What is meant by the σοφία may be gathered from a comparison of St Paul's earlier with his later Epistles. The σοφία will involve especially the ampler teaching as to the Person of Christ and the eternal purpose of God. Such 'wisdom' we have in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians especially, and in a less degree in the Epistle to the Romans. This 'wisdom' is discerned in the Gospel of St John, as compared with the other Evangelists. Compare the note on γάλα οὐ βρῶμα (iii. 2).

τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου] i.e. the great men of this world, as the whole context seems imperatively to demand; the princes whether in intellect or in power or in rank, so that οἱ ἄρχοντες κ.τ.λ. would include the σοφοί, δυνατοί, εὐγενεῖς of i. 26. See further the note on ver. 8.

On the other hand some of the fathers (e.g. Origen *Homil.* iv. in *Matth.*, ix. in *Genes.*) understood it of the powers of evil, comparing Eph. vi. 12 πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. In this sense the Gnostics availed themselves of it to support their Dualism, see Tert. *adv. Marc.* v. 6. And it would almost seem as if St Ignatius were referring to this passage in *Ephes.* § 19 ἔλαθεν τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἢ παρθενία Μαρίας καὶ ὁ τοκετὸς αὐτῆς, ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ θάνατος τοῦ Κυρίου, τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς, where however ἔλαθεν is probably intended as a paraphrase of οὐδεὶς

τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἔγνωκεν (ver. 8). At all events, the meaning is quite out of place here; and 'the princes of this world' are to be understood as great men according to the world's estimate of greatness.

τῶν καταργουμένων] is best explained by i. 28 τὰ μὴ ὄντα ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ: i.e. who are brought to nought by the power of Christ, whose glory wanes before the advance of Messiah's kingdom; ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος being the direct opposite of ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 'Messiah's kingdom' in its widest sense. Compare *Martyr. Vienn.* c. 8 (in Routh *R.S.* i. p. 305) καταργηθέντων δὲ τῶν τυραννικῶν κολαστηρίων ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ τῆς τῶν μακαρίων ὑπομονῆς. See also the note on δόξαν ἡμῶν in the next verse.

7. Θεοῦ σοφίαν] is the correct order, Θεοῦ being emphatic: 'a wisdom not of this world, but of God.' The received text has σοφίαν Θεοῦ on the slenderest authority.

ἐν μυστηρίῳ] 'the wisdom which consists in a mystery.' The phrase must be taken either (1) with σοφίαν or (2) with λαλοῦμεν. Perhaps the former is preferable. For the omission of the article see the note on 1 Thess. i. 1 ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ, and references there. If ἐν μυστηρίῳ is taken with λαλοῦμεν, the sense will be much the same; 'We speak a wisdom of God, while declaring a mystery.' On the Pauline use of the word μυστήριον, as something which would not have been known without revelation, and its connexion with words denoting publication (as here ἡμῖν γὰρ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ Θεός ver. 10) see the note on Col. i. 26. See also the note on 2 Thess. ii. 7: from the passage in Josephus there quoted, μυστήριον appears to have the subordinate sense of something extraordinary and portentous.

τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην] The article is frequently placed thus between the substantive and the accompanying adjective or participle when it is intended to give a definite reference to an indefinite statement. 'A wisdom of God, that wisdom I mean, which was etc.' Compare Gal. iii. 21 νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος, with the note.

ἣν προώρισεν] 'which God foreordained'; absolutely. It is not necessary to understand ἀποκαλύψαι or any word of the kind. The σοφία Θεοῦ is the scheme of redemption.

εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν] i.e. the glory of inward enlightenment as well as of outward exaltation; for the word δόξα (like βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ) involves the complex idea. Compare 2 Cor. iii. 8—18. Here there is an opposition between δόξαν ἡμῶν and τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, τῶν καταργουμένων, 'Our glory increases, while their glory wanes.' This use of καταργεῖσθαι in connexion with δόξα is illustrated by the passage from 2 Corinthians already referred to, and by 2 Thess. ii. 8 καταργήσῃ τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ (where see the notes).

8. ἣν] i.e. σοφίαν.

ἔγνωκεν] 'hath discerned.'

τὸν Κύριον...ἐσταύρωσαν] As types and representatives of the princes of this world, St Paul takes the Jewish and heathen rulers who crucified

the Lord (comp. Acts iv. 27). Yet the rebuke is not confined to these; and he rightly says οὐδείς τῶν ἀρχόντων, for all alike who oppose themselves to the spread of the Gospel, all the princes of this world, as such, do in a certain sense 'crucify the Lord afresh' (Heb. vi. 6).

τῆς δόξης] The contrast present to the Apostle's mind is that between the shame of the Cross (Heb. xii. 2) and the glory of the Crucified, between the ignominy which they seemed to be inflicting on Him and the honour which was intrinsically His.

9. ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται] 'but it has come to pass according to the words of Scripture.' The sentence is elliptical. For an exact parallel in form see Rom. xv. 3, and compare the note on 1 Cor. i. 31.

ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς κ.τ.λ.] The composition of the sentence is somewhat loose. Like 1 Tim. iii. 16 ὃς ἐφανερώθη κ.τ.λ. it begins with a relative, so that the construction is broken. The grammar also is irregular, ἃ being the accusative after εἶδεν and ἤκουσεν, and the nominative to ἀνέβη; and ὄσα (the correct reading for the second ἃ of the received text) in apposition with ἃ. Another construction is proposed which makes ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν (ver. 10) the apodosis, introduced by the particle δέ; but this, even if γάρ is not to be read for δέ, seems not to be after St Paul's manner, being too elaborate and indeed requiring ταῦτα δὲ ἡμῖν. The whole of verse 10 is best considered to be the Apostle's own addition to the quotation. For ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν, a Hebrew expression (קָבַל לֵב), see Acts vii. 23, Jerem. iii. 16, xlv. 21, li. 50.

The distinction here is between things perceived by the senses, and things apprehended by the understanding. Compare the lines of Empedocles οὕτως οὐτ' ἐπιδερκτὰ τὰδ' ἀνδράσι, οὐτ' ἐπακουστά, οὔτε νόφ περιληπτα in Sext. Empir. adv. Matth. vii. 123 (Ritter and Preller, p. 126).

The quotation, the words of which are not found in the existing text of the Old Testament, is generally considered to be a combination of Is. lxiv. 4, which runs in the LXX. ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον Θεὸν πλὴν σοῦ καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου, ἃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον, but more nearly in the Hebrew, 'From eternity they have not heard, they have not hearkened, neither hath eye seen a god [or 'O God'] save thee (who) worketh [or '(what) He shall do'] to him that awaiteth Him' (see Delitzsch *ad loc.*), and Is. lxv. 16, 17 οὐκ ἀναβήσεται αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν...οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν. The passage, if we may trust St Jerome, occurred as given by St Paul, both in the *Ascension of Isaiah* and in the *Apocalypse of Elias* (Hieron. in Is. lxiv. 4, iv. p. 761; *Prol. in Gen.* ix. p. 3). And Origen, in *Matth.* xxvii. 9 (III. p. 916), says that St Paul quotes from the latter, 'In nullo regulari libro hoc positum invenitur, nisi (εἰ μὴ, 'but only') in Secretis Eliae prophetæ.' This assertion is repeated also by later writers (see Fabricius *Cod. Ps. V. T.* I. p. 1073) doubtless from Origen, but combated by Jerome (ll. cc. and *Epist.* lvii. § 9, I. p. 314), who refers the quotation to Is. lxiv. 4. There does not seem any reason for doubting that the

quotation occurs as Origen states, especially as Jerome, making a savage onslaught on this opinion, tacitly allows the fact; see more below. If it could be shown that these apocryphal books were prior to St Paul, this solution would be the most probable; but they would appear to have been produced by some Christian sectarians of the second century, for Jerome terms them 'Iberae naeniae' and connects them with the Basilideans and other Gnostics who abounded in Spain (ll cc.; see also *c. Vigil.* II. p. 393, and comp. Fabricius, p. 1093 sq.). If so, they incorporated the quotation of St Paul, as also another missing quotation (Eph. v. 14, see below), in order to give verisimilitude and currency to their forgeries. At all events both these works appear from the extant remains to have been Christian. For the *Apocalypse of Elias* see Epiphanius *Haer.* xlii. (p. 372), who says that the quotation in Eph. v. 14 (which is obviously Christian) was found there; and for the *Ascension of Isaiah*, this same father *Haer.* lxvii. 3 (p. 712), where he quotes a passage referring to the Trinity. Indeed there is every reason to believe that the work known to Epiphanius and several other fathers under this name, is the same with the *Ascension and Vision of Isaiah* published first by Laurence in an Æthiopic Version and subsequently by Gieseler in a Latin. The two versions represent different recensions; and the passage 'Eye hath not seen, etc.' appears in the Latin (xi. 34) but not in the Æthiopic (see Jolowicz *Himmelfahrt u. Vision des propheten Iesaja*, p. 90, Leipzig, 1854). The Latin recension therefore must have been in the hands of Jerome; though this very quotation seems to show clearly that the Æthiopic more nearly represents the original form of the work (see Lücke *Offenbarung d. Johannes*, p. 179 sq.). Both recensions alike are distinctly Christian.

Still in favour of Jerome's view it may be said that St Paul's quotations are often very free as e.g. in i. 31, and that there is no instance in St Paul of a quotation from an apocryphal writing being introduced by *καθὼς γέγραπται*. The quotation from a Christian hymn in Eph. v. 14 is introduced by *λέγει*, which is quite general. It is just possible moreover that some Greek version, with which St Paul was acquainted, gave a different rendering from the LXX. and more resembling the quotation in the text.

It is at least remarkable that St Clement of Rome (§ 34) gives the quotation in almost the same words, though approaching somewhat nearer to the LXX. He reads *τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτὸν* for St Paul's *τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν*, and is followed by the *Martyr. Polyc.* § 2 *ἀνέβλεπον τὰ τηρούμενα τοῖς ὑπομείναςιν ἀγαθά, ἃ οὔτε οὐδ' ἤκουσεν, οὔτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδεν, οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίᾳ ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη*, passages which seem to suggest an original lying somewhere between the present LXX. rendering in Isaiah, and the quotation of St Paul, though nearer to the latter. In the other places where the quotation occurs, 2 [Clem.] §§ 11, 14, *Clem. Ep. ad Virg.* i. 9, it does not reach the point where Clement and St Paul diverge.

An additional interest attaches to this passage from the words ascribed to Hegesippus in a passage of Stephanus Gobarus ap. Photius *Bibl.* 232 (see Routh *R. S.* I. 219), who after quoting this passage says Ἡγήσιππος μένοι, ἀρχαῖός τε ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστολικός, ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ τῶν ὑπομημάτων οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι καὶ παθῶν μάτην μὲν εἰρῆσθαι ταῦτα λέγει, καὶ καταψεύδεσθαι τοὺς ταῦτα φαμένους τῶν τε θείων γραφῶν καὶ τοῦ κυρίου λεγόντος, Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ βλέποντες, καὶ τὰ ὄρα ὑμῶν τὰ ἀκούοντα καὶ ἐξῆς. Stephanus seems to regard this (at least Baur and Schwegler do so) as an attack on St Paul and a proof that Hegesippus was an Ebionite; but he has probably misunderstood the drift of Hegesippus' words. Hegesippus was attacking, not the passage itself, but the application which was made of it by certain Gnostics, who alleged it in support of an esoteric doctrine (see Routh *R. S.* I. p. 281 and *Galatians* p. 334). We know from Hippolytus (*Haer.* v. 24, 26, 27, vi. 24) that it was a favourite text with these heretics and that the Justinians even introduced it into their formula of initiation. Perhaps *the Revelation of Elias* may have been an early Gnostic work itself, and embodied this quotation from St Paul for doctrinal purposes. In favour of this view, it may be remarked that Hegesippus elsewhere (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 32) in attacking the Gnostic heresy avails himself of St Paul's own words ψευδῶν μος γῶσις (1 Tim. vi. 20), and seems to have commended the Epistle of Clement and to have been satisfied with the orthodoxy of the Corinthian Church (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22, comp. iii. 16).

10. ἡμῖν] 'to us who believe'; not to the Apostles specially, but to believers generally.

ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ Θεός] This order is perhaps better than that of the received text ὁ Θεὸς ἀπεκ., and is strongly supported (NABCD). The 'revelation' is the emphatic idea in the sentence. The aorist (ἀπεκάλυψεν) is on a par with many aorists in St Paul. Its force is, 'revealed it to us when we were admitted into the Church, when we were baptized.' Ἀποκάλυψις implies an extraordinary revelation, while φανέρωσις is the general term, including e.g. the revelation of God in nature.

τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα] i.e. the Spirit of God given to us. If we know the things of God, it is only by His Spirit dwelling in us. See Rom. viii. 9—27, where the same idea occurs in several forms and with several applications.

καὶ τὰ βάθη] 'even the depths,' which are manifold, the plural being stronger than the singular. On the other hand we have τὰ βαθέα τοῦ Σατανᾶ (Apo. ii. 24).

11. 'For as a man's self-consciousness reveals man's nature to him, so it can be nothing else but the Spirit of God dwelling in him which reveals to him the nature and dealings of God.' τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου are 'the things of man' generally, of human nature. The emphatic repetition of ἀνθρώπων, ἀνθρώπου, ἀνθρώπου and of Θεοῦ, Θεοῦ is intended to enforce the contrasts.

ἔγνωκεν] is the correct reading for the second οἶδεν of the received

text. The words are carefully chosen. *ὀιδεν* 'knoweth' denotes direct knowledge, while *ἐγνωκεν* 'discerneth' involves more or less the idea of a process of attainment. Compare e.g. 1 Joh. ii. 29 *ἐὰν εἰδῆτε ὅτι δίκαιός ἐστιν, γινώσκετε ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται*, where *γινώσκετε* implies an inference. In this passage the distinction is not so marked, but the *ἐγνωκεν* seems to place *τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ* a degree more out of reach than *οἶδεν* does *τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. Compare also 2 Cor. v. 16, and see for *γινώσκειν* the notes on Gal. iii. 7, iv. 9, for *εἰδέναι* 1 Thess. v. 12.

The examination of the passages, where the two words are found in the First Epistle of St John, shows most clearly that they were employed with the same precision of meaning as in the classical age. While *οἶδα* is simple and absolute, *γινώσκω* is relative, involving more or less the idea of a process of examination. Thus while *οἶδα* is used of the knowledge of the facts and propositions in themselves, *γινώσκω* implies reference to something else, and gives prominence to either the acquisition of the knowledge or the knowledge of a thing in its bearings. It surely cannot be by chance, that where St John wishes to place in bold relief the fundamental facts of our religious conviction in and by themselves, he uses *οἶδα* (see ii. 20, 21, iii. 2, 5, 14, 15, and especially v. 18, 19, 20); that where he speaks of our knowledge not as direct but as derived from something prior to it, he almost always employs *γινώσκω*, both in the phrase *ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκω*, which occurs repeatedly (ii. 3, 5, iii. 19, 24, iv. 2, 13, v. 2, cf. iii. 16 *ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνωκάμεν*: not once *ἐν τούτῳ εἰδέναι*), and in other expressions (ii. 18 *ὅθεν γινώσκομεν*, iii. 1 *οὐ γινώσκει ἡμᾶς ὅτι*, iv. 6 *ἐκ τούτου γινώσκομεν*, cf. iv. 7, 8); and that when the two words *γινώσκειν* and *εἰδέναι* are found together, as in the passage already quoted (comp. John xxi. 17, Eph. v. 5), they stand to each other in the relation which the distinction given above would lead us to expect. If there are also passages in which the difference of meaning is not so plain, the induction seems still to be sufficiently large to establish the facts.

οὐδεις...εἰ μὴ] i.e. 'no man, as man, knoweth, but only the Spirit of God.' *Οὐδεις* (sc. *ἀνθρώπων*) as *τις ἀνθρώπων* above. For this use of *εἰ μὴ* (*ἐὰν μὴ*) see on Gal. i. 7, 19, ii. 16.

τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ] Not *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ* according to the analogy of the preceding part of the verse; for though the spirit of man is in him, a similar expression would not correctly apply to the Spirit of God. This change of phraseology may be regarded as a caution to us not to press the analogy beyond the point to illustrate which it was introduced. It may be true that the spirit of man takes cognizance of the things of man, just as the Spirit of God does of the things of God; but it does not follow that the spirit of man has the same relation to man as the Spirit of God has to God.

12. *ἡμεῖς δὲ*] 'but we received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit

which cometh from God.' Ἡμεῖς includes the believers generally, but refers especially to the Apostles, as Paul and Apollos: for the reference is mainly to the teachers in the following verse.

τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κοσμοῦ] The interpretation of this expression will depend on the view taken of τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (ver. 6); see the note there. It seems therefore to be simply the spirit of human wisdom, of the world as alienated from God.

ἐλάβομεν] 'received,' i.e. when we were admitted to the fold of Christ. The aorist τὰ χαρισθέντα below refers to the same time. St Paul regards the gift as ideally summed up when he and they were included in the Christian Church, though it is true that the Spirit is received constantly.

ἵνα εἰδῶμεν κ.τ.λ.] i.e. 'that we may be conscious of, may realize the spiritual blessings and hopes conferred upon us.' For this sense of εἰδέναι see ii. 2 and the note on 1 Thess. v. 12. Here τὰ χαρισθέντα will include miraculous gifts; but, like χάρισμα itself, the expression extends to all blessings conferred by the Gospel. See i. 7 above.

13. 'Nor do we keep this knowledge to ourselves. As it is revealed to us, so also (καὶ) do we communicate it to others. And the manner of our communication is in accordance with the matter. Spiritual truths are expressed in spiritual language.' The expression ἀ καὶ λαλοῦμεν is in a measure corrective of any impression which might have been left by the foregoing words, that the mysteries of the Gospel were the exclusive property of a few. The emphatic word in the sentence is λαλοῦμεν, as the order shows; and the mention of the manner of communication (οὐκ ἐν διδακοῖς κ.τ.λ.) is quite subordinate.

σοφίας] is the genitive governed by διδακοῖς, as the form of the ellipsis in the corresponding clause ἐν διδακοῖς πνεύματος shows. Compare John vi. 45 (from Is. liv. 13) πάντες διδακοὶ Θεοῦ. This construction of the genitive with verbal adjectives of passive force is in classical Greek confined to poetry; e.g. Soph. *Electra* 343 ἅπαντα γὰρ σοὶ τὰμὰ νουθητήματα κείνης διδακτά, Pind. *Ol.* ix. 152 (100) διδακταῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀρεταῖς.

'There is no display of human rhetoric in our preaching. The language, no less than the matter, is inspired.' Indeed the notion of a verbal inspiration in a certain sense is involved in the very conception of an inspiration at all, because words are at once the instruments of carrying on and the means of expressing ideas, so that the words must both lead and follow the thought. But the passage gives no countenance to the popular doctrine of verbal inspiration, whether right or wrong.

πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες] 'combining the spiritual with the spiritual,' i.e. applying spiritual methods to explain spiritual truths. It is excellently explained by Theod. Mops. here: διὰ τῶν τοῦ πνεύματος ἀποδείξεων τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος διδασκαλίαν πιστούμεθα. This is the proper meaning

of συγκρίνειν 'to combine,' as διακρίνειν is 'to separate.' Συγκρίνειν, it is true, sometimes gets the sense of 'comparing,' as in 2 Cor. x. 12; but it does not suit the context here, whether explained, as by Chrysostom and others, of comparing the types of the Old Testament with the tidings of the New, or more generally. Others again, taking πνευματικοῖς to be masculine, translate it 'explaining spiritual things to spiritual men.' Against this it may be urged, (1) that though συγκρίνειν is frequently used of interpreting dreams, (cf. Gen. xl. 8, 22, xli. 12, Dan. v. 12), yet the leading notion which it involves is that of 'finding out,' 'comparing' the phenomena of the dream with the phenomena of common life (so κρίνειν, ἐγκρίνειν are used of dreams), which notion is out of place here: (2) the combination πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ points to the neuter gender, as otherwise we should rather expect πνευματικὰ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς: (3) the dative is naturally governed by the σύν of συγκρίνοντες, and (4) the qualifications of the recipient seem to be introduced first in the following verse by ψυχικός δέ.

14. 'Though we communicate our knowledge freely, yet being, as I said, spiritual—spiritual in form as well as in matter—it addresses itself only to spiritual hearers, and therefore the natural man is excluded from it.' The verse is connected with ver. 12, and St Paul comes round to the subject of ver. 6 once more.

ψυχικός] 'the natural man,' as opposed to πνευματικός, and closely allied to σαρκικός. See note on 1 Thess. v. 23, where the triple division of man's nature into σῶμα, ψυχή, and πνεῦμα is discussed.

οὐ δέχεται.] 'rejects,' 'does not receive'; not 'is incapable of' (a strictly classical usage of δέχεσθαι which would be expressed in the N. T. by οὐ χωρεῖ). The meaning which I have given is the universal sense of δέχεσθαι in the New Testament and is moreover better suited to the explanation μωρία γὰρ κ.τ.λ., which includes more than the incapacity of the hearer, and implies a disinclination also.

ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται.] 'for they' (sc. τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος) 'are spiritually discerned,' i.e. the investigation is a spiritual process. This is an explanation of the whole sentence from μωρία...γινῶναι, and not of the latter clause only.

15. 'On the other hand, the spiritual man is placed on a vantage-ground. He can survey and duly estimate the relative proportion of all things. He has a standard by which to measure others, but they have no standard which they can apply to him.'

ἀνακρίνει μὲν πάντα.] 'examineth,' 'sifteth everything,' e.g. in the matter of meats or of the observance of days. In any case the same translation of the verb ought to have been preserved in the English version here, as in ver. 14. The leading idea of ἀνακρίνειν is that of examination, investigation, sifting, while κρίνειν implies more prominently the pronouncing a verdict. The word adopted by the A. V. as an equivalent is unfortunate; for, besides being a mistranslation of ἀνακρίνεται, it is quite untrue in fact to say that the spiritual man 'is judged by no one.' So ὅτι οὐδενὸς ἀνακρίνε-

ται means 'he is a riddle to the natural man ; they can make nothing out of him, cannot bring him to book at all.'

"St Paul especially delights to accumulate" the compounds of κρίνειν, "and thus by harping upon words (if I may use the expression) to emphasize great spiritual truths or important personal experiences. Thus, he puts together συγκρίνειν, ἀνακρίνειν" here, "κρίνειν, ἀνακρίνειν, 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4 ; ἐγκρίνειν, συγκρίνειν, 2 Cor. x. 12 ; κρίνειν, διακρίνειν, 1 Cor. vi. 1—6 ; κρίνειν, διακρίνειν, κατακρίνειν, Rom. xiv. 22, 23, 1 Cor. xi. 29, 31, 32 ; κρίνειν, κατακρίνειν, Rom. ii. 1. Now it seems impossible in most cases, without a sacrifice of English which no one would be prepared to make, to reproduce the similarity of sound or the identity of root ; but the distinction of sense should always be preserved. How this is neglected in our English version, and what confusion ensues from this neglect, the following instances will show. In 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4, 5, the word ἀνακρίνειν is translated throughout 'judge' ; while in 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15, it is rendered indifferently 'to discern' and 'to judge.' But ἀνακρίνειν is neither 'to judge,' which is κρίνειν, nor 'to discern,' which is διακρίνειν ; but 'to examine, investigate, enquire into, question,' as it is rightly translated elsewhere, e.g. 1 Cor. ix. 3, x. 25, 27 ; and the correct understanding of 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4, 5 depends on our retaining this sense. The ἀνάκρισις, it will be remembered, was an Athenian law term for a preliminary investigation (distinct from the actual κρίσις or trial), in which evidence was collected and the prisoner committed for trial, if a true bill was found against him. It corresponded in short *mutatis mutandis* to the part taken in English law proceedings by the grand jury. And this is substantially the force of the word here. The Apostle condemns all these impatient human *præjudicia*, these unauthorised ἀνακρίσεις, which anticipate the final κρίσις, reserving his case for the great tribunal where at length all the evidence will be forthcoming and a satisfactory verdict can be given. Meanwhile this process of gathering evidence has begun ; an ἀνάκρισις is indeed being held, not however by these self-appointed magistrates, but by One who alone has the authority to institute the enquiry, and the ability to sift the facts (ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων με Κύριός ἐστιν). Of this half-technical sense of the word the New Testament itself furnishes a good example. The examination of St Paul before Festus is both in name and in fact an ἀνάκρισις. The Roman procurator explains to Agrippa how he had directed the prisoner to be brought into court (προήγαγον αὐτόν) in order that, having held the preliminary enquiry usual in such cases (τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενομένης), he might be able to lay the case before the Emperor (Acts xxv. 26). Again, in 1 Cor. xiv. 24 ἀνακρίνεται ὑπὸ πάντων, the sense required is clearly 'sifting, probing, revealing,' and the rendering of our translators 'he is judged of all' introduces an idea alien to the passage." *On a Fresh Revision of the English N. T.* p. 69 sq. (3rd edit.).

πάντα.] The article should be omitted, but the omission does not

affect the sense, because πάντα must still be taken as neuter. Τὰ πάντα would express with slightly increased force the comprehensiveness of the spiritual man. 'All things whatsoever—even those out of his own sphere—not πνευματικά only but ψυχικά also.'

16. 'For the mind in us is the mind of the Lord. Our spirits are one with His spirit: and we have Scriptural authority for saying that no one can penetrate and understand the mind of the Lord.'

τίς γὰρ ἔγνω κ.τ.λ.] 'for who hath perceived or apprehended etc.' From the LXX. of Is. xl. 13 τίς ἔγνω νοῦν Κυρίου; καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο, ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν; The middle clause is omitted in the quotation as being somewhat foreign to St Paul's purpose. On the other hand, in Rom. xi. 34, where the same quotation occurs, the first two clauses appear and not the third, as they bear on his argument there.

νοῦν Κυρίου] For the distinction between πνεῦμα and νοῦς see Usteri *Paul. Lehrb.* p. 384. In a man there might be an opposition between the νοῦς and the πνεῦμα (1 Cor. xiv. 14), but in God the νοῦς would be identical with, or at least in perfect accordance with, the πνεῦμα. It should be observed also that the original here translated νοῦν is ΠΙΓ which is the common word for πνεῦμα. Compare 1 Esdr. ii. 9, where ἐγείρειν τὸν νοῦν is equivalent to ἐγείρειν τὸ πνεῦμα of the preceding verse. Thus νοῦς was the familiar form in the ears of his hearers owing to the influence of the LXX.

ὃς συμβιβάσει] 'so that he shall instruct him.' Compare *Matth. Gr. Gr.* § 479, Obs. 1.

Συμβιβάζειν in classical Greek generally means 'to put together so as to draw an inference from, to conclude'; but here it is 'to instruct,' the sense which it usually bears in the LXX., where it occurs frequently. It thus represents the classical ἐμβιβάζειν.

νοῦν Χριστοῦ] equivalent to the νοῦν Κυρίου of the preceding verse. The 'Spirit of God' and the 'Spirit of Christ' are convertible terms here as in Rom. viii. 9 εἴπερ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, εἰ δέ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει κ.τ.λ. (cf. Gal. iv. 6). And the substitution of Χριστοῦ for Κυρίου in this passage and for Θεοῦ in the Romans has the same point: it suggests a practical test. 'Ask yourselves whether the mind of Christ is in you.' (Compare *Phil. ii. 5.*)

CHAPTER III.

The Corinthians incapable of discerning the wisdom of God (iii. 1—3).

1. The manner in which his readers are brought round after a long digression to their dissensions is characteristic of St Paul. One topic suggests another and he seems entirely to have lost sight of their subject : till accidentally, as one might say, the course of thought brings him within the range of its attraction, and he flies back to it at once. Thus the mention of party watchwords (in i. 12) leads him to speak of his abstaining from baptizing. He was sent not to baptize but to preach. What was the nature of his preaching? It was foolishness in the sight of the world. Yet it contained the truest wisdom. This wisdom however could not be revealed in all its depths, save to the spiritual. 'But ye are not spiritual, so long as these dissensions last.' And so he comes back to what he left.

κἀγὼ] 'And I, individually, was subject to the prohibition implied in the general rule of ii. 6, σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις. I was obliged to withhold from you the treasures of wisdom, which I possessed in myself.'

σαρκίνους] Unquestionably the reading here, as σαρκικοί in ver. 3 where it occurs twice. Considering the strong tendency to alter one or other word for the sake of conformity, the consistency of the MSS. is the more remarkable and must decide the readings.

Σάρκινος is 'fleshy, made of flesh,' 'carneus'; while σαρκικός is 'fleshly, partaking of the characteristics of flesh, associated with flesh,' 'carnalis.' Hence σαρκικός is scarcely a classical word, because the idea is not classical. As an illustration of the difference of meaning in the two terminations -ικός and -ίνος, compare τὸ δερματικὸν 'the tax on hides' with δερμάτινον, which could mean nothing else but 'made of hides.' On these terminations cf. Matth. Gr. Gr. § 108, 110, Meyer's reff. *ad loc.* and Buttm.

119. III, Fritzsche *ad Rom.* II. p. 46. The proper meaning of σάρκινος is seen in 2 Cor. iii. 3 οὐκ ἐν πλαξίν λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξίν καρδιαῖς σαρκίναίς, and that of σαρκικός in 1 Cor. ix. 11 εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν τὰ πνευματικὰ ἐσπούραμεν, μέγα εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν τὰ σαρκικὰ θερίσομεν (cf. Rom. xv. 27), in neither of which passages there is a various reading, and in neither of which the other

word would be suitable. In Heb. vii. 16, though we should expect *σαρκίης*, the νόμος ἐντολῆς σαρκίης is intelligible because the commandment was, as it were, a part of the flesh, and thus of hereditary descent from the body of Aaron. See also Rom. vii. 14, where *σάρκινος* is certainly right.

ὡς σαρκίνοις] 'to men of flesh.' For the vigour of the expression compare Matt. xvi. 17 σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι. While *σάρκινος* here points rather to their original nature when St Paul first preached to them, *σαρκεῖς* (ver. 3) expresses their moral tendencies, their hankerings, even after their conversion, and implies more of a rebuke, though the less strong word in itself.

νηπίους ἐν Χριστῷ] the opposite to which is τέλειοι ἐν Χριστῷ, Col. i. 28. See note on τέλειος ii. 6.

2. γάλα, οὐ βρῶμα] Apparently a favourite image with the Rabbinical teachers, who styled their scholars 'sugentes' or 'lactentes' (see Wetst on I Pet. ii. 2). Compare Heb. v. 12 sq. γεγόνατε χρείαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος, οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς· πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μετεχὼν γάλακτος, ἀπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης· νήπιος γὰρ ἐστίν· τελείων δὲ ἐστίν ἢ στερεὰ τροφή, where the resemblances are so close as to suggest that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had seen this Epistle and I Pet. ii. 2. The metaphor however was a common one at this time, see Philo *de Agricult.* § 2, I. p. 301 (ed. Mangey), ἐπεὶ δὲ νηπίους μὲν ἐστὶ γάλα τροφή, τελείους δὲ τὰ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα, Pinytus *ap. Routh R. S. I.* p. 184.

ἐπίτωσα, οὐ βρῶμα] For the zeugma compare Hesiod, *Theog.* 640 νέκταρ τ' ἀμβροσίην τε, τὰ περ θεοὶ αὐτοὶ ἔδουσι, Luke i. 64.

ἐδύνασθε] is probably to be taken absolutely here, 'for ye were not strong enough,' a sense in which it appears to be not infrequently used in the LXX., e.g. Jerem. v. 4, xxxviii. 5, Ps. cxxviii. 2.

ἀλλ'] 'Why should I say ye were not strong enough; nay ye are not strong enough even now'; for ἀλλὰ in this sense cf. Winer *Gr.* § liii. p. 551 sq.

οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν] An interval of about five years had elapsed since St Paul first visited them. He seems to make no allusion here to his *second* visit, which was probably of short duration, and in which he had few opportunities of instructing them.

We are led to enquire what teaching St Paul signified by γάλα and βρῶμα respectively. Obviously the doctrine of Christ crucified belonged to the former, as he himself says that he made the preaching of this his sole object on this occasion (ii. 3). This was the basis of his teaching. The best comment on this passage is furnished by Heb. v. 11—vi. 2, where the writer, laying down the same distinction between γάλα and στερεὰ τροφή, describes the former thus: 'not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.' And thus the teaching of the Thessalonian Epistles, which does not go beyond this, may be taken as a sample of the 'milk'

for babes. The doctrine of justification by faith, which, as lying at the foundation of Christian teaching, would fall under the term *γάλα*, might still in its more complex aspects be treated as *βρώμα*, and so it is in the Epistle to the Romans. If it be asked again whether St Paul is speaking of doctrinal or spiritual truths, our reply is that the two cannot be separated in Christianity. Christianity, it is said, is a life, not a creed. It could be more truly called 'a life in a creed.' See more on this subject in note on *σοφία* ii. 11.

3. *ἔπον*] introduces a condition. In itself it puts the case as purely hypothetical, and the fulfilment of the condition here is implied from the context, as in 2 Pet. ii. 11.

ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις] '*ζῆλος* cogitatione, *ἔρις* verbis, *διχοστασίαι* opere. Sall. *Catil.* ix. 2 Jurgia, discordias, simulates,' Wetstein. A regular sequence: 'emulation' engenders 'strife,' and 'strife' produces 'divisions.' Cf. ii. 3. But the words *καὶ διχοστασίαι* of the Textus Receptus should be omitted. For the terms see the notes on Gal. v. 20; and for a more complete sequence Clem. Rom. § 3 *ζῆλος καὶ φθόνος, καὶ ἔρις καὶ στάσις, διωγμὸς καὶ ἀκαταστασία, πόλεμος καὶ αἰχμαλωσία* (with the notes).

It is instructive to observe how *ζῆλος* has been degraded in Christian ethics from the high position which it holds in classical Greek as a noble emulation (*ἐπιεικὲς ἔστιν ὁ ζῆλος καὶ ἐπιεικῶν* Arist. *Rhet.* ii. 11), so that it is most frequently used in a bad sense of quarrelsome opposition. Compare especially Clem. Rom. §§ 4, 5. Similar to this is the degradation of *εὐτραπέλια* (Eph. v. 4 contrasted with Arist. *Eth. Nic.* ii. 7, iv. 14) and the exaltation of *ταπεινοφροσύνη* (e.g. 1 Pet. v. 5 compared with Arist. (?) *Eth. Eudem.* iii. 3 cited by Neander *Pfl. u. Leit.* ii. p. 759).

κατὰ ἄνθρωπον] '*with merely human motives or feelings*': i.e. your walk in life conforms to a merely human standard. Compare Rom. iii. 5, 1 Cor. xv. 32, Gal. i. 11, iii. 15. The expression is confined to the Epistles of this group. The preposition denotes the measure or standard.

(c) *Paul and Apollon human instruments merely* (iii. 4—23).

4. *ἐγὼ μὲν, ἕτερος δὲ*] Observe the irregular position of the particles *μὲν* and *δὲ*, which correspond logically though not grammatically. On the omission of St Peter's name here, see the note on i. 12.

ἄνθρωποι ἔστε] '*are ye not mere men?*' 'Is not the divine principle—the principle of love and unity—obliterated in you?' The word is much more forcible than *σαρκικοί*, the reading of the Textus Receptus introduced from ver. 3 above, and links on better with the foregoing *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*. The distinction of meaning between *ἄνθρωπος*, the lower, and *ἄνθρωπος*, the higher aspect of man, would be as present to St Paul's mind, as it would to that of a Greek of the classical age. See Xen. *Anab.* vi. 1. 26 *ἐγὼ, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἦθομαι μὲν ὑπὸ ὑμῶν τιμώμενος, εἴπερ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι*, Philostratus *Vita*

Apoll. i. 7. 4 τοὺς ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἀθρώπους ὑμῶν δὲ ἀνδρῶν ὄντων, i. 19. "Ανθρώπος is equivalent to the Heb. אָדָם and ἀνήρ to אִישׁ, as in the LXX. of *Is.* ii. 9, v. 15, xxxi. 8.

5. τί οὖν...τί δέ] 'Are Apollos and Paul then lords over God's vintage, that you exalt them to party-leaders? No; they are but servants.' Τί is the right reading both times, being much more emphatic than τίς: it expresses greater disdain. 'As though Apollos or Paul were anything.'

'Απολλῶς, Παῦλος] This, the correct order, is perhaps to be explained as a mark of respect to Apollos; or it may be that St Paul here, as elsewhere (e.g. iv. 10), picks up the last word from the preceding verse first—'I am of Apollos, why what is Apollos?' and then adds 'and what is Paul?' lest he should seem to exalt himself at the expense of Apollos.

Ἄλλ' ἢ must be omitted on strong external testimony, though grammatically quite correct. This is one out of many instances where the received text enfeebles the style of St Paul, by smoothing his abruptnesses.

διάκονοι] 'mere servants,' not leaders at all. The word is opposed to the Great Master (ὁ Κύριος), Who is mentioned just below.

δὲ ὧν] i.e. the instruments only, not the objects of your faith; 'per quos, non in quos,' as Bengel says. Therefore do not pin your faith on them.

ἐπιστεύσατε] 'ye were converted, ye accepted the faith.' This use of the aorist is common: see the note on 2 Thess. i. 10 πιστεύσασι.

ἐκάστω] The construction is καὶ ἕκαστος (not ἐπίστευσεν but διηκόνει) ὡς ὁ Κύριος ἔθακεν αὐτῷ: comp. vii. 17, Rom. xii. 3. That the reference is here to the teachers and not to the taught, appears from the following words explaining the different ministrations assigned to each, 'I planted, Apollos watered,' and from ἕκαστος below, ver. 8.

ὁ Κύριος] 'the Lord,' 'the Master of the universe and of themselves'; opposed to οἱ διάκονοι. We have the same play upon the word, so to speak, in Col. iii. 22, 23, where δούλοι is opposed to τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις, and then immediately follows φοβούμενοι τὸν Κύριον and in the next verse again τῷ Κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε. See also Eph. vi. 5—9. Κύριος, which in Attic Greek is chiefly used for 'a master' with a technical legal meaning, is in the N. T. the common word rather than δεσπότης, which occurs comparatively seldom. On both words see Trench *N. T. Syn.* § xxviii.

6. ἐγὼ ἐφύτευσα κ.τ.λ.] This is entirely in accordance with the account given in the Acts of the part taken by St Paul and Apollos respectively in the foundation of the Church of Corinth: Acts xviii. 1—18 with regard to St Paul, xviii. 24—xix. 1 with regard to Apollos.

The Fathers put a very curious interpretation upon this passage: in order to refer ἐπίστευεν to baptism they applied ἐφύτευσα to the work of educating the catechumens. Thus Gregory Nyssen *c. Eunom.* ii. (p. 565)

φυτεύει μὲν διὰ τῆς κατηχήσεως ὁ ἀπόστολος, ποτίζει δὲ βαπτίζων ὁ Ἀπολλῶς, Optatus, 'de pagano catechumenon feci: ille catechumenon baptizavit,' and Petilianus *ap.* Aug. iii. 53, and Augustine himself, *Epist.* 48. The interpretation is instructive, as showing a general fault of patristic exegesis, the endeavour to attach a technical sense to words in the N. T. which had not yet acquired this meaning.

ἡύξανεν] Observe the change of tense from the aorist ἐφύτευσα, ἐπότισεν, to the imperfect. 'God ever gave the increase,' this being a continuous and gradual process.

7, 8. The argument is as follows: 'Paul and Apollos are *nothing*: therefore you ought not to make them lords over you (ver. 7). Again, Paul and Apollos are *one thing*: therefore they ought not to be the occasion of dissension among you (ver. 8).' Every word, especially in these earlier chapters, is charged with meaning.

7. ὥστε] is explained by ἀλλ' ὁ Θεὸς ἡύξανεν. It is as if the Apostle had said, 'What are the planting and watering without the principle of growth? Therefore you ought not to regard the planter and waterer etc.' The contrast is implied in the adversative ἀλλά.

ἐστὶν τι] For εἶναι τι see Gal. ii. 6, vi. 15, Acts v. 36, viii. 9.

ὁ αὐξάνων Θεός] i.e. τὰ πάντα ἐστι. Notice the order: 'but He that giveth the increase, which is God.'

8. ὁ φυτεύων δὲ] The particle either marks the opposition to ὁ αὐξάνων Θεός which has just preceded, or introduces the second application 'but again.'

ἐν εἰσιν] 'are *one thing*,' i.e. 'are working for one and the same end, are part of the same administration: and therefore ought not to be the cause of divisions.' Observe how their independence is sunk in the form of the expression (ἐν).

ἕκαστος δὲ] Here the particle is corrective: 'though they are one, yet they will *each* severally etc.' Just as their individuality had been ignored in ἐν εἰσιν of the former clause, so now it is especially emphasized in this new aspect by ἕκαστος and by the repetition of τὸν ἴδιον, 'congruens iteratio, antitheton ad unum' Bengel.

9. Θεοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν συνεργοί] It is better to refer γὰρ to the first clause in the preceding verse and to treat ἕκαστος δὲ...κόπον as parenthetical. 'We are a part of one great scheme, for we are fellow-workers with God.' Observe the emphatic Θεοῦ—emphatic both from its position and from its repetition. All things are referred to Him.

συνεργοί] 'labourers together with God,' 'fellow-labourers with God,' as the E. V., not, as others take it, 'fellow-labourers in the service of God.' See note on 1 Thess. iii. 2, where the transcribers have altered the text in order to get rid of so startling an expression as 'fellow-workers with God.'

Θεοῦ γεώργιον, Θεοῦ οἰκοδομὴ ἔσται] The former of these metaphors has been already applied (v. 6—8): and now the latter is expanded (v.

10—17). Thus 'God's husbandry, God's building' is the link which connects the two paragraphs together. Of the two images *γεώργιον* implies the organic growth of the Church, *οικοδομή* the mutual adaptation of its parts. *Οικοδομή* is a later form of *οικοδόμημα*: see Lobeck *Phryn.* p. 481 sq., Buttm. *Gr.* § 121.

10. St Paul had hitherto dwelt on the metaphor of the husbandry; he now turns to that of the building. The former metaphor was best adapted to develop the essential unity of the work, the latter to explain the variety of modes in which the workmen might carry out the labour.

. *κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ*] This is not a mere empty form of words. It is emphatic from its position. 'If I laid the foundation, I cannot take to myself the credit of the work. The honour is due to God.' St Paul is still dwelling on the same idea, which he brings out in the thrice repeated *Θεοῦ* of the preceding verse.

For the expression itself and for the emphatic position in which it is placed compare Acts xv. 11 *ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι*. Where it is necessary for him to speak of his work, he is careful to exclude boasting at the outset. *Χάρις* is the watchword of St Paul. It is the objective element, the divine counterpart, corresponding to the subjective element, the human correlative *πίστις*; cf. Eph. ii. 8 *τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως*. It is opposed to *νόμος* (Rom. vi. 14), as *πίστις* is to *ἔργα*.

σοφός] '*skilful*,' the correct epithet to apply to proficiency in any craft or art. Cf. Arist. *Eth. Nic.* vi. 7 *τὴν δὲ σοφίαν ἐν ταῖς τέχναις τοῖς ἀκριβεστάτοις τὰς τέχνας ἀποδίδομεν ὡς οἷον Φειδιαν λιθουργὸν σοφὸν καὶ Πολύκλειτον ἀνδριαντοποιόν*. The expression *σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων* occurs in Is. iii. 3.

θεμέλιον] The dictum of Moeris *θεμέλια καὶ θεμέλιον οὐδετέρως, ἀπτικῶς θεμέλιοι καὶ θεμέλιος, κοινῶς* (cf. Thom. Magister) is not borne out by its usage in extant passages. For an instance of the neuter in the *κοινή* see Acts xvi. 26, and of the masculine in Attic see Thucyd. i. 93. The singular masculine and neuter seem equally rare in Attic writers (no instances given in the common lexicons), though not uncommon in the *κοινή* (cf. e.g. Polyb. i. 40. 9, not cited in the *lexx.*). The word is properly an adjective and therefore when used in the masc. *λίθος* is understood. Cf. Aristoph. *Av.* 1137 *γέρανοι θεμελίου καταπεπωκῦναι λίθους*.

ἔθηκα] the better supported reading, is more appropriate here. The more absolute *τέθεικα* 'I have laid' would savour somewhat of arrogance, and would better describe the office of God than of the human agent. See the note on *κείμενον* ver. 11.

ἄλλος δέ] The reference is not solely to Apollos, for he was only one out of many teachers who had built up the Corinthian Church. Cf. *ἕκαστος δέ*. At the same time, occurring as it does so soon after the mention of Apollos (ver. 6), it suggests the idea that St Paul feared that Apollos

might not be quite free from blame: that he might have conceded too much to the cravings of the ears and intellect of the Corinthians.

πὼς ἐποικοδομεῖ] 'what is the character of the building he erects thereupon'; including the character of the materials, which are specified afterwards, but not restricted to them. 'My caution,' says St Paul, 'has reference to the building up, for the superstructure may be built up in many ways (and therefore care is needed): but only one foundation is possible.'

St Paul refuses to conceive the possibility of any professedly Christian teacher laying any other foundation. The foundation is already laid for him. In exactly the same spirit he speaks of the impossibility of there being more than one Gospel in Gal. i. 6, 7 *θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε...εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο κ.τ.λ.* The word *δύναται* here must not be emptied of its meaning.

11. *παρὰ τὸν κείμενον*] 'besides that which lieth,' stronger than *τὸν τεθέτα* which *ἔθηκα* (ver. 10) would lead us to expect, or even than *τὸν θεμελίον*. The foundation is already laid, when the workman begins his work. *Τὸν κείμενον* asserts the position of the foundation stone to be absolutely independent of human interference.

St Paul is here inconsistent in his language only that he may bring out the truth more fully. He had before spoken of himself as a skilful architect. Now he says that no one could have done otherwise than he has done. He had before asserted that he had laid the foundation stone. Now he affirms that the foundation stone was already laid for him.

'*Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*] The one only foundation stone is the personal Saviour, the historical Christ. Observe that it is not *Χριστός* alone—no ideal Christ—no theories or doctrines about Christ—not faith in Christ—but Jesus Christ himself, 'the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever' (Heb. xiii. 8).

Our Lord is here represented as the foundation stone (*θεμέλιος*), elsewhere the chief corner stone, *ἀκρογωνιαίος* (Eph. ii. 20). He is the basis on which the Church rests, and the centre of her unity.

12. In the passage which follows there seems to be a clear allusion to the prophecy of Malachi iii. 1 sq. *ἐξαίφνης ἦξει εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἑαυτοῦ κύριος...καὶ τίς ὑπομενεῖ ἡμέραν εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ...διότι αὐτὸς εἰσπορεύεται ὡς πῦρ χωνευτηρίου...καὶ καθιέται χωνεύων καὶ καθαρίζων ὡς τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ ὡς τὸ χρυσίον*, iv. 1 *διότι ἰδοὺ ἡμέρα ἔρχεται καιομένη ὡς κλίβανος καὶ φλέξει αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔσονται...οἱ ποιοῦντες ἄνομα καλάμη καὶ ἀνάψει αὐτοὺς ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἐρχομένη*, i.e. the fire shall purify the nobler materials, the silver and gold, and consume the baser material, the stubble. The application of the metaphor of the 'fire' and the 'day' here however is somewhat different.

εἰ δέ τις] i.e. but on the other hand the character of the superstructure may vary, and these varieties will be made manifest,

χρυσίον κ.τ.λ.] i.e. durable materials as gold, silver and costly stones, or perishable materials as wood, hay and stubble. The words go in threes, of a palace on the one hand, of a mud hovel on the other. The idea of splendour however seems to be included in the first triad. The structure is at once a palace adorned with gold and silver and precious stones no less than a palace firmly built of gold and silver and costly marbles. Tibull. iii. 3. 16 'Quidve domus prodest Phrygiis innixa columnis, Aurataeque trabes, marmoreumque solum.'

Χρυσίον, ἀργύριον, which represent the right reading here, differ from χρύσος, ἄργυρος (gold and silver simply) in signifying gold or silver made up in some way, as in coins, plate etc. The λίθοι τίμιοι are perhaps 'costly marbles.' Perhaps however 'precious stones, jewels' may be meant, and the description here is not intended to apply to any actual building, but to an imaginary edifice of costly materials as the New Jerusalem. Cf. Rev. xxi. 18, 19 καὶ ἡ πόλις χρυσίον καθαρὸν...οἱ θεμέλιοι τοῦ τείχους τῆς πόλεως παντὶ λίθῳ τιμίῳ κεκοσμημένοι. The LXX. use of the expression appears to vary between these two meanings. Thus in 2 Sam. xii. 30 τάλαντον χρυσίου καὶ λίθου τιμίου it is employed of a king's crown, in 1 Kings x. 2, 2 Chron. ix. 1, 9 of the Queen of Sheba's gifts. In other passages (1 Kings x. 11, 2 Chron. ix. 10) it seems to refer to marbles. Cf. also Ezek. xxvii. 12, 22 and esp. Dan. xi. 38.

ξύλα, χόρτον, καλάμην] A hovel of which the supports would be of wood, and the hay and straw would be employed either to bind the mud or to plaster together, or to thatch the roof. Compare Seneca *Ep.* xc. 10, 17 'Culmus liberus textit...non quaelibet virgea in cratrem texuerunt manu et vili obleverunt luto, deinde stipula aliisque silvestribus operuere fastigium?'

The question is raised here whether 'the building' represents 'the body of believers,' or 'the body of doctrine taught.' In favour of the first view is the direct statement Θεοῦ οἰκοδομῆ ἔστε (ver. 9): in favour of the second, the whole context, which certainly has some reference to the character of the teaching. Perhaps we should say that neither is excluded, that both are combined. The building is the Church as the witness of the truth. Thus it is the doctrine exhibited in a concrete form.

From the metaphor is derived the use of οἰκοδομή (-μεῖν -μία -μῆσις) in the sense of 'instruction,' 'edification.' This meaning seems not to occur in the LXX., and probably not in the classical writers. Indeed in the New Testament it is not found out of St Paul with the exception of Acts ix. 31 (for in Acts xx. 32 it occurs in a speech of St Paul); and therefore the prevalence of this metaphor of 'edification' is probably due to the influence of his phraseology. See on 1 Thess. v. 11.

The idea of an allusion in the whole passage to the conflagration of Mummius is too far fetched to commend itself.

13. ἐκάστου κ.τ.λ.] The apodosis is framed, as if the protasis had

run otherwise—*εἴτε τις ἐποικοδομῆι χρυσίον κ.τ.λ. . . . εἴτε ξύλα κ.τ.λ.* ‘whether the superstructure has been raised of durable or of perishable materials.’

τὸ ἔργον] The plural *τὰ ἔργα* is frequently used in a special sense of buildings, or ‘works’ as we say. That sense is less defined in the singular, but there may perhaps be a tinge of it here. Cf. e.g. Thuc. i. 90.

ἡ ἡμέρα] ‘*the day*.’ See the notes on 1 Thess. v. 2, 4.

ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται] The idea of manifestation, which is faintly involved in *ἡμέρα*, having been more definitely insisted upon in *φανερὸν γενήσεται* and *δηλώσει*, the *manner* of this manifestation is declared: ‘it is revealed in fire’—a reference to Malachi i. c. Cf. also 2 Thess. i. 8.

ἐν πυρὶ] The idea of fire here is the connecting link between the idea of illumination which has hitherto prevailed and that of burning which now takes its place. By its destructive property the fire will test the stability of the work, purifying the better material and consuming the baser. The application is thus to a certain extent different from that in Malachi i. c.

ἀποκαλύπτεται] For this use of the present see the note on 1 Thess. v. 2 *ἔρχεται*, and to the references there given add Luke xvii. 30.

ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον] may either be the accusative case after *δοκιμάσει*, this being the more idiomatic construction; or on the other hand a suspended nominative. Rom. xii. 2 *εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ θέλημα* is in favour of the nominative here; but a single passage should not weigh much, and the order of the words is against this construction.

αὐτὸ] Though omitted in the T.R., *αὐτὸ* is probably genuine, the weight of authority slightly preponderating in its favour. It is taken by Meyer closely with *πῦρ* ‘the fire itself,’ but it is not easy to see the force of the expression. Rather should it be considered as referring to *ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον*, the pronoun being added by a pleonasm not uncommon in the N. T. ‘The fire shall test it.’ This idiomatic use will account for its omission. Similar omissions of the pleonastic pronoun occur in some MSS. on Matt. ix. 27, xxvi. 71, Luke viii. 27, xvii. 7. In other passages the stumbling block is removed by altering the form of the sentence.

14. *μένει*] It is a question whether this verb is present or future. Though the future would accord with the following *κατακαίσεται*, yet on the other hand the present is the more forcible here, the notion of permanence being better expressed by it. Compare John viii. 35, xii. 34, 1 Cor. xiii. 13 for *μένειν* in this tense.

15. *ζημιωθήσεται*] ‘*shall be mulcted of his reward*,’ sc. *τὸν μισθὸν* understood from the previous verse. Cf. Deut. xxii. 19, Exod. xxi. 22, where *ζημιῶν* is used with an accusative of the fine inflicted. The idea can be illustrated by 2 Joh. 8 *ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσητε τὸ ἡργασάμεθα ἀλλὰ μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβητε*.

αὐτὸς δὲ] opposed to *μισθόν*. His reward shall be lost, but his person shall be saved.

οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός] ‘*but only as one passing through fire is saved*’: i.e. with such a narrow escape. ‘Prope ambustus evaserat’ Livy xxii. 35. Much has been built on this passage. The Romish doctrine of purgatory has been supposed to be supported by it. But we must not press οὕτως ὡς as though the expression necessarily implies any actual fire. It is used equally to express a fact and a similitude. Thus in 1 Cor. iv. 1 οὕτως ἡμᾶς λογιζέσθω ἄνθρωπος ὡς ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ it expresses a fact, they were ministers; on the other hand in 1 Cor. ix. 26 οὕτως πυκτεύω ὡς οὐκ ἀέρα δέρω it introduces a metaphor. But the context decides the meaning to be metaphorical here. From beginning to end we cannot treat any part as literal to the exclusion of the rest (the ξύλα, χόρτος, καλάμη). There is no stopping at one point. If any further argument were needed, it would be found in the fact that a moral and not a physical agency is obviously required here. It would be rash to deny that St Paul conceived of the Lord appearing amidst an actual flame of fire: but the outward appearance is only the symbol of a spiritual power. Thus the light which accompanies the Lord’s appearing is a symbol of that light which He will shed on the thoughts and deeds of all men, the revelation of the hidden things of darkness: the flame of fire, which surrounds Him, betokens the powerful agency which consumes the inefficient work, and spares only the substantial labour. Here St Paul sees the thing symbolized in the symbol. See the notes on 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.

Διὰ πυρός is here local, not instrumental; cf. e.g. Rom. xv. 28 δι’ ὑμῶν εἰς Σπανίαν, and see Winer § 51, p. 452. For it is clearly an allusion to the proverbial expression of ‘passing through fire.’ This expression is equally common in classical Greek (compare Eur. *Andr.* 487 διὰ πυρός εἰλεῖν, Eur. *Electr.* 1182 διὰ πυρός μολεῖν) and in the Old Testament. See Is. xliii. 2, Ps. lxxv. 12 διελθεῖν διὰ πυρός, Zech. xiii. 9 διάγειν διὰ πυρός, and for similar phrases Zech. iii. 2 ὡς θαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός, 1 Pet. iii. 20 διεσώθησαν δι’ ὕδατος. There is therefore no idea of purifying ‘by means of fire’ implied in the passage here. It simply denotes a hairbreadth escape.

That the Apostle does not intend any purgatorial fire by this expression will appear from the following considerations. (1) Fire is here simply regarded as a destructive agency. There is no trace here of the idea of refining or purging, an attribute elsewhere given to it, as in Malachi iii. 3, though even there the prophet seems to speak of purging the whole nation by destroying the wicked, not of purging sin in the individual man. (2) The whole image implies a momentary effect and not a slow, continuous process. The Lord shall appear in a flash of light and a flame of fire. The light shall dart its rays into the innermost recesses of the moral world. The flame shall reduce to ashes the superstructure raised by the careless or unskilful builder. The builder himself shall flee for his life. He shall escape, but scorched and with the marks of the flame about him.

16. οὐκ οἴδατε] The warning and the metaphor seem to come in somewhat abruptly, but there is a link of connexion, for ναὸς is only a definition of the previous metaphor οἰκοδομῆ (ver. 9). The building has now become a temple. Compare Eph. ii. 20—22, where we have the same transition, first the building (ἐποικοδομηθέντες), then that building defined as a temple (εἰς ναὸν ἄγιον), lastly that temple described as the permanent abode (εἰς κατοικητήριον) of God in the spirit. Here ναὸς is more immediately suggested by the passage of Malachi which the Apostle has in his mind throughout, the temple there being one of the leading ideas (Mal. iii. 1).

ναὸς Θεοῦ] ‘*God’s temple,*’ not ‘*a temple of God.*’ The Apostle is speaking of the community, not of the individual Christian. There is an allusion in these verses to the dissensions which are a corrupting of God’s temple. The metaphor is not from the many temples of the heathen, but from the one temple of Jerusalem. So Philo *Monarch.* ii. 1 (II. p. 223 *ed.* Mangey) προενόησε δὲ ὡς οὔτε πολλαχόθι οὔτ’ ἐν ταύτῳ πολλὰ κατασκευασθήσεται ἱερὰ δικαιοσύνας ἐπειδὴ εἰς ἐστὶ Θεὸς καὶ ἱερὸν εἶναι μόνον.

οἶκέ] The ναὸς, the inward shrine or sanctuary, was regarded as the abode of the deity (from ναίω ‘to dwell’). Of course this was the case with heathen deities, but in a certain sense it was also true of the temple at Jerusalem; for though God ‘dwelleth not in temples made with hands’ (Acts xvii. 24), yet the symbol of His presence, the Shechinah, was there. Hence St Luke (xi. 51) calls the inner temple the οἶκος, where another evangelist has ναὸς (Matt. xxiii. 35). Observe however that, in the case of the Christian community, the word is appropriate not because the image of the deity was there, as in heathen temples, nor the symbol, as in the Jewish temple, but because the Spirit of God was the Indweller.

17. φθείρει, φθερέ] The same word is studiously kept to show that the offender is requited in kind. Compare Acts xxiii. 2, 3 ἐπέταξεν τύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα... Τύπτειν σε μέλλει ὁ Θεός, where we must recollect that St Paul is speaking. The same English word then ought to have been preserved at all hazards in the A. V. For the metaphor compare Ign. *Ερμ.* § 16 μὴ πλανᾷθῃς, ἀδελφοί μου, οἱ οἰκοφθόροι βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν κ.τ.λ., following immediately after § 15 πάντα οὖν ποιῶμεν ὡς αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικοῦντος, ἵνα ὄμην αὐτοῦ ναοί.

A comparison with vi. 19 is instructive. Here it is a subtle and disputatious spirit, there moral impurity, which violates the temple of the Spirit. The two passages together condemn the leading vicious tendencies of the Corinthian character.

18. δοκεῖ] ‘*seemeth to himself.*’ This is the usual (though perhaps not the universal) sense of δοκεῖν in St Paul: comp. vii. 40, viii. 2, x. 12, xiv. 37 etc.

ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ] The idea is not temporal, but ethical, moral: the mundane order of things as opposed to the eternal, the heavenly.

19. ὁ δρασσόμενος κ.τ.λ.] *'he that seizeth the wise'*; a quotation from Job v. 13, the only quotation from Job in the N. T. The Apostle however translates from the Hebrew himself, substituting two more forcible expressions for the LXX. ὁ καταλαμβάνων σοφούς ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτῶν. St Paul's rendering of ׀ַרַּעַ by πανουργία is the more correct, as the adjective ׀ַרַּעַ is generally translated πανούργος in the LXX.

The words, it will be observed, are the words of Eliphaz, but they are appropriated because of their intrinsic truth. Compare Gal. iv. 30, where the language of Sarah is cited as Scripture (ἡ γραφή), and Matt. xix. 5, where apparently the words of Adam are quoted as the voice of God.

20. καὶ πάλιν] Taken from the LXX. of Ps. xciv. (xciii.) 11, τῶν σοφῶν however being substituted for τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Here the LXX. follows the Hebrew more closely, but *'there seems to be a reminiscence of the original in the next words ἐν ἀνθρώποις'* (Stanley).

διαλογισμοῦς] *'the reasonings,' 'thoughts'*: not *'the disputations.'* This is the sense of the word in the original and therefore is decisive for us here, besides being the usual meaning of διαλογισμοὶ in the N. T. See the note on Phil. ii. 14.

21. ἐν ἀνθρώποις] i. e. *'in human teachers,'* returning to what he has said in i. 31.

πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστίν] The whole universe, as it were, lies at the feet of the true disciple of Christ. Compare Rom. viii. 28, where the same idea is expressed in not quite such strong language. This mode of speaking is perhaps borrowed from Stoic phraseology; but though the Stoics certainly talked in this way, the application is different. Zeno (*ap. Diog. Laert. vii. 1. 25*) may say καὶ τῶν σοφῶν δὲ πάντα εἶναι, Cicero (*Acad. ii. 44*) *'omnia, quae ubique essent, sapientis esse,'* Seneca (*de Benef. vii. 2, 3*) *'emittere hanc dei vocem Haec omnia mea sunt'*; but though the Stoic and Christian phraseology may be the same, how striking the real contrast of sentiment! Instead of assigning all virtues to the wise, it is just to the wise that St Paul denies them. They belong, so to speak, to the fools (οἱ μωροί). Again, instead of assigning this universal dominion to the isolation of self, he bestows it upon the negation of self, the absorption or incorporation of self in Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ). All things are the believer's; but they are only his, in so far as he is Christ's, and because Christ is God's. See *Philippians*, p. 304 sq.

22. Παῦλος, Ἀπολλῶς, Κηφᾶς] He begins with the human teachers. *'They all belong to you, they are your slaves; you each individually take one of them as a party-leader, but they are all yours.'* He starts from this, as being the point at issue: and then he goes on, *'Indeed the whole universe, the whole order of things is yours.'* Here κόσμος is best taken by itself, the rest hanging together in pairs. *'Whether life or death.'* Again an exhaustive division, but this time with reference to the subjective state. Life and death are antagonistic to each other, are

mutually exclusive; yet either state ministers alike to the good of the faithful. Compare Rom. viii. 38, Phil. i. 21, and for *ἐνεστώτα, μέλλοντα* see the note on Gal. i. 4.

23. *ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ*] 'But this mastery of the universe is only yours by virtue of your incorporation in Christ, your participation in His sovereignty.'

Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ] It is not the human but the divine nature of Christ to which the Apostle alludes. This interpretation is necessary for the proper understanding of the Nicene Creed; necessary for the preservation of the Unity of the Godhead, while confessing the divinity of Christ. Compare St John xvii. 7, 8, 21—23.

CHAPTER IV.

Human preferences worthless: the divine tribunal alone final

(iv. 1—5).

1. οὕτως] The adverb does not go with what precedes 'this being so,' 'therefore'; but is to be taken closely with ὡς: comp. iii. 15, ix. 26, 2 Cor. ix. 5, Eph. v. 33. The order of the words seems imperatively to demand this, because otherwise we can give no account of the position of ἡμᾶς, which then becomes the principal word in the sentence. Eph. v. 28 οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ἀγαπᾶν τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκας ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα has a very different order and force. 'So ought the husbands also to love their wives as their own bodies.' If οὕτως be taken as the principal word and joined with ὡς, ἡμᾶς falls at once into insignificance, as the sense demands.

οἰκονόμους] '*stewards of the mysteries*,' i.e. teachers of the revealed truths. The church is the οἶκος (1 Tim. iii. 15), God the οἰκοδοσότης (Matt. xiii. 52), the members the οἰκεῖοι (Gal. vi. 10, Eph. ii. 19, where see the notes). See also especially the notes on οἰκονομίαν Col. i. 25, Eph. i. 10.

2. ὡδε] This reading has the vast preponderance of evidence. The same change into ὁ δὲ has been made in Luke xvi. 25, where it is quite impossible to connect with the previous sentence, as the reading ὁ δὲ would require. Compare also Rev. xiii. 18, xvii. 9. Ὡδε never has any other than a local sense in the N. T., 'here,' 'in this matter'; but it must be taken with what follows, as is distinctly done by the principal versions (Vulg. Pesh. Memph.).

λοιπὸν κ.τ.λ.] '*for the rest, it is required* (generally the force of ζητεῖν) *that a man be found trustworthy*' (passive, see Galatians, p. 155).

3. ἐμοὶ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] '*but to me it amounts to the smallest of all matters that I should be examined by you or by man's day*.' For εἰς after εἶναι in the sense of 'it comes to' compare vi. 16 ἔσονται...εἰς σάρκα μίαν. Somewhat different is the expression in Col. ii. 22 ἃ ἔστιν εἰς φθορὰν 'destined to,' where see the note. On the technical sense of ἀνακρίνειν here see above on ii. 15.

ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας] The A. V. somewhat boldly translates 'man's judgment'; but the word is put here because it is in opposition to ἡ ἡμέρα of iii. 13 'the Lord's day.' The meaning is 'by any day fixed by man.' The idea of a day as implying judgment is common in Hebrew, and would be directly assisted by such expressions as 'diem dicere,' 'to fix a day for judgment.' Compare the English 'daysman,' which contains the same idea (Wright's *Bible Word Book* s. v.).

4. οὐδὲν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] 'for though I know nothing against myself, yet.' It is important to see exactly what the Apostle's meaning is. It is simply a hypothetical case. 'For supposing I am conscious of no guilt in myself, yet am I not thereby justified.' The most saintly of men are the most conscious of guilt in themselves, and St Paul would be the last to make an absolute statement to the contrary. The sentence means 'on the supposition that I am not conscious, though I am.' Other instances of the second sentence qualifying the first are (1) Rom. vi. 17, where the force of the passage is 'Thanks be to God that though we were slaves to sin, we have obeyed,' (2) Matt. xi. 25 'that while thou hast concealed these things from the wise and prudent, thou hast revealed them' etc., and (3) John iii. 19, where it is not true to say that the judgment consisted in the fact of the light coming into the world, but, light having come into the world, the judgment is this that men loved darkness rather than light. Here then the sentence is put as a pure hypothesis.

'I know nothing by myself' is simply an archaism: compare Cranmer's letter to Henry VIII. quoted in Wright's *Bible Word Book*, 'I am exceedingly sorry that such faults can be proved by the queen.' For the idea cf. Horace *Epist.* i. 1. 61 'nil conscire sibi nulla pallescere culpa.'

ἀλλ' οὐκ] Comp. Ign. *Rom.* § 5 ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο δεδικαίωμα, a reminiscence of this passage.

5. πρὸ καιροῦ] i.e. 'do not therefore anticipate the great judgment (κρίσις) by any preliminary investigation (ἀνάκρισις), which must be futile and incomplete.'

ὁ Κύριος] There seems to be here a secondary allusion to the technical sense of κύριος as the properly constituted authority, e.g. Plato *Legg.* viii. p. 848C κύριος ἔστω τῆς νομῆς, Arist. *Pol.* ii. 9 (p. 1270 *ed.* Bekker) κύριος εἶναι κρίσεων μεγάλων, ii. 11 (p. 1273) ἀλλὰ κύριοι κρίνειν εἶσι. See also the note on iii. 5 and cf. vii. 22.

ὅς καὶ φωτίζει κ.τ.λ.] i.e. 'Who will reveal all the facts, bring all the evidence to light; thus superseding the necessity of this human ἀνάκρισις; and will make manifest the counsels of men's hearts, and then shall his due praise accrue to each one from God.' Ὁ ἔπαινος is 'the praise due to him,' whether small or great, whether much or none. Compare Rom. ii. 29 οὐ ὁ ἔπαινος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, where the force of the article is lost in the A. V.

(d) *Contrast between the self-satisfied temper of the Corinthians and the sufferings and abasement of the Apostles* (iv. 6—21).

6. ταῦτα δὲ κ.τ.λ.] 'But though I have spoken only of Paul and Apollos, you must not suppose that the remarks refer to these solely or chiefly. I used the name of Paul and Apollos : but I alluded especially to others'—the Judaizing factions doubtless, with whom probably the party-spirit, as such, was strongest.

μετεσχημάτισα] 'I transferred by a figure to myself and Apollos, that taking us as an illustration ye might learn not to exceed what is written in scripture.'

We find from both Greek and Latin writers that σχῆμα (schema) was used at this time especially (and almost exclusively) to imply a rhetorical artifice, by which, either from fear or respect or some other motive, the speaker veiled the allusion to individuals under an allegory or a feigned name or in any other way. Thus Quintilian says (ix. 2) 'Jam ad id genus ...veniendum est in quo per quamdam suspicionem, quod non dicimus accipi volumus...quod et supra ostendi jam fere solum schema a nostris vocatur et inde controversiae figuratae dicuntur.' It appears therefore that this sense of a 'covert allusion' had almost monopolized the meaning of schema in Quintilian's day : compare Martial iii. 68. 7 'schemate nec dubio sed aperte nominat illam.' Another Latin term equivalent to 'schema' was 'figura.' Suetonius *Dom.* 10 'occidit Hermogenem Tarsensem propter quasdam in historia figuras,' and this explains the 'controversiae figuratae' above. St Paul therefore says, 'I have applied these warnings to myself and Apollos for the purpose of a covert allusion, and that for your sakes, that ye may learn this general lesson.'

ἐν ἡμῖν] 'in our case,' 'by our example,' i.e. 'by this μετασχηματισμὸς to ourselves.'

μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται] 'not to go beyond what is written in scripture'; apparently a proverb, or at any rate in a proverbial form ; hence its elliptical dress : compare Terence *Andr.* I. I. 61 'id arbitrator Adprime in vita esse utile ut ne quid nimis.' The insertion of φρονεῖν after μὴ in the Textus Receptus illustrates the tendency to smooth down these ellipses of St Paul by insertions : see v. 1 ὀνομάζεται, xi. 24 κλώμενον, and the notes on 2 Thess. ii. 3 ὅτι, 1 Cor. i. 26 οὐ πολλοί, 31 ἵνα καθὼς γέγραπται. Passages in the Apostle's mind would doubtless be those quoted by him on i. 19, 31, iii. 19, 20.

φυσιοῦσθε] For the present indicative after ἵνα comp. Gal. iv. 17 ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε with the note. It is conceivable however that in both these cases we have a dialectic form of the conjunctive of verbs in -ωω.

7. τίς γὰρ σε διακρίνει ;] 'for who is he that maketh a difference in thee?' 'who differentiates thee from another?'

8. The Apostle bursts out in impassioned irony. 'You, it appears, are to be exalted by the Christian dispensation. You are eager to seize all

the advantages, to aim at all the elevation ; but you will leave to us all the hard work, all the indignities, all the sufferings. It is a very easy thing to claim all the privileges of your calling.'

κεκορεσμένοι] An allusion probably to Deut. xxxi. 20 *καὶ φάγονται καὶ ἐμπλησθέντες κορήσουσι καὶ ἐπιστραφήσονται ἐπὶ θεοῦ ἀλλοτρίους*, comp. Deut. xxxii. 15. They are filled and (as the Apostle implies) have waxed wanton.

ἐπλουτήσατε, ἑβασιλεύσατέ] The aorists, used instead of perfects, imply indecent haste. Here we meet with Stoic phraseology once more : see the note on iii. 21.

συμβασιλεύσωμεν] For their triumph, supposing it to be genuine, would be his triumph also. They were his *στέφανος καυχήσεως*. Genuine however it was not : this is the force of the aorist after *ᾄφελον* without *ἄν*.

9. **δοκῶ γάρ]** 'As it is, so far from being kings, we are the refuse of society. For, I fancy, God exhibited us, the Apostles, last of all as condemned criminals : for we were made a spectacle to the whole world, aye to angels and men.'

τοὺς ἀποστόλους] He adds the words not to claim this position for himself alone.

ἀπέδειξεν] a technical word here, like the Latin 'edere' (Suet. *Aug.* 45 'edere gladiatores,' Livy xxviii. 21 'munus gladiatorium'). 'He brought us out in the arena of this world's amphitheatre.' We have the same metaphor in xv. 32 *ἐθριομάχησα*. Tertullian (*de pudic.* 14) takes up the idea 'velut bestiarioris.'

ἑσχάτους] 'last of all,' i.e. to make the best sport for the spectators. The Apostles were brought out to make the grand finale, as it were. The reference to *ἑσχατοὶ* would be to the prophets and martyrs under the Old Covenant (Heb. xi. 33 sq., esp. *vv.* 39, 40).

ἐπιθανατοῦς] 'condemned criminals.' In this sense Dionysius of Halicarnassus, speaking of the Tarpeian Rock, says (*A. R.* vii. 35) *ὄθεν αὐτοῖς ἔθος βάλλειν τοὺς ἐπιθανατίους*.

θέατρον] The Greek word may mean (1) the place, (2) the spectators, (3) the actors in the spectacle, or (4) the spectacle itself. The last meaning is the one used here and is the rarest (Hesych. *θέατρον*· *θέαμα ἢ σὺνάγμα*).

καὶ ἀγγέλους] *καὶ* is not exclusive of what went before, but singles out the *ἄγγελοι* for special attention. Compare ix. 5 *οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Κηφᾶς*, Acts i. 14 *σὺν γυναῖξιν καὶ Μαρίας*. For the angels as interested spectators of man's doings see xi. 10, 1 Tim. v. 21.

12. **ἐργαζόμενοι]** He had done this at Corinth before (Acts xviii. 3) ; he was doing it at Ephesus when he wrote (Acts xx. 34).

13. **δυσφημούμενοι]** A rare word, and like *γυμνιτεύομεν*, *ἀστατοῦμεν* above and *περικαθάρματα*, *περίψημα* below, a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* in the N. T. Hence the change in many MSS. to the common word *βλασφημούμενοι*. It occurs however in 1 Macc. vii. 41.

περικαθάρματα] 'sweepings, offscourings.' This is the primary meaning

of the word. But the Apostle is carrying on the metaphor of *ἐπιθανάτιος* above. Both *περικαθήματα* and *περίψημα* were used especially of those condemned criminals of the lowest classes who were sacrificed as expiatory offerings, as scapegoats in effect, because of their degraded life. It was the custom at Athens to reserve certain worthless persons who in case of plague, famine or other visitations from heaven, might be thrown into the sea, in the belief that they would cleanse away, or wipe off, the guilt of the nation. Hence they were called *κάθαρμα*. The word sometimes corresponds to *φάρμακοί*, those slaves who were sacrificed for the good of the state, as being too vile to live (see Hermann *Griech. Alterth.* Gottesdienst. § 60). Though the simple form is more common, *περικαθήματα* occurs in Epictetus (iii. 22. 78) of Priam *ὁ πενήκοντα γέννησας περικαθήματα*, see also Prov. xxi. 18 *περικαθήματα δικαίου ἄνομος*.

τοῦ κόσμου, πάντων] These genitives refer to the people both from whom and for whom the lives are sacrificed.

περίψημα] On this word see the note on Ign. *Eph.* 8. It is not uncommon in the writings of the sub-apostolic age (Ign. *Eph.* 8. 18, *Eph. Barn.* 4, 6).

15. *παιδαγωγός*] See the note on Gal. iii. 24.

17. *ἔπεμψα*] Probably a little before the letter, as xvi. 10 seems to imply. The aorist however is not decisive, nor is the notice in Acts xix. 22. Timothy appears not to have reached Corinth. On his movements at this time and those of Titus see *Biblical Essays*, p. 273 sq. 'The Mission of Titus to the Corinthians' (especially p. 276 sq.).

21. *ἐν ῥάβδῳ*] The Hebraism is the more natural, as it is an O. T. phrase, 1 Sam. xvii. 43 *σὺ ἔρχῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἐν ῥάβδῳ*, 2 Sam. vii. 14, xxiii. 21, Ps. ii. 9, lxxxviii. 32. The Apostle offers the alternative: shall he come as a father or as a *παιδαγωγός*?

CHAPTER V.

ii. THE CASE OF INCEST, v. 1—vi. 20.

(a) *The incest denounced: the offender to be cast out of the Church*
(v. 1—13).

1. We have come now to the main pivot of the letter, the leading motive of the Apostle in writing it. The Second Epistle likewise arises altogether out of this case and the way in which the Corinthians received St Paul's rebuke.

Who then was St Paul's informant? Possibly the household of Chloe (i. 11), but more probably Stephanas and his household mentioned in xvi. 15 sq. For we notice an evident anxiety to shield them from the displeasure of the Corinthians. Hence the suppression of the informants' names here. But this is pure conjecture.

The connexion of this chapter with what precedes is twofold: (1) the condemnation of their vanity, involving the contrast between the spiritual pride of the Corinthians and the state of their Church, comp. iv. 18, 19 with v. 2; and (2) the character of his intended visit, should it be made in love or not, comp. iv. 18, 19, 21 with v. 3.

ἅλως] 'altogether,' 'most assuredly': almost equivalent to πάντως, 'prorsus.' That ἅλως bears this sense in the N. T. appears from vi. 7, xv. 29, Matt. v. 34, the only passages where the word occurs. It is not a common meaning in itself, but is found in classical writers also, e.g. Plato *Philebus* 36 B ἀλοῦνθ' ἅλως ἢ χαίροντα, Arist. *Top.* Θ. 1. p. 152 l. 24 ed. Bekker κἂν ἅλως χρήσιμον ἦ.

ἀκούεται.] 'is reported,' i.e. is commonly known to exist: ἐν ὑμῖν to be connected with ἀκούεται rather than with πορνεία.

πορνεία.] The context enables us to form some idea of what the crime was. (1) It was a lasting, not a momentary relation. This is inferred, not, as some take it, from πράξας (ver. 2) or κατεργασάμενον (ver. 3), but from ἔχειν (ver. 1). It might have been concubinage or marriage. (2) The former husband and father was still living: see 2 Cor. vii. 12 τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος. (3) There had been a divorce or separation. The crime is called πορνεία, not μοιχεία. (4) As no censure is uttered on the woman

in either Epistle, it may be inferred that she was not a Christian. Thus she was one of 'those without,' whom God would judge (*v.* 13).

ἤτις οὐδέ] On this ellipse see *iv.* 6 above. If a word had to be supplied, ἀκούεσθαι would be preferable to ὀνομάζεσθαι of the Textus Receptus; but probably nothing so definite was intended. ὀνομάζεσθαι comes apparently from *Eph.* *v.* 4.

ἐθνεσιν] The heinousness of this form of sin among the Gentiles is well illustrated from Cicero *pro Cluentio* *v.* 14 'nubit genero socrus...o mulieris scelus incredibile, et praeter hanc unam...inauditum.' See other passages given in Wetstein *ad loc.* We may well ask how was this crime possible? It was probably due to the profligacy of the Corinthian Church, but it may be accounted for in another way. The Mosaic Law was very stringent on this point (*Lev.* *xx.* 11, *Deut.* *xxii.* 30). But some of the Rabbis had invented a subterfuge to escape its stringency. They allowed such a connexion in the case of a proselyte. He had, as it were, they said, undergone a new birth; he had thus been taken out of his old relationships, and thus this intercourse was allowable (so Rabbi Akibah). It is quite possible that some subterfuge of this kind may have had its influence in excusing this crime to the man himself and to the Church.

2. ὑμεῖς πεφυσωμένοι ἐστέ] 'You vaunt your higher wisdom, you are proud of your spiritual gifts, you are puffed up; while this plague-spot is eating like a canker at the vitals of the church.' The ὑμεῖς prepares us for the following ἐγὼ μὲν (*ver.* 3).

ἐπενθήσατε] 'ye ought rather to have put on mourning,' i.e. when it came to your ears. Observe the change of tenses. Ἐπενθήσατε is more than ἐλπηθήτε. It involves the idea of the outward exhibition of humiliation and grief, and is especially used of funerals: see *Matt.* *ix.* 15 and *Gen.* *i.* 10 ἐποίησε τὸ πένθος τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. 'Ye should have clothed yourselves with sackcloth: ye should have humbled yourselves before God.'

τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο πράξας] This is the reading, not ποιήσας, which is weaker and less technical; comp. ἐν τῷ πράγματι *1 Thess.* *iv.* 6 (with the note). Πράξας brings out the moral aspect of the deed. The whole expression is a sort of euphemism.

3. ἐγὼ μὲν γάρ] 'for I for my part.' He contrasts his feelings with theirs.

ἀπὼν] 'albeit absent,' i.e. 'notwithstanding my absence, while you on the spot condoned the offence.' The ὡς of the Textus Receptus is to be left out before ἀπὼν. It enfeebles the sense, and manuscript evidence is against it. For παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι comp. *Col.* *ii.* 5.

ἤδη κέκρικα ὡς παρὼν] 'have already decided as though I were present.' The proper punctuation is to put a colon after παρὼν, and to take τὸν κατεργασόμενον as a prospective accusative, governed by παραδοῦναι and resumed in τὸν τοιοῦτον. For κέκρικα absolutely 'I am resolved,' a frequent use, see *Pliny Ep.* *i.* 12 'dixerat sane medico admonenti cibum

κέκρικα,' Epict. ii. 15 etc. The form of the sentence can be illustrated by Acts xv. 38 Παῦλος δὲ ἤξιον τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας καὶ μὴ συνελθόντα αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἔργον μὴ συναρалаμβάνειν τοῦτον, where we seem almost to hear the Apostle's own words.

οὕτως] The word aggravates the charge, 'under circumstances such as these.'

4. Of all the various possibilities enumerated by Meyer, the connexion of words suggested by the order appears most natural and best accords with the sense. By it ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κ. Ἰ. is to be taken with συναχθέντων ἡμῶν, and σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν Ἰ. with παραδοῦναι. Thus the inauguration of the proceedings, the gathering together, is in the name of the Lord, in accordance with Matt. xviii. 20; the action as the result is accompanied by His power. In the picture given, an imaginary court is formed and the Apostle's spirit is represented as presiding. That some such a tribunal was actually held and the offender condemned appears from 2 Cor. ii. 6, where we learn the result in 'the penalty inflicted by the majority.' The bearing of this passage on the question of direct apostolic supervision in the earliest stage of the Church's history is drawn out in *Philippians*, p. 198.

5. παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον] 'that we (or ye) should deliver so rank an offender as this.' He is described in the same vague way in 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7. The Apostle forbears to give his name.

τῷ Σατανᾷ] We have just the same expression in 1 Tim. i. 20. Satan is here spoken of as the instrument of physical suffering, just as in 2 Cor. xii. 7 St Paul's own malady is described as ἄγγελος Σατανᾶ. This delivery to Satan is by virtue of the extraordinary power given to St Paul as an Apostle, and has its analogy in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v. 1 sq.) and Elymas (Acts xiii. 8 sq.). He alludes to this power again in 2 Cor. xiii. 10. That physical suffering of some kind is implied, the purpose being remedial, appears from 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7, 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 10 εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς καθαίρεσιν. Thus the instrumentality of Satan is used for a divine end. Of the two forms, Σατᾶν and Σατανᾶς, the first is the Hebrew word; the second, a Grecised form of the Aramaic, is alone employed by St Paul: see on 1 Thess. ii. 18.

εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός] Not merely a crushing of fleshly lusts, though this is involved in the expression; but physical suffering also.

6. τὸ καύχημα ἡμῶν] 'the subject of your boasting.' What St Paul means is this: 'there is nothing in you worth boasting about, as long as this plague-spot remains; all your intellectual insight is worth nothing, is no matter of self-congratulation.' For the contrast with καύχησις see the notes on Gal. vi. 4, Phil. i. 26.

μικρὰ ζύμη] On the application of this proverb see the note on Gal. v. 9, where it occurs again. That ζύμη here is not the sinner, but the sin or sinfulness, appears from ver. 8. Philo *de vict. off.* 6 (II. p. 256 *ed.* Mangey) takes leaven as the symbol of inflation, pride (φουσηθεῖς ὑπ' ἀλαζονείας).

This idea however is not present to St Paul's mind here. Though pride is condemned in the context, yet the leaven here represents not the pride but the profligacy of the Corinthian Church. Elsewhere (*de congr. erud. gr.* 28 I. p. 542) Philo explains the metaphor otherwise τὸ μὴ οἰδεῖν καὶ ἀναζειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, which, he says, constitutes ἐορτὴ διανοίᾳ φιλάθλῳ.

[**ζυμοί**] A various reading δολοί occurs both here and in Gal. v. 9, chiefly in western authorities. Hence Jerome (on Gal. l. c.) says 'male in nostris codicibus habetur modicum fermentum totam massam *corrumpit*.' The accusation of the Greeks against the Latins (see Mich. Cerul. in Tischendorf), that they read φθείρει, seems to be founded on a mistake. They retranslated 'corrumpit,' which was really a rendering, not of φθείρει, but of δολοί. Tertullian (*de pudic.* 13, 18, *adv. Marc.* 1. 2) has 'desipit.'

7. **ἐκκαθάρατε**] A new turn is given to the metaphor, the mention of leaven suggesting the Paschal Feast. The reference is to the purging out the leaven on the eve of the Passover (Exod. xii. 15, xiii. 7). The word in Ex. xii. 15 (LXX.) ἀφανείτε ζύμην is very strong, 'ye shall make it to vanish.' With what exactness this injunction was carried out appears from a passage in Chrysostom (p. 177 *ed.* Field μῶν ὅπᾳς περιεργάζονται, 'they even scrutinise mouse-holes to see that there is no leaven in them'), and is confirmed by statements quoted in Lightfoot *H. H.* I. p. 953 and Edersheim *Temple*, p. 188. The passage in Zeph. i. 12 was considered to authorise a search with candles on this occasion.

νέον] On the distinction between νέος and καινός see the note on Col. iii. 10, and for the contrast between the old and the new, comp. also 2 Cor. v. 17, Eph. iv. 22 sq.

καθὼς ἴστε ἄζυμοι] 'even as ye are unleavened,' i. e. 'by the very terms of your Christian profession'; in other words, 'that ye may fulfil the idea of your being,—may be, as ye profess to be, καινὴ κτίσις.'

Vain attempts have been made to give ἄζυμοι the sense of 'eating unleavened bread.' These destroy the point of the image. There is a double application of the metaphor here. The Corinthians are (1) the φύραμα itself, the lump which is leavened (*vv.* 6, 7), (2) then they become the keepers of the festival (*vv.* 7, 8), and the Apostle characteristically passes from the one to the other. Examples of these sudden inversions of metaphors have already been given in the note on 1 Thess. ii. 7. So here the Apostle has turned the metaphor about to find some new lesson which he could draw from it.

καὶ γὰρ] 'for besides.' Here another analogy is introduced. Not only is there a Christian putting away of the leaven, but also a Christian paschal sacrifice. The passage gains much by the omission (with the best authorities) of the words ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, which blunt the point of the Apostle's reference. All we want here is the fact of the sacrifice.

τὸ πάσχα] 'the paschal lamb': as frequently in the Gospels, Matt. xxvi.

17 φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα, Mark xiv. 12 τὸ πάσχα ἔθνον...ἵνα φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα, comp. ver. 14, Luke xxii. 7, 11, 15.

ἐτίθη] ‘was sacrificed’ on the Cross. The A. V. loses the point by translating as a present or perfect. The reference is not to the passover as a type of Christ’s sacrifice, but rather to this sacrifice under the figure of the Paschal Feast. It is not the old as signifying the new, but the Paschal Lamb of the new dispensation.

Χριστός] ‘even Christ.’

8. ἐορτάζωμεν] ‘let us keep perpetual feast.’ Chrysostom grasps the point when he says (p. 175) ἐορτῆς ἄρα ὁ παρῶν καιρός...δεικνύς ὅτι πᾶς ὁ χρόνος ἐορτῆς ἐστί καιρός τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῶν δοθέντων ἀγαθῶν. There is some resemblance to St Paul’s language here in Philo *de sacrific. Abel. et Cain.* 33 (I. p. 184 sq.) τὸ τοίνυν φύραμα...ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν αὐτοί...μόνος δὲ ἐορτάζει τὴν τοιαύτην ἐορτὴν ὁ σοφὸς κ.τ.λ., but he is not speaking of the passover.

κακίας καὶ πονηρίας] ‘malice and villainy.’ Κακία is the vicious disposition, πονηρία the active exercise of it. The words occur together in Rom. i. 29. See Trench *N. T. Syn.* § xi. p. 37 sq. and the note on Col. iii. 8 κακίαν.

ἀληθείας] In the widest sense of the word: comp. John iii. 21 ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. This exercise of truth extends throughout all the domain of moral life: see Eph. iv. 15 ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ ‘holding the truth’ i.e. speaking and doing the truth. We have parallel applications of the metaphor in the sub-Apostolic age: Ign. *Magn.* 10 (where it applies to the leaven of Judaism) ὑπέρθεσθε οὖν τὴν κακὴν ζύμην τὴν παλαιωθείσαν, καὶ ἐνοξίασαν, καὶ μεταβάλεσθε εἰς νέαν ζύμην ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Just. *Mart. Dial.* 14 p. 114 τοῦτο γάρ ἐστί τὸ σύμβολον τῶν ἀζύμων, ἵνα μὴ τὰ παλαιὰ τῆς κακῆς ζύμης ἔργα πράττητε κ.τ.λ., *Clem. Hom.* viii. 17 ὁ Θεὸς αὐτοὺς ὥσπερ κακὴν ζύμην ἐξελείν ἐβούλετο. For εἰλικρινίας see on Phil. i. 10 εἰλικρινεῖς.

It has been suggested with great probability that we have in this verse a hint of the season of the year when the Epistle was written. This was, we know, towards the end of the Apostle’s stay at Ephesus, which place he hoped to leave about Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8). It is thus probable that the Jewish Paschal Feast was actually impending. The natural way, however, in which the mention of the Passover arises here out of the proverb just quoted, deprives this suggestion of much of its force. Similarly a passage in the Second Epistle may have been suggested by the Feast of Tabernacles. The reference in 2 Cor. v. 1 sq. seems to be a comparison between the removal into their permanent dwellings after the destruction of the temporary booths, and our removal to a ‘house not made with hands’ after the destruction of ‘our earthly house of the tabernacle.’ If we follow the narrative in the Acts, we see that the Second Epistle would probably have been written about the time of the Feast of Tabernacles.

9. ἔγραψα κ.τ.λ.] ‘I wrote unto you in my letter.’ The Apostle is reminded here of general instructions which he had sent them in a former communication, and in the spirit of which he asks them now to act. The expression imperatively demands the hypothesis of a previous letter. This necessity does not lie in the word ἔγραψα, which might stand equally in the beginning or middle of a letter as at the end: see the note on Gal. vi. 11 πηλίκους ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα, where the question of the epistolary aorist is gone into and instances given, Philemon 19, 21 ἔγραψα, Col. iv. 8 ἔπεμψα with the notes, and *Biblical Essays*, p. 275 (note 1). In the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* for example immediately after the salutation occurs (§ 1) an epistolary aorist ἐγράψαμεν ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὰ κατὰ τοὺς μαρτυρήσαντας καὶ τὸν μακάριον Πολύκαρπον κ.τ.λ., giving the purport of the letter of which it is the opening sentence. But the theory of a previous letter is rendered necessary by the words ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, which are quite meaningless if applied to our extant Epistle. It is true that ἡ ἐπιστολή is a phrase used sometimes of the letter itself in which it occurs (Rom. xvi. 22, 1 Thess. v. 27, Col. iv. 16, and probably 2 Thess. iii. 14, see the notes on the last three passages); but in all these cases the expression occurs in a postscript, when the Epistle is considered as already at an end. These instances therefore are not to the point, and the same can be said of *Martyrdom of Polycarp* § 20 τὴν ἐπιστολὴν διαπέμψασθε, where the document is regarded as concluded. But we have no example of the phrase occurring in the middle of a letter as here. Nor is the case met by the theory propounded by Stanley of a postscript note consisting of 1 Cor. v. 9—13 subsequently incorporated in the middle of the Epistle. For apart from the awkwardness of this hypothesis, the whole passage hangs together in close connexion of thought: ver. 9 μὴ συναγαμίνυσθαι πόρνοις arising naturally out of the mention of the leaven in vv. 6—8, and vi. 1 κρίνεσθαι being directly suggested by the κρίνειν, κρίνετε of vv. 12, 13. These links would not exist, if that theory were true. The hypothesis of a previous letter is as old as the first Latin commentator Ambrosiaster, and is accepted by Calvin, Beza, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, Meyer and many others. It is likewise borne out by other expressions of St Paul to the Corinthians, viz. 2 Cor. vii. 8 εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, where the words cannot refer to the letter which he was inditing, but require a previous communication; and especially 2 Cor. x. 10, 11, where the acknowledgement of the Corinthians that his ‘letters are weighty and powerful’ together with his own reply ‘Such as we are by letters when absent etc.’ cannot be explained quite satisfactorily by the single extant Epistle written before this date. See the whole question of lost letters of St Paul treated in *Philippians*, p. 138 sq. There are extant two letters, one purporting to be from St Paul to the Corinthians, the other from the Corinthians to St Paul, both obviously spurious, but held as canonical by the Armenian Church (see Stanley *Corinthians*, p. 591 sq. and my note on vii. 1 below).

10. οὐ πάντως] 'assuredly I did not mean.' The πάντως qualifies the οὐ, not the οὐ the πάντως. This is at least an allowable meaning (probably the general meaning) in classical Greek, see Cope's Appendix to *Gorgias*, p. 139 sq., who however shows that οὐ πάνν (we may extend the term to οὐ πάντως) need not necessarily mean 'not at all'; and it becomes still more prominent in Biblical Greek as coinciding with a common Hebraism (Mark xiii. 20, Acts x. 14, 1 Joh. ii. 21, Apoc. vii. 16 etc., and 1 Cor. i. 21 above). Compare *Clem. Hom.* xix. 9 καὶ ὁ Πέτρος, Οὐ πάντως ὀρώμεν γὰρ πολλοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγαθοὺς ὄντας, *Epist. ad Diogn.* 9 οὐ πάντως ἐφθόμοιο τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν ἡμῶν ἀλλ' ἀνεχόμενος, where it would be impossible to give the sentence the meaning that God was 'not altogether pleased' with sin. Taken by itself the passage before us is not decisive, and might imply 'it was not altogether my meaning'; but with the examples cited it is better to render it, as above, in the sense 'it was altogether not, assuredly not, my meaning': compare Rom. iii. 9.

ἢ τοῖς πλεονέκταις καὶ ἄρπαξιν ἢ εἰδωλολάτραις] Καὶ is the right reading. On the false interpretation of πλεονέκταις here to denote sins of sensuality see the note on Col. iii. 5. The καὶ connects πλεονέκταις with ἄρπαξιν, which together form one notion; εἰδωλολάτραις introduces another, though a kindred, idea, see Col. L c. and Eph. v. 5.

εἰδωλολάτραις] Here again Stanley without sufficient reason attempts to put into this word a reference to sins of sensuality. The fact is there was a strong temptation for Christians living among heathen to play fast and loose with idolatrous rites. These rites might be licentious or not, but this further idea is not conveyed by the word itself. We have a prospective reference here to the discussion which is introduced subsequently (ch. viii.) upon εἰδωλόθυτα (see esp. x. 21 *τραπέζης δαιμονίων*). That this danger of idolatry even in the Christian Church was not an imaginary one appears from the warning given in 1 Joh. v. 21 *τεκνία, φυλάξατε εαυτὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων*.

The word εἶδωλον has a curious history. It originally means 'a phantom, shadow,' and so 'unreality' as opposed to genuine truth. This is the sense in which Bacon uses the word 'idols' in his *Novum Organum*, implying idle phantoms which lead men astray. It was then happily applied in the LXX. to false gods, as a translation, among other words, of the Hebrew לֵילִים, 'nothingness.' In the next stage, the word was applied to anything used as a representation of these false gods, and thus had attached to it an idea the very reverse of its original meaning, viz. a tangible, material god as opposed to the Invisible God. The passage before us marks the first appearance of the compound εἰδωλολάτρης.

ἐπεὶ ὠφέλιτε ἄρα] The imperfect is the correct reading both from a vast preponderance of textual authorities and from the sense. 'Ye ought to have done something, which has not been done,' is the meaning of the imperfect, 'ye ought to do something,' of the present. The ἄρα declares the ἐπεὶ to be conditional. 'Since in that case it would have

been your duty, which it is not, to leave the world wholly.' See vii. 14 below, and comp. xv. 15 *εἴπερ ἄρα*.

11. *νῦν δὲ*] Is ethical not temporal, 'as matters stand,' 'the world being what it is.' Comp. Rom. iii. 21, and esp. 1 Cor. vii. 14 *ἐπεὶ ἄρα...νῦν δὲ*, Heb. ix. 26 *ἐπεὶ ἔδει...νῦν δὲ ἅπαξ*. The misinterpretation of *ἔγραψα* (ver. 9) has been partly aided by taking *νῦν* in its primary temporal sense.

ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος] 'called a brother,' but not really deserving the name: comp. Rom. ii. 17 *Ἰουδαίος ἐπονομάζει*.

λοιδωρός] Here again Stanley (on vi. 10) sees a reference to sins of sensuality; but there is no indication of any such connexion in the N. T., see esp. 1 Pet. iii. 9.

μέθυσος] This is an instance of the not unfrequent phenomenon of a word used first in a comic sense, which in later times becomes part of the common stock of language, having lost its original ludicrous character. This is what is meant by grammarians who say that in Attic the word is never applied to men but to women. Pollux vi. 25 *ἡ δὲ γυνή μεθύση καὶ μεθύστρια παρὰ Θεοπόμπῃ τῷ κωμικῷ· ὁ γὰρ μέθυσος ἐπὶ ἀνδρῶν Μενάνδρῳ δεδόσθω*, which we may illustrate from Meineke *Comm. Fragm.*, Menander IV. p. 88 *πάντας μεθύσους τοὺς ἐμπόρους ποιεῖ*, quoted originally in Athen. x. p. 442 D. Thus it was originally 'tipsy,' rather than 'a drunkard'—Lucian *Τίμων* 55 *μέθυσος καὶ πάροις οὐκ ἄχρῖς φῶδῆς καὶ ὀρηστυῶς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ λοιδωρίας καὶ ὀργῆς*. Other examples of words casting off all mean associations in the later language are *ψωμίζειν* (1 Cor. xiii. 3) and *χορτάζειν* (Phil. iv. 12): see also other instances in Lobeck *Phryn.* p. 151 sq. The elevation of *ταπεινοφροσύνη* under Christian influence is noticed in the note on Phil. ii. 3.

12. *τοὺς ἔξω*] 'those outside the pale' of the Church: see on Col. iv. 5.

οὐχὶ κ.τ.λ.] Two points in the punctuation of this passage require a notice. (1) Is *οὐχὶ* to be taken separately 'nay, not so,' in which case *κρίνετε* would become an imperative? No; for (a) wherever *οὐχὶ* is so taken in the N. T., it is always followed by *ἀλλά* (Luke xii. 51, xiii. 3, 5, xvi. 30, Rom. iii. 27): (b) the sentence is not a direct answer to *τί γάρ μοι κ.τ.λ.* *Οὐχὶ* therefore is best taken with *τοὺς ἔσω*. (2) Is *κρίνει* to be read or *κρίνει*? The present tense is probably right, (a) because more suited to the context, preserving the parallelism better; (b) because more emphatic and more in accordance with usage, comp. vi. 2 *κρίνεται*, Rom. ii. 16, John viii. 50 *ὁ ζητῶν καὶ κρίνων*.

13. *ἔξάρτε κ.τ.λ.*] An adaptation of the command given Deut. xvii. 7 *καὶ ἐξαρτίτε τὸν ποτηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν*, and repeated elsewhere (with variations *ἐξαρτίς, τὸ ποτηρὸν*) of sins akin to this (Deut. xxii. 21 sq.). On *ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν* Bengel remarks 'antitheton *externos*.'

CHAPTER VI.

(b) *The Corinthian brethren apply to heathen courts to decide their disputes* (vi. 1—9).

1. The close of the last paragraph suggests a wholly different subject. The Apostle had incidentally spoken of the right and wrong tribunals for judging offences against purity. Hence he passes to the question of litigation in heathen courts.

Τολμᾶ τις ὑμῶν πρᾶγμα ἔχων] ‘Τολμᾶ grandi verbo notatur laesa majestas Christianorum’ says Bengel. Πρᾶγμα is the proper technical term for a lawsuit: for its forensic sense see the references in Meyer, and compare the technical sense of ‘negotium’ and ‘res.’

κρίνεσθαι] ‘to go to law,’ as in Matt. v. 40 τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι. The propriety of the forensic terms used here by St Paul is noteworthy: it is otherwise in Gal. iv. 1 sq., where see the notes.

τῶν ἀδίκων, τῶν ἀγίων] The word ἄδικοι is borrowed from Jewish phraseology, just as δίκαιος was a faithful Israelite. It is chosen here rather than any other word, (1) because it enhances the incongruity of the whole action of seeking justice at the hands of the unjust: (2) because of the alliteration: see the note on Phil. ii. 2. On the rabbinical prohibition, which was based on Ex. xxi. 1, see Meyer, p. 163.

2. τὸν κόσμον κρινούσιν] A reminiscence of Wisdom iii. 7, 8 ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτῶν ἀναλάμψουσιν...κρινούσιν ἔθνη καὶ κρατήσουσιν λαῶν, of the souls of the righteous, which is decisive in favour of the future here: compare for the idea Daniel vii. 22 τὸ κρίμα ἔδωκεν ἁγίοις ὑψίστου. This office the saints will hold by virtue of their perfected ἐπίγνωσις, their completed communion with the judgments of the Great Judge. This is a necessary part of the ultimate triumph of good over evil. Just as the faithful shall reign with Christ as kings (2 Tim. ii. 12, Rev. xxii. 5), so shall they sit with Him as judges of the world. The thought is an extension of the promise made to the Apostles (Matt. xix. 28, Luke xxii. 30): comp. Rev. xx. 4.

ἐν ὑμῖν] ‘before you, among you,’ ‘in consessu vestro.’ This is a common use of ἐν when speaking of tribunals: see Aristides *de Socrat.* I.

p. 128 ἐν ἡμῖν πρώτοις ὁ Φίλιππος ἐκρίνετο, Thuc. i. 53. ἰ ἐν δικασταῖς, and other references given in Wetstein and Meyer.

κρίνεται] The present tense denotes the certainty of the event. With Him is no before and no after: see the note on 1 Thess. v. 2 ἔρχεται.

ἀνάξιό ἐστε κ.τ.λ.] i. e. unworthy to sit in the most trivial tribunals.

κριτηρίων] The word κριτήριον is said by grammarians to have two meanings, (1) 'a tribunal, court of judicature' (so in the LXX. Dan. vii. 10, Judg. v. 10), (2) 'a trial'; but no passage quoted appears to demand this latter sense. Such instances as Lucian *in accus.* 25 οὐδὲν ἡγείται κριτήριον ἀληθές εἶναι can readily bear the meaning of a 'court of justice.' St Paul's injunction here is echoed in *Apost. Const.* ii. 45 μὴ ἐρχέσθω ἐπὶ κριτήριον ἐθνικόν.

3. μήτιγε] An elliptical sentence, 'let me not say,' and so, 'much more.' See the references collected in Winer § lxiv. p. 746 and Wetstein *ad loc.* It is frequent in the classics: e. g. Demosthenes *Olynth.* B. p. 24 οὐδὲ τοῖς φίλοις ἐπιπάττει ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τι ποιεῖν, μήτιγε δὴ τοῖς θεοῖς.

βιωτικά] 'things of this life.' The word occurs also in Luke xxi. 34 μερίμνας βιωτικαῖς, comp. *Clem. Hom.* i. 8 βιωτικά πράγματα, Marc. Anton. vi. 2 τῶν βιωτικῶν πράξεων. There is an important difference between βίος and ζωή. Ζωή signifies the principle of life, βίος the circumstances and accidents of life; thus ζωή is vita qua vivimus, βίος vita quam vivimus. With Aristotle βίος is the more important word of the two. He calls it λογική ζωή: hence it follows that his conception of life was a low one. But when we come to the N. T., the principle of life is no longer physical but spiritual: accordingly ζωή is exalted, while βίος remains at its former level. In the N. T. ζωή is commonly, but not universally, used of the higher spiritual life, βίος is always employed of the lower earthly life, e. g. Luke viii. 14 τῶν ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου, 2 Tim. ii. 4 τοῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματίαις, 1 Joh. ii. 16 ἡ ἀλαζονία τοῦ βίου, that is to say of the external concomitants of life. Thus βίος expresses the means of subsistence (Luke xv. 12, 30, xxi. 4, and 1 Joh. iii. 17, where it is contrasted with the ζωή of two verses earlier). For the contrast of the two words compare Origen *c. Cels.* iii. 16 περὶ τῆς ἐξῆς τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ ζωῆς προφητεύσαντος, *Clem. Hom.* xii. 14 τοῦ ζῆν τὸν βίον μεταλλάξαι. See also the note on Ign. *Rom.* 7.

4. τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους] Several modern commentators take the sentence as though καθίσετε were an indicative interrogative, and τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκ. equivalent to 'the heathen.' But apart from the awkwardness of the interrogative coming at the end of so long a sentence, this rendering is open to two serious objections: (1) the force of μὲν οὖν 'nay rather' is obscured, and equally so if we take μὲν merely to correspond to an unexpressed δέ, (2) τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους is a strong phrase to apply to the heathen without any further explanation. It appears best to render as the E. V., and to consider the clause to mean 'those possessed of high spiritual gifts are better employed on higher matters than on settling petty wrongs among you, and thus serving tables.' Compare

Origen *c. Cels.* iii. 29 *ad fin.* τίς γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσαι καὶ τοὺς χεῖρους τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ συγκρίσει βελτιόνων ἐλάττους πολλῶ κρείττους τυγχάνει τῶν ἐν τοῖς δήμοις ἐκκλησιῶν; and the Jewish dictum (*Sanhedr.* fo. 32 a) 'omnes idonei sunt ut iudicent lites pecuniarias.'

5. οὕτως] 'has it come to this that,' 'is it to such a degree true that?' The rendering of Meyer and others 'things being so' is less forcible.

ἐν] 'is found,' stronger than ἐστὶ: see on Gal. iii. 28. Οὐδεὶς σοφὸς ὄς, i.e. 'no one with sufficient wisdom to.'

ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ] 'to decide between his brothers.' The sentence is much abridged: ordinary Hebraic usage would require at least the insertion of ἀδελφοῦ καὶ after ἀνὰ μέσον. The word τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ conveys a reproach: 'must his brothers go before strangers?' This reproach is driven home in the next verse: 'not only this, but brother goes to law with brother.' Thus the very idea of brotherhood is outraged and a scandal caused in the sight of unbelievers.

7. ἤδη] 'to begin with,' i.e. prior to the ulterior question of the fitness of Gentile courts. See Kühner II. p. 675, and comp. Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 1. 2 ἐγὼ μὲν ξύμπαντας ὑμᾶς ἤδη ἐπαινώ.

μὲν] to be separated from οὖν. It suggests a suppressed clause with δέ, which would have run somewhat in this vein, 'but ye aggravate matters by going before the heathen.'

ὅλως] 'altogether,' i.e. 'before whomsoever they are tried'; or perhaps 'under any circumstances,' i.e. 'whatever the decision may be.'

ἤττημα ὑμῖν ἐστίν] 'it is a loss to you, a defeat.' 'You trust to overreach, to gain a victory: it is really a loss, a defeat, before the trial even comes on.' In Is. xxxi. 8 the word ἤττημα is equivalent to 'clades': in Rom. xi. 12 it is opposed to πλοῦτος: thus the two ideas given above can be predicted of it.

μεθ' ἑαυτῶν] 'with yourselves.' The Apostle does not say μετ' ἀλλήλων, for though the pronouns are often interchanged, the reciprocal ἑαυτῶν differs from the reciprocal ἀλλήλων in emphasizing the idea of corporate unity. See the passage from Xen. *Mem.* (iii. 5. 16) quoted on Col. iii. 13. Ἀλλήλων here would bring out the idea of diversity of interest, ἑαυτῶν emphasizes that of identity of interest: 'you are tearing yourselves to pieces.'

8. ὑμεῖς] Emphatic: 'you, Christians though you are.'

9. Θεοῦ βασιλείαν] The order, though unusual, is right here and adds to the force of the passage. 'God is essentially just: unjust men may inherit the kingdom of this world, but God's kingdom they cannot inherit.' A similar transposition for the sake of emphasis occurs in Gal. ii. 6 πρόσωπον Θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει.

Their spirit, whether of sensuality or strife, is inconsistent with heirship in the kingdom of heaven (vi. 10, 11).

11. ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε] 'but ye washed yourselves': a reference to baptism. They were voluntary, conscious, agents: comp. Acts xxii. 16 ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου, where St Paul is narrating the circumstances of his own conversion.

ἡγιασθητε] 'ye were consecrated.' The word is not to be taken in the technical theological sense of sanctification; but in that of e.g. 1 Cor. vii. 14 ἡγιασται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναίκί, comp. i. 2. This appears from the order of the words.

ἐδικαιώθητε] 'ye were justified,' i.e. by incorporation into Christ. The verb is used in Rom. vi. 7 also in connexion with the initial entrance into the Church by baptism. We have put ourselves in a new position: we are justified not simply by imputation, but in virtue of our incorporation into Christ.

ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, ἐν τῷ πνεύματι] There is a reference here to the external and to the internal essentials of baptism. Comp. Acts x. 48, xix. 5, 1 Cor. i. 13.

(c) *The distinction between license and liberty applied to sins of the flesh (vi. 12—20).*

12. The new subject arises out of the preceding. Certain members of the Corinthian Church defend their moral profligacy on the ground of Christian liberty. Such a contention seems to us extraordinary; but the glaring immorality of Corinth, where sensuality was elevated into a *cultus*, may partly account for it. It was thus difficult for converts to realize their true position, and they ran into the danger of extending the Pauline doctrine of ἀδιάφορα so as to cover these vital questions. The case of incest mentioned above obviously did not stand by itself (see 2 Cor. xii. 21): the sin of sensuality was the scourge of the Corinthian Church. In his reply the Apostle opposes the true principle of liberty to the false, the Christian to the heathen.

πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν] This is the principle pleaded by his opponents. The Apostle admits the principle, but qualifies it by the words ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα συμφέρει. The opponents then return to the charge; and again the Apostle replies ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγὼ κ.τ.λ. This ἐγὼ points to a different person as being supposed to assert the principle. St Paul has an imaginary opponent before him. Not that St Paul denies the principle πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν: he himself asserts it quite as strongly. But the πάντα, he says, are πάντα ἀδιάφορα, and he disputes the application to sins of the flesh by examining this qualifying word.

What then are ἀδιάφορα? Two principles, he contends, are to be observed with regard to them: (1) scandal to others is to be avoided, (2) self-discipline is to be maintained. These are the main, though not the

sole, considerations in the two replies; (1) *οὐ πάντα συμφέρει*, i.e. expedient especially with regard to their effect on others, (2) *οὐκ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπό τιμος*, i.e. I shall not allow myself to be tyrannised over by any habit. This second idea therefore is the effect produced on one's own moral character by the weakening of self-discipline. In x. 23 the same maxim is urged in the same form: but there both *συμφέρει* and *οικοδομεῖ* refer to the effect produced on others, as the context seems to show (he is speaking of *εἰδωλόθυτα*); here the words are chosen so as to balance one aspect of the question with the other. Similarly, when the case of *εἰδωλόθυτα* is discussed at length (viii. 1—13), neither side is neglected: (1) *οὐ συμφέρει* (viii. 9—13), (2) *οὐκ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι* (viii. 1—8).

ἐξουσιασθήσομαι.] The active *ἐξουσιάζω* occurs in Luke xxii. 25 with a genitive, the active in LXX. (Neh. ix. 37, Eccles. ix. 17, x. 4). The present however is the only place where the passive appears, and in fact the use must be regarded as a slight straining of the Greek language. As a general rule we only find the passive of verbs which in the active take an accusative after them; but this rule has numerous exceptions in later Greek: e.g. *διακονεῖσθαι* (Matt. xx. 28), *δογματίζεσθαι* (Col. ii. 20). The subtle paronomasia of *ἔξεστι*, *ἐξουσιασθήσομαι* should be noticed: 'All are within my power; but I will not put myself under the power of any one of all things.'

13. These half-converted Gentiles mixed up questions which were wholly different in kind, and classed them in the same category; viz. meats and drinks on the one hand, and sins of sensuality on the other. We have traces of this gross moral confusion in the circumstances which dictated the Apostolic Letter (Acts xv. 23—29), where things wholly diverse are combined, as directions about meats to be avoided and a prohibition of fornication. It was not that the Apostle regarded these as the same in kind, but that the Gentiles, for whom the rules were framed, did so. St Paul here carefully separates the two classes. The cases are quite different, he says. *First*, as regards meats, there is a mutual adaptation, *βρώματα* and *κοιλία*, each made for the other and both alike perishable. *Secondly*, as regards fornication, we have on the contrary, the body not made for fornication but for the Lord: the body, again, not perishable but with an existence after death.

βρώματα.] This may have here a threefold application. (1) To *εἰδωλόθυτα* (chs. viii. ix.). (2) To the Mosaic distinction of meats. These had been abrogated for the Christian and he enjoyed liberty. (3) To certain ascetic prohibitions which appeared early in the Church, such as drinking no wine and eating no flesh (Col. ii. 16, 21 with the notes and *Colossians*, pp. 86 sq., 104 sq.). We have other traces of the same ascetic tendency at this time in Rom. xiv. 2 *λάχαρα ἐσθίει*, and in ver. 21 of that chapter the Apostle deals with it on the principle laid down in this Epistle. Which thought then was uppermost in St Paul's mind here? The large space which the *εἰδωλόθυτα* occupy in

the latter part of the Epistle points more especially to these, and the repetition of the same maxim (x. 23) in connexion with meats sacrificed to idols confirms this view. But there is no reason to suppose that he is alluding to them solely. There was certainly an appreciable section of Judaizers in the Corinthian Church, and possibly there were ascetic Essene tendencies also. To all these alike the maxim would apply.

καὶ ταύτην καὶ ταῦτα] The same argument is used in Col. ii. 20—22.

τὸ δὲ σῶμα κ.τ.λ.] The case, argues the Apostle, is different here. It is the body and the Lord which stand to each other in the same relation as the βρώματα and κοιλία. They are each for the other.

The argument depends upon the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and would be discussed more appropriately in connexion with ch. xv. Two remarks will suffice here. *First*, the idea of the resurrection of the body is in reality not a philosophical difficulty but a philosophical necessity to us. As far as we know of man, the union of the soul of man with an external framework is essential. We cannot conceive of man as not working through some such instrument. Hence the Christian doctrine commends itself to true philosophy. But, *secondly*, we must not suppose that the resurrection-body is like our present body. St Paul guards against this confusion (1 Cor. xv. 35 sq.); but it does add to the difficulty of most people that they cannot dissociate the idea of a body from the idea of flesh and blood. The resurrection-body need not have any particle the same as the present body. All we can say about it is that it must be a body which, if not imperishable, is at all events capable of constant renewal. Of its form, structure, size etc. we cannot form any conception. But we may affirm that it must be an external instrument through which the man acts, an instrument which has its position in space. Many of our difficulties arise from forgetting that St Paul carefully guards against any supposition that it resembles our material body. The κοιλία, with its eating and drinking, with its gratification of the senses, is perishable: the σῶμα will live on always.

The moral import of this doctrine of the resurrection of the body is sufficiently obvious. It was the fashion of the Platonists and Stoics to speak contemptuously of the body, but in Christian theology the body is glorified because destined to be conformed to Christ's glorified body (Phil. iii. 21). This moral aspect has had great influence in banishing such sins as the Apostle is contemplating here.

It is noticeable that these three verses (12—14) contain the germ of very much which follows in the Epistle: (1) the great principle which is to guide the Christian conduct, (2) the question of εἰδωλόθυστα involved in βρώματα, (3) the conflict with sensual indulgences, (4) the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead.

τῷ Κυρίῳ] The Apostle does not argue this point. It is an axiom

which has its roots in the Christian consciousness. It is involved in the very profession of a Christian.

14. *καὶ τὸν Κύριον...καὶ ἡμᾶς*] corresponding to the *καὶ ταύτην καὶ ταῦτα* of the preceding verse. 'Ἡμᾶς 'and therefore our bodies,' for the body is a part of the man.

ἐξεγερεῖ] The manuscripts present some interesting variants: (1) *ἐξεγερεῖ* NCD³EKL f vulg. (but see below), Pesh. Harcl. Memph. Arm. Æth., Iren. (transl.), Tert. Archel. Method. Athan. etc., (2) *ἐξγειρεῖ* AD*PQ 37, 93 (but P 37, 93 *ἐξεγειρεῖ*) d e suscitavit. (3) *ἐξήγειρεν* B 67 *am. Juld. harl.* suscitavit (but the confusion with suscitabit was easy). The choice must lie between the aorist and the future. If we prefer the former, we may compare Eph. ii. 6, Col. ii. 12, 13. This idea however, though strictly Pauline, is not the idea wanted here: for it is not the past resurrection of the spirit, but the future resurrection of the body, on which the argument turns, in accordance with other passages (as ch. xv. throughout, 2 Cor. iv. 14, Rom. viii. 11, 1 Thess. iv. 14). Still *ἐξήγειρεν* is not impossible in this connexion. The past spiritual resurrection might be regarded here as elsewhere, e.g. Rom. vi. 5, viii. 11, as an earnest and an initiation of the future bodily resurrection. But on the whole *ἐξεγερεῖ* is the more likely reading and has the best documentary support.

αὐτοῦ] The pronoun probably refers to Christ: comp. 1 Thess. iv. 14 *διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (in 2 Cor. iv. 14 the right reading is *συν Ἰησοῦ*). We have both *δύναμις Θεοῦ* frequently, and *δύναμις Χριστοῦ* (e.g. 2 Cor. xii. 9). The use of *διὰ* here rather points to the mediation of Christ in our resurrection, but it cannot be considered as in any way decisive.

15. *μέλη Χριστοῦ*] The earliest application of this metaphor which plays so important a part in this and later Epistles.

ἄρας] Not as the A. V. 'take' (which would be *λαβών*), but 'take away.' It is robbing Christ of what is His own. *Ἀίρειν* 'tollere' is (1) either 'to take up,' e.g. Mark ii. 9 *ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου*, Luke ix. 23 *ἄράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ*, John xi. 40 *ἦραν οὖν τὸν λίθον*: or (2) 'to take away,' e.g. Luke vi. 29 *αἴροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον*, xi. 52 *ἦρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως*; but never simply 'to take.'

μὴ γένοιτο] On this expression see Gal. ii. 17, vi. 14. Like *οὐκ οἶδατε* (of this and the following verse) it is confined to this chronological group of St Paul's Epistles, where it occurs thirteen times; but it is found also in Luke xx. 16.

16. *τῇ πόρῃ*] The article marks the fact that she is considered no longer as an individual, but as the representative of a class. Compare John x. 12 *ὁ μισθωτός*, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 7 *ὁ ἐπίσκοπος* etc.

ἔσονται γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] Taken from Gen. ii. 24. Several points require notice here. (1) As to the text. St Paul follows the LXX., for the Hebrew text has not the words *οἱ δύο* nor have the older Targums. The additional phrase however appears, not only in the LXX., but also in the Samaritan

Pentateuch, the Targum of Jonathan, the Peshito, in Philo (*Leg. Allegor.* § 14, I. p. 75 ed. Mangey, *de Gigant.* § 15, I. p. 272, *Lib. 1 in Genes.* § 29, 22 ed. Aucher), and invariably in the N. T. quotations (Matt. xix. 5, Mark x. 8, Eph. v. 31), and perhaps in some Rabbinical quotations also (e.g. possibly *Beresh. Rab.* 18). Still no such variant is at present known to exist in any Hebrew manuscript (see De Rossi *Var. Lect. Vet. Test.* I. p. 4). But from this great number of independent authorities which contain the words we are disposed to think that they had a place at some time in the Hebrew text. (2) As to the interpretation. It is impossible to weaken the meaning of *ἔσονται εἰς* here so as to make it imply less than the Hebrew idiom *ל ייח* 'they shall become': see esp. Matt. xix. 5, 6 *ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν*, where our Lord's comment is explicit *ὅστε οὐκέτι εἰσὺν δύο ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία*. (3) As to the application. In Genesis l.c. the words are used of man and wife, the legitimate connexion of male and female. But, so far as regards the question at issue, there is no difference between the two cases. What applies to the one applies to the other also, for as Athanasius says *ἐν γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο κάκεινο τῇ φύσει τοῦ πράγματος*. (4) Lastly, as to the authority assigned to the passage. What are we to understand by *φησὶν*? Is *ὁ Θεὸς* to be supplied or *ἡ γραφή*? To this question it is safest to reply that we cannot decide. The fact is that, like *λέγει*, *φησὶν* when introducing a quotation seems to be used impersonally. This usage is common in Biblical Greek (*λέγει* Rom. xv. 10, Gal. iii. 16, Eph. iv. 8, v. 14: *φησὶν* Heb. viii. 5, 2 Cor. x. 10 v. l.), more common in classical Greek. Alford, after Meyer, objects to rendering *φησὶν* impersonal here, as contrary to St Paul's usage. But the only other occurrence of the phrase in St Paul is 2 Cor. x. 10, where he is not introducing scripture, but the objections of human critics and of more than one critic. If then *φησὶν* be read there at all, it must be impersonal. The Apostle's analogous use of *λέγει* points to the same conclusion. In Eph. v. 14 it introduces a quotation which is certainly not in scripture, and apparently belonged to an early Christian hymn. We gather therefore that St Paul's usage does not suggest any restriction here to *ὁ Θεὸς* or *ἡ γραφή*. But we cannot doubt from the context that the quotation is meant to be authoritative. In the original the words are Adam's; but Adam is here the mouthpiece of God. Compare Gal. iv. 30 where Sarah's words are adopted in the same way, and the quotation from Job v. 13 given above (ch. iii. 19).

17. *ἐν πνεύμα*] The union is an inner spiritual union (Eph. iv. 4). The converse truth appears in Eph. v. 30.

18. *πᾶν ἁμάρτημα*] i.e. 'every other sin.' Even drunkenness and gluttony are in a certain sense *ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος*.

εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα] which is unnatural. See Eph. v. 29.

19. *ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε*] Of the ten occasions on which this expression is found in this Epistle, six occur in this chapter. The others are iii. 16, v. 6, ix. 13, 24. It is used only twice elsewhere by St Paul

(Rom. vi. 16, xi. 2) and then in an Epistle of this group: but it appears in James iv. 4.

The same truth is enunciated in iii. 16 in almost the same words: see the note there. The difference in application is mainly twofold: *first*, here the expression τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν means 'the body of each one of you' individually, while in iii. 16 the whole Christian brotherhood is regarded collectively as the shrine; *secondly*, there the sins attacked are hatred, strife and vainglory, here sensuality.

20. ἡγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς] 'for ye were bought with a price.' The aorist shows that the ransom was paid once for all: compare vii. 23, where the metaphor is developed. In the ordinary form of the metaphor, Christ's blood is a λύτρον (Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45) or ἀντιλύτρον (1 Tim. ii. 6); and the process of redemption, ἀπολύτρωσις (Rom. iii. 24, Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15), or simply λύτρωσις (Heb. ix. 12). It is thus a ransom from slavery, from captivity, the purchase-money of our freedom. Here on the other hand it is spoken of as τιμή, that is to say, a transference to another master, the purchase by which a new owner acquires possession of us, by which we become his slaves. In Rom. vi. 18, 22 the two ideas are combined, ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ...ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ.

δῆ] The word is hortatory, 'now,' 'verily,' 'surely'; not 'therefore' as the A. V. renders it, which would be οὖν in N. T. language. For this use of δῆ compare Luke ii. 15 διέλθωμεν δῆ, Acts xiii. 2 ἀφορίσατε δῆ μοι, xv. 36 ἐπιστρέψαντες δῆ κατηγοροίμεν.

ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν] So the Apostle's genuine words end, as his argument requires. The addition of the T. R. καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ὑμῶν ἅτινά ἐστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ is condemned by the vast preponderance of ancient authority. But how came it to be added? I venture to think from some ancient liturgical use of the passage, thus: V. δοξάσατε δῆ τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν. R. καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ὑμῶν ἅτινά ἐστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. The response would then be incorporated in the text by scribes who remembered the versicle. The influence of liturgical forms on the reading of the N. T. appears in the doxology added to the Lord's Prayer in Matt. vi. 13, and the baptismal formula in Acts viii. 37. The early and curious Latin reading 'glorificate et portate' (or 'tollite') found in g, in Tertullian, Cyprian, Lucifer and the Vulgate, may perhaps be traced to a similar source, or may have arisen from a reading ἄραγε (comp. Acts xvii. 27, Matt. vii. 20, xvii. 26) which was confused with ἄρατε: see Reiche *Comm. Crit.* i. p. 165, and the reading of Methodius, ἄρα γε δοξάσατε (δῆ omitted), which goes far to justify this suggestion. Chrysostom (*in 1 Cor. hom.* xviii. § 2, p. 153 E) reads δοξάσατε δῆ ἄρατε τὸν Θεόν, if his text is to be trusted (Saville read ἄρα τε); but lower down (*hom.* xxvi. § 1, p. 227 D) δοξάσατε δῆ ἄρα τὸν Θεόν, which probably represents more nearly his true text in both passages.

CHAPTER VII.

3. MARRIAGE, vii. 1—40.

- (a) *To marry or not to marry.* (b) *Duties of those already married.*
(c) *Advice to the unmarried, the widows, the separated* (vii. 1—11).

1. [Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε] Here we have the first reference to the letter written by the Corinthians to St Paul. This letter must obviously have reached him later than the date of the Apostle's letter to the Corinthians to which he alludes in v. 9: otherwise it would have received an answer in that letter. We may form a fairly complete idea of the contents of this letter of the Corinthians. It raised questions relating to marriage under various circumstances (see vii. 1); it contained a reference to *εἰδωλόθυτα*, for we may infer from the way in which that topic is introduced that they had consulted St Paul about it (comp. viii. 1 *περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων* with vii. 25 *περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων*: it is as though the Apostle were taking in detail the heads of their letter); it consulted him as to the conduct of women in church (xi. 2 shows that the connecting link is an allusion to something which the Corinthians had related); it raised the question of spiritual gifts. This also may be inferred from the form of the introduction of this topic in xii. 1 (*περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν*). We may suppose that the letter was brought by Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus, who by their presence 'supplemented the deficiency' of the Church (xvi. 17 *τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑστέρημα οὗτοι ἀνεπλήρωσαν*), that is, explained more fully the condition of things by word of mouth.

As I have already said (see on v. 9), there is extant in Armenian a spurious correspondence consisting of an epistle from the Corinthians to St Paul and of an epistle from St Paul to the Corinthians. These are included in the canon of the Armenian Church, and the translations which we have are made from the Armenian. They are given in Stanley's *Corinthians* (ed. 4) p. 593 sq. in the English translation made in 1817 from the Armenian by Lord Byron assisted by Aucher. See also Meyer, p. 6 and Fabricius *Cod. Apocr. N. T.* p. 918 sq. It is remarkable that

though this correspondence consists of two letters, and though St Paul mentions just two such letters, yet there is no analogy between the two sets of letters. There is no reason at all for believing that the forger intended to supply the lack; or at least, if his work was suggested by the notices in 1 Corinthians, he has certainly performed it in a most slovenly way.

Let us first take the spurious letter addressed by the Corinthians to St Paul. It begins in the name of Stephanus and the elders with him, no doubt intended to represent Stephanus and his companions (1 Cor. xvi. 17). They write to consult St Paul about certain heretics who are troubling the Church. Of these Simon (probably Magus) and Cleophas are mentioned by name. The heresies are described and St Paul's advice asked. The Apostle is supposed to receive the letter at Philippi and to be a prisoner at the time. Thus the topics have nothing in common with the topics of the real letter of the Corinthians, and the circumstances are different, for the real letter must have been received by the Apostle at Ephesus.

The so-called letter from St Paul to the Corinthians exhibits just the same divergencies from the real facts of the case. The one topic which we know for certain that St Paul's letter must have contained is the direction quoted in 1 Cor. v. 9 *μη συναναμιγνυσθαι πόρνοις*. There is however no reference whatever to this subject. The spurious letter of St Paul is an answer to the spurious letter to St Paul. The writer meets the case of the heresies by a declaration of the true doctrine of the Resurrection, and concludes with a warning against false teachers. Thus not only are the topics quite dissimilar from what we might have expected, but the order of the letters is reversed. The lost letter of the Corinthians was later in time than the lost letter of St Paul, whereas in the forged correspondence the letter of the Corinthians comes first in chronological order.

Yet there is no flagrant anachronism in the Epistles. The heresies might very well be those of the end of the first or the beginning of the second century. In *Ep. Paul. ad Cor.* 30 'but these cursed men hold the doctrine of the serpent,' there is probably an allusion to the Ophites; but I have given elsewhere reasons for supposing that this form of heresy was closely connected with that combated by St Paul in the Pastoral Epistles, and if so it must have been widely prevalent in the latter half of the first century. See the excursus in *Biblical Essays* (p. 411 sq.), where this question is fully discussed. This spurious correspondence then was an early forgery probably of the second century, but a very obvious forgery. Its genuineness however is maintained by Rinck (*das Sendschr. d. Kor. an d. Apost. Paul.* Heidelb. 1823) who is answered by Ullmann in the *Heidelb. Jahrb.* 1823.

καλόν] 'good,' 'right,' comp. ver. 26; not 'convenient.' There is no qualification in the word itself; the qualifications are added afterwards in

the context. They are twofold. (1) With what limitations is celibacy good? These limitations are given in verses 2 and 9. Thus it is not good in all cases. (2) For what reasons is it good? These appear in vv. 26, 32 sq. Celibacy therefore is only so far better than marriage in proportion as it fulfils these conditions. It may not however fulfil them in the case of particular men; and so with them it is not better than marriage, but the reverse. Further, the passage must not be taken alone, but in connexion with what the Apostle says elsewhere, Eph. v. 22—33, where he exalts marriage as a type of the union of Christ with the Church. In Heb. xiii. 4 *τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν πᾶσιν κ.τ.λ.* the first clause is an imperative 'let marriage be respected among all,' as appears from the true reading of the next sentence *πόρνους γάρ*; it can therefore only be adduced as an argument here by a misinterpretation. In the passage before us *καλὸν* is not employed for *καλὸν μὲν*: the statement is made absolutely and the limitation *διὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.* comes in as an after consideration.

2. *τὰς πορνείας*] The phrase hints at the profligacy of all kinds which prevailed in the dissolute city (2 Cor. xii. 21).

ἕκαστος, ἐκάστη] An incidental prohibition of polygamy. Such a prohibition was by no means unnecessary at this time, when polygamy was recklessly encouraged by the Jewish rabbis: see Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 134 and the note on 1 Tim. iii. 2 *μῖα γυναικὸς ἄνδρα*. The variation of the form *τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα, τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα* is noticeable, the husband being, as it were, considered the lord of the wife. If this passage stood alone, it would be unsafe to build upon it; but this difference of expression pervades the whole of the Epistles; e.g. Eph. v. 28, *τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυν.*, 31 *τὴν γυν. αὐτοῦ*, 33 *τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυν.*, as contrasted with Eph. v. 22, Tit. ii. 5, 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5 *τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν*, 1 Cor. xiv. 35 *τοὺς ἰδίους ἄνδρας*.

3. *τὴν ὀφειλὴν*] Not a classical word in any sense: for though stated in Etym. Magn. to be used in Xenophon *περὶ πόρων*, it does not occur in the present text of the treatise: see Steph. *Thes.* s.v. It is found in Matt. xviii. 32, Rom. xiii. 7.

5. *εἰ μήτι ἂν*] If *ἂν* is to be retained here, we must supply *γένηται* 'it should take place,' see Winer § xlii. p. 380. For *ἂν* for *ἐὰν* see Winer § xli. p. 364, who quotes John xiii. 20, xvi. 23, xx. 23. The use is classical also, e.g. Eur. *Alc.* 181 *σώφρων μὲν οὐκ ἂν μᾶλλον, εὐτυχὴς δ' ἴσως*, quoted by Alford.

σχολάσητέ] 'may devote yourselves to,' literally, 'may have leisure for.' Thus the secondary meaning has eclipsed the primary, and *σχολή* which originally meant 'leisure' becomes 'work,' 'school' (as in Acts xix. 9). *Σχολάζειν* takes the dative (1) of the subject studied, *φιλοσοφία, στρατεία, μαθήμασιν, τοῖς φίλοις, τῇ τοῦ λόγου διακονίᾳ* (Chrysost. *de sacrīs*); or (2) of the person teaching, *Σωκράτει, Πλάτωνι*, etc. It is used absolutely in Matt. xii. 44, Luke xi. 25 in its primary sense.

τῇ προσευχῇ] The words *τῇ νηστείᾳ καί*, which precede *τῇ προσευχῇ* in the T. R., are to be omitted by the vast preponderance of ancient

authorities. There are three other passages where similar insertions are made, supported by varying degrees of evidence. In the case of Matt. xvii. 21 the whole verse should be omitted; it is wanting in $\aleph B$, some old Latin authorities (e ff), the Curetonian and Jerusalem Syriac, the Thebaic, in manuscripts of the Memphitic, and in the Eusebian Canons, a combination of authorities which shows decisively that the passage has been transferred from Mark ix. 29. In Acts x. 30 the words *νηστεύων καὶ* are omitted in $\aleph BAC$ etc., the Vulgate, Memphitic, Armenian, etc., and where they occur are found in different positions, e.g. in D^* , the oldest manuscript which contains them, *νηστεύων τὴν ἐνάτην τε καὶ προσ.* Here again there can be not a shadow of a doubt that they are an insertion. In Mark ix. 29 the case is somewhat different. The words *καὶ νηστεία* are omitted in $\aleph Bk$, a small but very formidable combination; and here again authorities which contain them present them in different positions as *ἐν νηστεία καὶ προσευχῇ* (Pesh. Arm. Æthiop.). Hence, if retained, the phrase should certainly be bracketed as doubtful.

The four passages represent what may be called an ascetic addition of later scribes. Yet too much must not be made of this fact. Though the tendency of a later age was to exalt fasting to a level with prayer, yet the highest authorities for the practice itself still remain in the example (Matt. iv. 2) and directions of our Lord (Matt. vi. 16—18), and in the custom of the Apostles (Acts xiii. 2, 3, xiv. 23) in pursuance of our Lord's prophecy (Matt. ix. 15, Mark ii. 20, Luke v. 35). We must not however adduce in this connexion such passages as 2 Cor. vi. 5, xi. 27, because the context shows that in both cases *ἐν νηστείαῖς* denotes involuntary fastings, like *νήστεις* in Matt. xv. 32, Mark viii. 3. Thus the practice of fasting has abundant sanction in the New Testament; but it holds a subordinate place to prayer, with only a secondary value in so far as it promotes self-discipline or conduces to spiritual growth.

ἀκρασίαν] We must carefully distinguish two words spelt in the same way, (1) *ἀκρασία*, a rare word, derived from *κεράννυμι* and akin to *ἄκρατος* 'unmixed,' 'untempered,' used (Theophr. *C. P.* iii. 2. 5) of the climate or sky as opposed to *εὐκρασία* and equivalent to the Latin 'intemperies'; and (2) *ἀκράσια*, which we have here and in Matt. xxiii. 25, the character of the *ἀκρατής* (from *κρατεῖν*), opposed to *ἐγκράτεια*, and expressed in Latin by 'impotentia,' 'the absence of self-restraint.' That this is the word meant here is evident from the juxtaposition of *ἐγκρατεύουσαι* (ver. 9). It is common in classical Greek (see Steph. *Thes.* s.v., Wetstein *ad loc.*, Lobeck *Phryg.* p. 524), and found in passages which set at rest the question of its derivation, e.g. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 5. 7 *τῷ ἀκρατεῖ...αὐτὰ γὰρ δήπου τὰ ἐναντία σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀκρασίας ἔργα ἐστί*, Arist. *Eth. Nic.* vii. 1 *passim* where it is contrasted again and again with *ἐγκράτεια* and associated with *ἀκρατής* and *ἀκρατεύεσθαι*. It is apparently the usual form in Aristotle, though *ἀκράτεια* appears also (*de virt. et vit.* p. 1250 ll. 1, 22 ed. Bekker). It is found

likewise in Plutarch (*Mor.* p. 446 B) associated with ἀκρατής. A similar form is γυναικοκρασία which occurs side by side with γυναικοκρατία. Owing to their similarity of sound and meaning ἀκρασία and ἀκράσια are frequently confused: see Steph. *Thes.* s.v.

6. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω] To what does the Apostle refer? Not to the previous verse only, or to part of it; but to the general terms of the preceding paragraph (*vv.* 2, 3, 4, 5), especially to verse 2 as involving the rest, to the recommendation, that is to say, of the marriage state with all its obligations.

κατὰ συγγνώμην οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν] 'by way of concession, not by way of command.' It is permissive, not imperative. 'I do not give this as a binding rule (e.g. γυναῖκα ἐχέτω). I state it as what is allowable. If I had my way, I should desire all men to live a celibate life in continence like myself.'

The rendering of the A. V. 'by permission, not by commandment' seems to imply 'though I have no command from God, yet I am permitted by God to speak this'; accordingly ver. 25 ἐπιταγὴν Κυρίου οὐκ ἔχω γνώμην δὲ δίδωμι is frequently referred to in the margin of English bibles to illustrate this verse. It is conceivable that the translators of the Authorised Version intended this to be the meaning, though the passage is otherwise and, as I think, correctly explained in a note in the Geneva Version. This interpretation however in itself is hardly possible, much less probable. True, it has in its favour ver. 25 quoted above, also κατ' ἐπιταγὴν used elsewhere (Rom. xvi. 26, 1 Tim. i. 1, Tit. i. 3) of the divine commands. But neither the verb συγγνώσκω nor the substantive συγγνώμη is used of God in either the LXX. or the N. T., nor would it be an appropriate word to employ, for it contains by implication the notion of fellow-feeling and the like. Nor does this meaning suit what follows θέλω δὲ κ.τ.λ. On these grounds therefore it is better to explain the passage in the sense given above.

7. θέλω δὲ] 'on the contrary I desire.' Δὲ is undoubtedly the correct reading, γὰρ being a correction for the purpose of simplification. While γὰρ would connect this verse with the whole preceding sentence, δὲ attaches it more particularly with the last clause οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν.

ὡς καὶ ἑμαυτὸν] 'as myself': comp. ver. 9 ὡς ἐγώ. The obvious interpretation of this and similar passages is that St Paul was unmarried. On the other hand Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 6, p. 535 ed. Potter) states the opposite; but then he gives his reasons. He is arguing against the Enkratites and referring to Phil. iv. 3 says ἐν τινὶ ἐπιστολῇ τὴν αὐτοῦ προσαγορεύει σύνζυγον: he then goes on to add that though the Apostle had a wife, he did not 'lead her about,' as he had a perfect right to do (1 Cor. ix. 5). It is clear therefore that Clement's view had no support from tradition, but was an inference from St Paul's own language. Tertullian (*ad Uxor.* ii. 1) and almost all the other fathers speak of St Paul as unmarried. Origen (on *Rom.* i. p. 461 ed. Delarue) characteristically

gives both explanations (Paulus ergo sicut quidam tradunt cum uxore vocatus est de qua dicit ad Philippenses, etc.) and follows his master Clement but with hesitation (si vero ut aliis videtur sine uxore etc.). To say nothing of the grammatical difficulty of the masculine form *γῆσοι σύνζυγε* being applied to a woman, the verse we are considering is fatal to that interpretation of the passage, and the contention of Clement and Origen therefore falls to the ground (see the note on Phil. 1c.). In these latter years of his life the Apostle certainly had not a wife living. There is however one argument which needs consideration in favour of his having been married earlier in life and being at this time a widower. It was a maxim of the rabbis, at all events of a later date, that no one could be a member of the Sanhedrin or sit in judgment on a capital offence, except one who was not only a married man but a father (*Sanh. fo. 36 b*); because such a one was more likely to take a merciful view of an offence. Now St Paul says (Acts xxvi. 10) expressly that he recorded his vote against those who were condemned to death on the charge of Christianity. Hence it is contended that at that time he must have been a married man. But this inference depends on two points both very precarious: (1) that *κατήνεγκα ψῆφον* is to be taken literally, (2) that the regulations laid down by the later Talmudists held good at the time of which we are speaking. Against this highly precarious hypothesis we may set two considerations, (a) that wife and children are never once hinted at, but everything points the opposite way: he goes about as one entirely free from such ties: (b) the whole passage before us implies that the Apostle lived a celibate life throughout, and lived it in continence.

χάρισμα] It was such, for it was an instrument for preaching the Gospel. Others might have other gifts, might serve God in other ways; but this which enabled him to keep himself free from all earthly ties was to the Apostle a special grace. Comp. xii. 4, Rom. xii. 6, 1 Pet. iv. 10, and for the wide use in St Paul the notes on i. 7 above and Rom. i. 11.

οὕτως, οὕτως] The maxim therefore is thrown into a general form. It is quite comprehensive: each man has his own qualifications for serving God and it is his business to realize them. On *οὕτως οὕτως* see Judg. xviii. 4, 2 Sam. xi. 25, xvii. 15, 2 Kings v. 4, references given in Meyer.

8. **τοῖς ἀγάμοις**] i.e. the unmarried of both sexes; not to be rendered 'widowers' as though corresponding to *ταῖς χήραις*.

9. **οὐκ ἐγκρατεύονται**] The negative belongs closely to the verb and the phrase is to be treated as one word; otherwise it would be *μή*. Grammarians tell us that *ἀκρατεύεσθαι* is a solecism, though used by many, as Menander (Lobeck *Phryn.* p. 442 *ἀκρατεύεσθαι ἀδοκίμῳ ὄντι οἷγε πολλοὶ χρῶνται τοῦτῳ τῷ ὀνόματι καὶ Μένανδρος Δέγε οὖν οὐκ ἐγκρατεύεσθαι*). *Ἀκρατεύεσθαι* however occurs several times in Aristotle (see index to the Nicomachean Ethics). On the other hand there is no such classical authority for *ἐγκρατεύεσθαι*. St Paul would doubtless have used

ἀκρατεύεσθαι, if it had served his purpose ; but it would have conveyed a darker shade of meaning than he intended. *Ἐγκρατεύεσθαι* occurs in Gen. xliii. 30, 1 Sam. xiii. 12.

10. οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ Κύριος] The common conception of this phrase is quite wrong. It is generally thought that the distinction on which St Paul insists is the distinction between Paul inspired and Paul speaking of himself, between an utterance *ex cathedrâ* and a private opinion. The real difference is between the words of Paul the inspired Apostle and the express command of Christ Himself. We are expressly told that our Lord did prohibit divorce (Matt. v. 32, xix. 9, Mark x. 9, 11, 12, Luke xvi. 18). The nearest approach to St Paul's language is Mark x. 9 ὁ οὖν ὁ Θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. In Matt. v. 32 an exception to the rule is allowed *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* ; but St Paul does not think it necessary to add this qualification, because it would be understood of itself. Indeed it is not found in the other Gospel passages, except possibly in Matt. xix. 9 where it occurs in the common text.

μὴ χωρισθῆναι, μὴ ἀφιέναι.] For this distinction see the quotation from Bengel given on ver. 13.

11. ἐὰν δὲ...καταλλαγῆτω] The sentence is parenthetical : a caution being introduced as an afterthought. Compare ver. 15 εἰ δὲ ὁ ἄπιστος χωρίζεται χωριζέσθω, and ver. 21 ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ δύνασται ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι μᾶλλον χρῆσαι, where a great deal depends on the interpretation of this one clause : see the note there.

(d) *On the marriage relations of the believer wedded with the unbeliever, and on change of condition generally* (vii. 12—24).

12. τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς] Hitherto St Paul had spoken solely to Christians (in *vv.* 8, 9 to the unmarried, in *vv.* 10, 11 to the married). Now he turns to speak of mixed marriages between Christian and heathen. The use of *οἱ λοιποὶ* here of the Gentiles is akin to the use elsewhere in St Paul (Eph. ii. 3, 1 Thess. iv. 13, v. 6).

λέγω ἐγὼ] This is the right order of the two words ; it corresponds with what goes before, *παραγγέλλω οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ Κύριος* (ver. 10), and it is more emphatic in itself, comp. Gal. ii. 20.

αὐτῇ] is preferable to *αὐτῆ* here, because of *οὗτος* which succeeds in the next verse.

συνευδοκεῖ] The compounding preposition shows that the man's consent is assumed.

13. μὴ ἀφιένω] '*Separatur pars ignobilior, mulier ; dimittit nobilior, vir : inde conversa ratione etiam mulier fidelis dicitur. dimittere : et vir infidelis, separari,* *vv.* 13, 15.' Bengel on ver. 10.

τὸν ἄνδρα] This, the correct reading, is stronger than *αὐτόν*. 'Let her not dismiss him, for he still remains her husband.'

14. ἡγήσασται] Observe the large and liberal view which the Apostle here adopts. The lesser takes its character from the greater, not the

greater from the lesser. God does not reject the better because of its alliance with the worse, but accepts the worse on account of its alliance with the better. On this feature in St Paul's theology see the note on i. 2 κλητοῖς ἁγίοις.

ἐπεὶ ἄρα] i.e. 'since on the contrary supposition it follows that your children are unclean,' a thing not to be thought of. This argumentative ἐπεὶ 'since otherwise' (which can stand alone without ἄρα) is not uncommon in St Paul (xv. 29, Rom. iii. 6, xi. 6, 22) and elsewhere (Heb. ix. 26, x. 2), and is followed by the indicative.

νὺν δὲ ἁγιά ἐστων] 'but, as it is, they are holy.' St Paul regards this as an axiom. 'It is allowed on all sides that the children of these mixed marriages are holy.' The sense of the passage is clear enough, but to what objective fact does it correspond? Plainly the children of mixed marriages were regarded as in some sense Christian children. We cannot say more or less than this.

It has been affirmed that this passage tells against the supposition of Infant Baptism as a practice of the Early Church at this time. Thus Meyer says, 'weil darum die ἁγιότης der Christenkinder einen andern Grund gehabt habe.' But this is a mere *petitio principii*. How do we know that it was not the very token of their ἁγιότης that such children were baptized as Christians? This at all events was a definite overt act to which the Apostle might well make his appeal, as showing that they were regarded as holy. The passage is not to be pressed on either side. The Jews indeed had a maxim, that the child of a proselytess need not be baptized (*Jebamoth* f. 78, 'si gravida fit proselyta, non opus est ut baptizetur infans quando natus fuerit: baptismus enim matris ei cedit pro baptismo'). But this proves nothing, because it proves too much. If valid at all, it would be valid against ever baptizing one born of Christian parents. As a matter of fact, the baptism of the Christian corresponded not to the baptism of the proselyte, but to the circumcision of the Jew, which was required of all alike. Thus no inference can be drawn here against the practice of Infant Baptism. On the contrary the expression tells rather in its favour. Certainly it enunciates the principle which leads to infant baptism, viz. that the child of Christian parents shall be treated as a Christian.

15. εἰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] By parity of reasoning this includes by implication the unbelieving woman as well as the unbelieving man.

ἐν δὲ εἰρήνῃ κ.τ.λ.] 'but in peace hath God called us.' This is not to be connected with what immediately precedes, as though it meant, 'they are not bound to a compulsory connexion which would be fatal in their peace.' The words refer to the whole tenour of these directions, the first part of ver. 15 being a parenthetical limitation. What St Paul says is this: 'Do not let any jar or conflict in the family relations arise out of your Christianity. Live peaceably with the heathen husband or wife who wishes to live with you. If a discussion is urged on their part, do not

refuse it. The Christian is not so enslaved by such an alliance that he or she may not thus be set free. But let the liberation be the work of another. Do not foster dissensions, do not promote a separation. Do nothing to endanger peace: peace is the very atmosphere of your calling in Christ, the very air which you breathe as Christians.'

16. *τί γὰρ οἶδας κ.τ.λ.*] This passage again is often wrongly interpreted as though it meant, 'separate yourself, for you cannot be sure that by continuing the connexion you will convert the unbelieving husband (or wife).' Thus Stanley (p. 105) speaks of the injunction as 'a solemn warning against the gambling spirit which intrudes itself even into the most sacred matters,' and 'a remarkable proof of the Apostle's freedom from proselytism.' But surely the Apostle would not have admitted this interpretation of his words. For (1) such a motive—the conversion of the partner—was not likely to be urged by the Corinthian Christians for remaining in this state of enforced wedlock; nor (2) was the Apostle likely to give prominence to the uncertainty of the result as a reason for seeking freedom. What he is really advising is the sacrificing of much for the possible attainment of what is a great gain though an uncertain one. If we look at the sense we see that though the possibility of succeeding in the conversion would be a highly adequate reason for continuing the connexion, yet on the other hand the possibility of failure would be a highly inadequate reason for closing the connexion. The interpretation of the passage depends upon the meaning to be assigned to *εἰ* in the phrase *τί οἶδας, τίς οἶδεν* etc. As a matter of fact, whether we should have expected it beforehand or not, these expressions, so far from emphasizing a doubt, express a hope: e.g. 1 Sam. xii. 22 *τίς οἶδεν ἐλεήσει με Κύριος* implying that there is a reasonable chance (comp. Esther iv. 14, Jonah iii. 9, Joel ii. 14 the only passages in the LXX. under *οἶδα* which illustrate the meaning). We therefore conclude that the whole sentence expresses a hope, and that St Paul's meaning is that this saving of the husband (or wife) is worth any temporal inconvenience.

17. *εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ.*] A general maxim arising out of a special case, and illustrated below by the examples, *first*, of circumcision (*vv.* 18, 19), *secondly*, of slavery (*vv.* 20, 21). These illustrations are a digression which arises out of the general maxim. *Εἰ μὴ* never stands for *ἀλλά*; it is here as elsewhere in the sense of *πλὴν* 'only': see Rom. xiv. 14, Jelf G. G. § 860, Winer § liii. p. 566, and the notes on Gal. i. 7, 19.

ὡς μεμέρικεν ὁ Κύριος, ὡς κέκληκεν ὁ Θεός] Two variations from the reading of the T. R. are necessary. (1) The substantives should be interchanged in accordance with the vast majority of ancient authorities and St Paul's own usage. For in all cases (1 Thess. iv. 7, Rom. iv. 17, viii. 30, 2 Tim. i. 9) it is God Who calls; on the other hand to assign external positions in the Church falls naturally to Him Who is the Head of the Church and is elsewhere associated with the distribution of such gifts (xii. 5 *διαίρεσεις διακονῶν εἰσὶν καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος*, Eph. iv. 11).

(2) *Μεμέρικεν*, though only read by NB, is preferable to *ἐμέρισεν*; as balancing the perfect which follows, and as being in itself a rare form. The sense also is improved by the change of tense, 'has assigned his lot in life once for all.' The word here refers entirely to the external conditions of life: Ecclus. xlv. 20 ἀπαρχὰς πρωτογενημάτων ἐμέρισεν αὐτοῖς, 2 Macc. viii. 28.

18. *ἐπισπᾶσθω*] 'become as uncircumcised,' efface the signs of his Judaism. This was done literally by renegade Jews, e.g. in the time of Antiochus (1 Macc. i. 15), comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 5. 1. See Buxtorf, p. 1274 s.v. *גיטל*, Wetstein here and Schöttgen I. p. 1159 sq. Here however the term is used as the symbol of a much wider application, e.g. the observance of sabbaths, festivals, etc.

κέκληται] The change of tense from the aorist of the preceding clause may have been guided by the fact that as a rule the conversions of the Jews were earlier than the conversions of the Gentiles.

19. We have the same sentiment expressed in Gal. v. 6, vi. 15. On independent grounds we know that our Epistle was the earlier one, and this quite accords with the evidence of the three passages considered together. The passage before us gives the original form. The maxim is two-edged, and both edges are used here. On the other hand, in Galatians II. cc. it is applied only against the Gentiles who would become as Jews. Stanley rightly draws attention to the double assertion of the maxim in St Paul's own conduct: the circumcision of Timothy as a child of one Jewish parent (Acts xvi. 3), the non-circumcision of Titus as a Greek (Gal. ii. 3). In its wider application the maxim reconciles the Apostle's own conduct as a Jew among Jews (Acts xxi. 21 sq.) with his assertion of Gentile freedom (e.g. in the Epistle to the Galatians). It condemns those in our own time who insist on the absolute rejection of forms and those who maintain the absolute necessity of retaining them, as equally opposed to the liberty of the Gospel.

τήρησις ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ] In the corresponding passages the requisites are *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη* (Gal. v. 6) and *καυῆ κτίσις* (Gal. vi. 15): see the notes there. Those who would contrast the teaching of St Paul with that of St James, or who would exaggerate his doctrine of justification by faith, should reflect on this *τήρησις ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ*.

20. *ἐν τῇ κλήσει*] From this passage comes the common usage of the word 'calling' or 'vocation,' for our profession in life regarded as sanctified, as given to us by God. The sentiment which underlies this thought is essentially right, but as an interpretation of the Apostle's words here it is quite wrong. Here, as always in the N. T., *κλήσις* is the summons to the knowledge of God, to membership in the Church, to the kingdom of Christ. *Κλήσις* is a good classical word, meaning (1) a designation or appellation, (2) an invitation, e.g. to a supper, (3) a summons or citation to appear as a witness or advocate in court. These last two senses form a connecting link with the N. T. use of the expression.

The calling of Christians into the kingdom is represented under the image of an invitation to a feast (Matt. xxii. 3, 4, 8, 11: comp. the technical use of *καλεῖν* in Luke xiv. 7). But more than this, the language of Epictetus i. 29 § 46 *μάρτυς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κεκλημένος* and § 49 *ταῦτα μέλλεις μαρτυρεῖν καὶ καταισχύνεις τὴν κλήσιν ἣν κέκληκεν [ὁ Θεός]* reminds us forcibly of St Paul's language here (cf. Eph. iv. 1, 2 Tim. i. 9), which the Stoic philosopher seems elsewhere to have caught (see *Philippians*, p. 313 sq.), though here he has put another meaning into it. In the N. T. the substantive occurs chiefly, but not solely (see Heb. iii. 1, 2 Pet. i. 10) in St Paul's writings, and is applied both to the act and (as here) to the circumstances of calling. But the circumstances represent not the external condition to which God called us, but the external conditions in which God called us to a knowledge of Himself.

21. *ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ κ.τ.λ.*] 'but if it should be in thy power to become a free man, the rather avail thyself of the opportunity.' Two opposite interpretations have been put upon this passage: (1) 'even though it is in thy power to be set free, prefer to continue in slavery'; (2) 'if it should be in thy power etc., prefer this freedom to remaining in slavery.' In the first case the sentence (vv. 21, 22) is continuous; in the latter, the clause *ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ...μᾶλλον χρῆσαι* is parenthetical, 'in giving you this injunction I do not mean to prevent you from becoming free if opportunity offers.'

Of earlier commentators, Origen (in Cramer's *Catena*, p. 140) explains the slavery metaphorically of marriage and seems to take the phrase as recommending liberty. He mentions that *οἱ λοιποὶ ἐρμηνευταὶ* interpret the passage of subjection to the ordinances of the law. Of those who explain the sentence literally and naturally, Severianus (in Cramer) takes it to recommend liberty; Photius slavery, and so Theodoret with qualifications. Hilary (Ambrosiaster) is doubtful. Chrysostom mentions the interpretation which recommends liberty (*τινὲς τὸ μᾶλλον χρῆσαι περὶ ἐλευθερίας φασὶν εἰρησθαι*), but prefers the contrary view. Thus the tendency of patristic interpretation is on the side of a continuance in slavery; and this we should expect, for while slavery was an existing institution, there would be a temptation to explain the passage as recommending the *status quo*.

Turning now to the language, we may safely say that *εἰ καὶ* may bear both senses. It may mean 'although,' 'even though,' as in Phil. ii. 17 *ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι*, Col. ii. 5, Luke xi. 8 etc.; or it may mean 'if,' as in Luke xi. 18 *εἰ καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς...διεμερίσθη*: comp. *ἐὰν καὶ* (vii. 11, Gal. vi. 1). When however we come to consider the phrase *μᾶλλον χρῆσαι*, it is much more natural to supply *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ* out of the *ἐλεύθερος* of the immediate sentence, than *τῇ δουλείᾳ* out of the *δούλος* of a more distant clause. Again *χρῆσαι* in the sense of 'to avail oneself of an opportunity offered' is an idiomatic usage which occurs elsewhere in this Epistle, ix. 12 *ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐχρησάμεθα τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ταύτῃ*, 15 *οὐ κέχρημαι οὐδενὶ τούτων*, and is thus characteristic and forcible.

But the main argument in favour of the translation adopted in these notes is the extreme improbability that St Paul would have taken any other view. From the nature of the case the free man was in a much more advantageous position for doing God's work than a slave who was fettered at every turn. Again, the Apostle's own practice in his own case shows how strong was the sense of freedom which he carried with him. This he exhibits when he asserts more than once his rights as a Roman citizen (Acts xvi. 37, xxii. 25 sq.).

Thus we conclude that the passage is parenthetical, a qualification of the Apostle's general statement which precedes it, added lest he should be misunderstood. 'In saying this, I do not mean but that, if you have the opportunity of gaining your freedom, you should avail yourself of the more advantageous position in which you will then be placed.' Whatever the nature of the freedom may be, it is generally to be preferred to the slavery whatever it may be, if it come in a natural and lawful way. Compare the parentheses in *vv.* 11, 15. Thus the substantive to be supplied is τῆ ἐλευθερίᾳ.

22. ὁ γὰρ...δούλος] '*for he that is called in the Lord being a slave*'; comp. ver. 21. The expression ἐν Κυρίῳ καλεῖν, though unusual, occurs in 1 Pet. v. 10, but not in Eph. i. 11, where ἐκληρώθημεν is the correct reading.

ἀπελεύθερος] '*freedman*.' A double process is indicated here. Christ first buys us from our old master, sin, and then sets us free. For this enfranchisement see Rom. viii. 2, Gal. v. 1. But observe that a service is still due from the *libertus* to his *patronus*. This was the case in Roman Law (see Becker and Marquardt, v. p. 211), which required the freedman to take his patron's name, live in his patron's house, consult his patron's will etc. Compare the language of Ignatius (*Rom.* 4) ἐκεῖνοι ἐλεύθεροι, ἐγὼ δὲ μέχρι νῦν δούλος· ἀλλ' ἐὰν πάθω, ἀπελεύθερος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἀναστήσομαι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐλεύθερος. See the note on vi. 20 ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς above, where the double aspect of the Redemption, as an emancipation and as a transference of ownership, is drawn out. This second aspect is hinted at here in the word *Kyriou* representing the great Lord of all (see the note on iii. 5, above). But in effect freedom in Christ and slavery to Christ merely represent two sides of the same moral truth: for subjection to Christ is freedom from sin (Rom. vi. 18, 22).

23. τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε] See the note on vi. 20.

μὴ γίνεσθε] '*become not*': for it would be a change of state if they were to become slaves once more. Comp. Gal. iv. 31, v. 1.

δούλοι ἀνθρώπων] What is the reference here? There is nothing in the context which points to the meaning, and we have to look for the idea elsewhere in the Epistle. The allusion is probably to the insolent tyranny of their party-leaders (i. 12, iii. 4, 21); and if so, it can be well illustrated by 2 Cor. xi. 20 ἀνέχεσθε γὰρ εἴ τις ὑμᾶς καταδουλώ.

24. In this verse St Paul repeats again the general maxim formulated in ver. 17, emphasizing the saving clause, 'in the sight of God,' παρὰ Θεῶ.

(e) *On virgins specially* (vii. 25—38).

25. *περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων*] This commences a new subject and (from the way in which it is introduced) probably another of the topics of the Corinthian letter (see on vii. 1).

A preliminary question has to be settled. Does *παρθένοι* include both sexes? The use of the word in Rev. xiv. 4 is not decisive; for obviously the term there was not a recognised term: otherwise St John would not have said further *παρθένοι γὰρ εἰσω*—an addition which shows that he used the phrase *καταχρηστικῶς*. There is apparently no indication of this use until a much later period, unless *Pistis Sophia*, p. 146, be an example in Syriac (see Payne Smith, *Theo. Syr.* p. 624 sq.). But, it will be said, St Paul does immediately afterwards (*vv.* 26—28, 29—33) speak of both sexes. That is true; but the facts seem to be that the Corinthians consulted him about the special case of giving virgin daughters in marriage; whereupon St Paul generalised, first stating the guiding principle (*ver.* 27), then applying it to both sexes (*vv.* 28—35), and finally dealing with the special point which the Corinthians had put to him (*vv.* 36—38).

ἐπιταγὴν Κυρίου] i.e. an express command, whether a directly recorded saying of our Lord (as in *ver.* 10), or a direct intimation to the Apostle by revelation.

ἡλεημένος] Compare 1 Tim. i. 13, 16.

26. *τοῦτο καλὸν ὑπάρχειν*] '*this is good to begin with.*' It is thus the fundamental axiom, the starting-point, of the discussion that follows. *Καλὸν* is used in the same sense as in *ver.* 1, and the sentiment is nearly the same. *Ἀνθρώπων* here includes both sexes.

ἐνεστῶσαν] '*present,*' not '*imminent.*' On this word see on Gal. i. 4, where this passage is referred to.

ἀνάγκην] Persecution was impending. There were signs of a coming storm. The man, who kept himself free from the entanglement of earthly ties, would save himself from many a bitter conflict: he would not have to face the terrible alternative—the most terrible to sensitive minds—between duty to God and affection to wife and children. He was altogether more free to do and to suffer for Christ. A man who is a hero in himself becomes a coward when he thinks of his widowed wife and his orphaned children. The *ἀνάγκη*, of which the Apostle speaks, might or might not be the beginning of the *ἀνάγκη μεγάλη* (Luke xxi. 23).

ὅτι καλὸν κ.τ.λ.] Governed, like the preceding clause, by *νομίζω*, but a new construction.

οὕτως] '*just as he is,*' i.e. '*unmarried,*' for he is speaking of them. For *οὕτως* compare *ver.* 40, Rom. ix. 20, John iv. 6.

27. *ἀλυσαι*] '*art thou set free from a wife:*' not implying that the person addressed was ever married. It is complementary to *δέδεσσαι*

above. That this sense is legitimate appears from Xen. *Cyr.* i. 1. 4 (quoted by Meyer) *ἔτι καὶ νῦν αὐτόνομα εἶναι λέγεται καὶ λελύσθαι ἀπ' ἀλλήλων.*

28. **γαμήσης, γήμη]** If this distinction is intentional, it certainly is not the distinction of classical usage between *γαμείν* for the man and *γαμείσθαι* of the woman (Lobeck *Phryg.* p. 742, Porson on *Medea* l. 264, Pollux iii. 45); for here the aorist active is used of the woman also *ἐὰν γήμη ἢ παρθένος.* So too ver. 34 *ἡ γαμήσασα,* 1 Tim. v. 11 *γαμείν θέλουσιν (χῆραι),* 14 *βούλομαι νεωτέρας γαμείν.* In all these cases the verb is used absolutely, but in Mark x. 12 *ἐὰν αὐτὴ γαμήσῃ ἄλλον* (the right reading) it governs an accusative. On the other hand the classical distinction is preserved below in ver. 39 *ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἣ θέλει γαμηθῆναι.* There is a tendency in scribes to alter the voice in order to bring it into conformity with the classical idiom; see Mark l.c. and Ign. *Pol.* 5 where *πρέπει δὲ τοῖς γαμοῦσι καὶ ταῖς γαμούσαις* has been corrected by the interpolator into *πρέπει δὲ τοῖς γαμοῦσι καὶ ταῖς γαμουμέναις* (see the note there). **Ἐγημα* (from *γάμω*) is an older form than *ἐγάμησα* (from *γαμέω*), which however is found in Menander and Lucian; both occur elsewhere in the N. T., *ἔγημα* in Matt. xxii. 25, Luke xiv. 20, *ἐγάμησα* in Matt. xix. 9, Mark vi. 17, x. 11, and ver. 9 above. For the occurrence of an older and a later form side by side in the N. T., comp. *κερδήσω, κερδανῶ* (1 Cor. ix. 21, 22), *ἐλεῶντος, ἐλεεῖ* (Rom. ix. 16, 18), and see Lobeck *de orthograph.* *Graec. inconst.* (*Path.* II. 341 sq.).

ἡ παρθένος] taken as a typical case: comp. vi. 16 *τῇ πόρῃ.* But the article here is doubtful.

ἐγὼ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] i.e. 'my object in giving this advice is to spare you suffering as far as possible.'

29. **συνεσταλμένος]** The verb *συνστελλεσθαι* is commonly used of persons to signify 'to be depressed,' 'dejected'; as in 1 Macc. iii. 6 *συνεστάλησαν οἱ ἄνομοι ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου αὐτῶν,* v. 5 *συνέστελεν αὐτούς,* 2 Macc. vi. 12 *μὴ συνστελλεσθαι διὰ τὰς συμφοράς,* see also examples in Steph. *Thes.* s.v. The question then arises, is *συνεσταλμένος* here temporal or moral, of the contracted time or of the pressure of calamity? Perhaps both ideas are implied in the phrase, but in the light of the context the temporal cannot be excluded (comp. Rom. xiii. 11). For *στελλεσθαι* see the note on 2 Thess. iii. 6, and for the Apostle's views as to the approach of the Second Advent the note on 1 Thess. iv. 15.

ἐστίν, τὸ λοιπὸν] This is the right reading: not *τὸ λοιπὸν ἐστίν,* nor *λοιπὸν ἐστίν.* How then is the expression *τὸ λοιπὸν* to be taken, with what precedes or with what follows? To connect it with what follows in the sense given by the A. V. 'it remains therefore that' becomes impossible as soon as the true reading *τὸ λοιπὸν* for *λοιπὸν* is established. Two possibilities therefore remain: (1) to connect with the preceding sentence 'the season is short henceforth,' which is flat and unmeaning; or (2) to consider the phrase as belonging to the subordinate clause *ἴνα...ᾧσιν,* but misplaced for the sake of emphasis, 'the season is short, so that

henceforth' etc. Such an anticipation of words for purposes of emphatic statement is characteristic of St Paul (see Winer § lxi. p. 685 sq.), especially with clauses introduced by *ὅσα*: see Rom. xi. 31, 2 Cor. ii. 4, Gal. ii. 10, Col. iv. 16 and comp. John xiii. 29: and is on the whole to be preferred here.

30. Sorrows and joys alike are temporary, are transient. In a moment all may be changed. Therefore to one who judges rightly, earthly grief is not over grievous and earthly joy not over joyous.

ὡς μὴ κατέχοντες] i.e. as not sure of absolute ownership. Compare 2 Cor. vi. 10, and for the metaphor Lucr. iii. 971 'Vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu.'

31. *οἱ χρώμενοι κ.τ.λ.*] The accusative (*τὸν κόσμον*) is very rare after *χρᾶσθαι* except in quite late writers (Malalas p. 5, Theophan. p. 314): it has very slight support in Acts xxvii. 17 *βοηθείαις* (v. l. *-as*) *ἐχρῶντο*, but occurs in Wisdom vii. 14 *θησαυρὸς...ὃν οἱ χρησάμενοι* (where the variant *κτησάμενοι* is rejected by Tischendorf and Fritzsche). The construction however is found in a Cretan inscription of the second or third century B.C. (Boeckh *C. I. G.* II. p. 405). In the passage before us the accusative may have been influenced by the *καταχρώμενοι* which follows; *καταχρᾶσθαι* often taking an accusative (A. Buttmann p. 157, Meyer *ad loc.*), even in classical writers. It occurs however below with a dative, ix. 18 *εἰς τὸ μὴ καταχρήσασθαι τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ μου*.

καταχρώμενοι] '*using up*,' 'using to the full,' comp. 'abuti' in Latin, which often takes this meaning. 'Misusing' would be *παραχρώμενοι*: 'abusing' of the A. V., though an archaism, well preserves the alliteration.

33, 34. The interesting question of the reading of this passage falls under two heads. (1) *καὶ μεμέρισται καὶ* is undoubtedly the reading at the end of ver. 33, the omission of the first *καὶ* in some manuscripts having been assisted by the fact that *γυναικὶ* immediately precedes it. (2) As regards ver. 34 three groups of reading present themselves: (a) *ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἀγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἀγαμος* supported by *NAF* 17, *Memph.*, (b) *ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἀγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος*, *BP Vulg. Bashm. Euseb.* and others, (c) *ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἀγαμος* *DFG* 37, 47 *fuld.* *Pesh. Harkl. Method.* These variants originated probably in the accident that in some very early manuscript, through the carelessness of the scribe or amanuensis, the words *ἡ ἀγαμος* were written above the line or in the margin, and so were inserted subsequently in different places of the text. The choice seems to lie between (b) and (c). If we choose the first of these two alternatives, then we punctuate after *καὶ μεμέρισται* and render 'and he is distracted,' i.e. his allegiance is divided; a rendering for which Achilles Tatius v. 24 p. 343 may be quoted *ἐμεμέριστο πολλοῖς ἅμα τὴν ψυχὴν, αἰδοῖ καὶ ὄργῃ καὶ ἔρωτι καὶ ζήλοισιν*. The *γυνὴ ἡ ἀγαμος* is then 'the widow,' one who was once married and remains unmarried. If however we prefer the second alternative, we punctuate after *γυναικὶ* and after *παρθένος*: and in this case *μεμέρισται* has a different meaning 'there is a distinction between' (as the

A. V. renders it). I venture to prefer this latter reading, though supported chiefly by Western authorities, from internal evidence; for the sentences then become exactly parallel. There is just the same distinction between the married woman and the virgin, as between the married and the unmarried man. The other view throws sense and parallelism into confusion, for *καὶ μεμέρισται* is not wanted with ver. 33 which is complete in itself. It also necessitates the awkward phrase *ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾷ*. The reading *ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἀγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἀγαμος* illustrates the habitual practice of scribes to insert as much as possible, and may be neglected.

35. *βρόχον ἐπιβάλλω*] The rendering of the A. V. 'cast a snare' conveys a false impression as to the Apostle's meaning, because it suggests temptation instead of constraint: St Paul's desire is not to fetter their movements, the metaphor being that of the halter. Compare Prov. vi. 21 (quoted by Meyer) *ἐγκλοῖωσαι ἐπὶ σῶ τραχήλῳ* and Philo *Vita Moys.* iii. 34 (II. p. 173) *βλέπω (τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ βοήθειαν) βρόχους τοῖς αὐχέσι περιβάλλουσιν κατὰ τῶν ἀντιπάλων ἔλκει κατὰ τῆς θαλάσσης κ.τ.λ.*

εὐπάρედρον] A rarer word than *εὐπρόσεδρον* of the T. R., and better supported here. Similarly *παρεδρεύοντες* is the right reading in ix. 13. The form *πάρεδρος* occurs in Wisd. ix. 4 *τὴν τῶν σῶν θρόνων πάρედρον σοφίαν* 'the wisdom which is attendant on thy throne.' Like *ἀπερισπάστως* it is found here only in the N. T.

36. *ὑπέρακος*] 'of full age,' rather than 'past the flower of her age.'

37. These directions of St Paul must be judged in the light of two considerations. *First*, the recognized power of the father over his daughter, the 'patria potestas,' on which see Becker and Marquardt, v. 3 sq. *Secondly*, the way in which St Paul makes the question depend not on the wishes of the daughter but of the father, points doubtless to the form in which the matter was submitted to him in the letter of the Corinthians, viz. with special reference to the attitude of the father in such cases.

(f) *On widows specially* (vii. 39, 40).

39, 40. It is impossible to say what led St Paul to add these last two verses. It is conceivable that we have here an answer to a question raised in the Corinthian letter, or the subject may have sprung from something which has gone before. But however this may be, we have here the origin of the metaphor which was worked out a few months later in the Epistle to the Romans (vii. 1—3). A parallel case has been noted already on ver. 19 with regard to the Epistle to the Galatians. The influence of the passage in the Roman letter is traceable in the interpolation of *νόμφη* after *δέδεται* from Rom. vii. 2, where it comes in naturally, the legal aspect underlying the whole passage.

39. **μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ**] This expression is generally interpreted to imply that she must marry a Christian husband, if she marry at all. But the expression cannot be so pressed. It will only signify that she must remember that she is a member of Christ's body; and not forget her Christian duties and responsibilities, when she takes such a step. Marriage with a Christian only does not seem to be contained in the words, though that might be the consequence of her attempt to fulfil those duties.

40. **οὕτως**] For οὕτως see on ver. 26 : for δοκῶ the note on iii. 18 δοκεί.