

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

*THE APOSTLE PAUL'S HYMN OF LOVE (1 COR.
XIII.) AND ITS RELIGIOUS-HISTORICAL SIG-
NIFICANCE.*¹

THE note of the great hymn of praise on love in the 13th chapter of 1 Corinthians is already struck ² by the Apostle a few chapters before (viii. 1) but is immediately abandoned again for the moment. After some expositions of another sort, he comes, in chapter xii., to the gifts (*χαρίσματα*), regarding which the morally still immature community of Corinth required detailed instruction both theoretically and practically. God distributes the gifts as it pleases Him; they are therefore not to be obtained by effort of will.³ Further, the gifts all have the same purpose, to build up the community as a whole, therefore all are equally necessary; and to give the preference to one gift and disparage the others is objectionable. As we learn in chapter xiv., the Corinthians preferred before all the gift of speaking with tongues; they all wished, if possible, to speak with tongues; whereas this very gift, in the judgment of the Apostle, is to be regarded, considering its results, as the humblest. Between the instruction on this special point and the general explanation of the nature and purpose of the gifts, Paul has inserted the song of praise to love, which interrupts the didactic exposition both through its subject and its style.

¹ [In the process of translation a few notes have been added for the sake of precision and clearness. These are enclosed within square parentheses. The sections also are due to the translator.]

² ἡ γυνῶσις φησὶ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ . . . εἰ δὲ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἐγνωσται ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ.

³ [Man kann sie daher nicht erzwingen.]

I. THE TRANSITION TO THE HYMN.

The manner in which the hymn is introduced presents some difficulties. After the Apostle had concluded his general remarks with the lively questions: "Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all powers (workers of miracles)? have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret (the words of those who speak with tongues)?" he continues: "Strive rather after those gifts which are the higher [better], and yet show I unto you in surpassing wise a way." What is to be understood by the "higher [better] gifts"? Further, in how far could the Apostle describe the contents of the hymn which now follows as a "way"? Finally, must we not with Luther and others refer the words "in surpassing wise" as an adjectival qualification to "way" (a more excellent way) instead of connecting them with the verb?

The first question can be decided with certainty. The "higher [better] gifts" can only be those which in another place¹ are described as the "fruit" of the spirit, love, peace, kindness; and other Christian virtues. In calling them here "gifts" (*χαρίσματα*) he intentionally writes paradoxically; for those virtues are not "gifts" in the narrower sense, since, as they are in themselves actually the expression of the Christian character, they may and must be acquired by every Christian. The "gifts" in the narrower sense, however, really are "extra gifts"; being such they may be regarded as exaltations of the Christian condition; but nevertheless love, joy, peace, etc., remain the truly highest gifts because they are absolutely necessary, because it is only in them that the Christian character finds its expression, and because the eternal destiny depends on them alone. Over against the mania of religious enjoyment and

¹ Gal. v. 22: "But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control."

the unholy eagerness which characterised the Corinthians, who attached themselves to the "gifts," the Apostle sets the simple and necessary as the greater or rather as the better thing.

The commentators almost all explain the words "the higher gifts" differently.¹ They hold that the Apostle here exhorts those addressed to prefer amongst the gifts in the narrower sense those which serve most to edify, as, for example, prophecy, or power of teaching or knowledge, instead of speaking with tongues. But "the higher gifts" are obviously opposed not only to the two last-named (speaking with tongues and interpretation), but also to all those which are mentioned in verses 29 and 30 and therefore also those in verses 4 to 11. Every restriction here is purely arbitrary. And it would also be not indeed wholly inadmissible, but at least scarcely comprehensible, if the Apostle, who shortly before had written that God distributes the gifts to all as He finds good (v. 11) should now give the exhortation "Strive after (*ζηλοῦτε*) these gifts."

Moreover the reading *μειζονα* is not at all assured, least of all by xiv. 5, and xiii. 13; for in both these places gifts of the same category are compared with one another. It appears to me probable that *κρείττονα* was the original reading which has been supplanted by *μειζονα* (xiv. 5, xiii. 13).² This reading makes it perfectly clear that Paul is now considering an entirely different category of gifts—namely virtues which he does not otherwise call gifts.

¹ [This paragraph and the two which follow are one single footnote in the German.]

² *κρείττονα* is found in DEFGKL al longe plu, d, e, f, vg. (excepto am.) oop.^{vid.}, arm., Tertull.,¹ Origen, Ambros., Ambrosiast., Chrysostom (*οὐκ εἶπε τὰ μείζονα ἀλλὰ τὰ κρείττονα*) and other Fathers. *μειζονα* is attested by NABC am., aeth^{nt.} Hieron. and certain Fathers, amongst whom, however, Origen can scarcely be counted as his *μειζονα* appears to be derived from *μείζων* by contamination with xiv. 5. It is possible that Origen himself was doubtful.

In any case *μείζονα* is an almost exclusively Alexandrian reading.¹ Godet and Meyer have declared for *κρείττονα*; the greater majority of commentators prefer *μείζονα*. Heinrici designates the latter as the more difficult reading and follows it for this reason; it is less to the point, not more difficult.

Which are the higher or better gifts, it was not necessary for the Apostle to state expressly to the Corinthians; for, though all the gifts which he had named in chapter xii. did not belong to these, yet every heart must feel and know what he had in mind. Therefore what follows is connected by "and yet" (*καὶ ἔτι*) = "and in superabundance."² He does not say, however, that he will now name the better gifts to his readers, but that he will show them "the way" which leads to them.³ This way into which he wishes to guide the zeal of the Corinthians is love. Therefore "the way" is here to be taken quite literally, and not (as one might think of doing) to be understood as "instruction." Love gives rise to a whole series of negative and positive virtues; and these are—so we must now say specifically—the "better gifts" which the Apostle had in his mind chapter xii. 31; and love, since it is their root, is the means, therefore also the way, to attain to them.⁴

¹ ["*κρείττονα* is Western and Syrian": Findlay in *Expositor's Greek Testament*.]

² The reflections which Klostermann has based on the very meagrely attested reading *εἰτι* (*εἰται*), I shall pursue no farther.

³ Those commentators who understand the *χαρίσματα κρείττονα* (*μείζονα*) as the higher gifts amongst those treated of in chap. xii., must take *καὶ ἔτι* . . . *δεικνύω* adversatively; but then it would at least have to be *ἔτι δέ*. Thus the contrast to the gifts does not begin only in verse 31b, but already in verse 31a. The exegetes have allowed themselves to be led astray by the explanation of verse 31a in xiv. 1 (*ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε*), as if by these words the exhortation: *ζηλοῦτε τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα* were simply resumed. But these words are preceded by the exhortation: *διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην*. In this the contents of chap. xiii. and also of xii. 31 are comprehended.

⁴ It is striking that *δοῦν* has no article (all manuscripts agree in this). Probably Bengel is right: the Apostle wishes to stimulate the attention of the Corinthians. Yet examples of the omission of the article through

As to the reference of *καθ' ὑπερβολήν* I cannot come to any quite definite opinion. This Pauline phrase is in Romans vii. 13 connected with the adjective (*κ. ὑ. ἀμαρτωλός*), but in 2 Corinthians i. 8, iv. 17, Galatians i. 13, with the verb. Without doubt the latter reference is, from the point of view of style, the more natural,¹ especially as the want of the article with *όδός* is doubly felt if *καθ' ὑπερβολήν* belongs to this word. In respect of meaning, though not of style, the connexion *ὁδὸν καθ' ὑπερβολήν* makes very good sense ("a way, high above all," "a sublime way"). But if we refer *καθ' ὑπερβολήν* to the verb, then more than one translation seems possible.

(1) We can connect the expression closely with *ἔτι*, so that it is simply to be understood pleonastically, "in superabundance,"² but this "superabundance" beside *ἔτι* appears really superabundant"; moreover, this translation can scarcely be supported by parallel cases.

(2) We can, with Billroth, paraphrase "in a way that is excellent because sure to be successful"; but if we do this the emphasis would be transferred from the way to the recommendation of the way, which the Apostle can scarcely have wished.

(3) Finally, we can assume that Paul with this expression heralds the enchanting hymnic form of his description of the way. The last interpretation, which assumes, it is true, an unnecessary anticipatory reflection on the part of the Apostle, must in my opinion be adopted, if one does not refer *καθ' ὑπερβολήν* to the substantive: "covet rather the

carelessness are not lacking. We can see a certain incorrectness in the fact that Paul, in making the exhortation *ζηλοῦτε τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ κρείττονα*, had probably also love in mind, but now designates it as the way in which to win these better gifts. But of love in the sense of the Apostle it may be said both that it is "the greatest" of all and that it is the way to all the others.

¹ But the arrangement of the words is less favourable to it.

² Thus Ewald and also Grotius.

better gifts, and yet I show¹ you a way in lofty speech."

Since none of these interpretations is quite satisfactory, it appears to me that the connexion with "way" is after all the most probable, especially as the oldest commentator of our chapter, Clemens Alexandrinus,² has τὴν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδόν.

II. THE TEXT OF THE HYMN.

Now follows the hymn of love. It is not my intention to add a new interpretation to the many complete ones already in existence.³ But both with regard to the critical examination of the text and with regard to the subject matter there still remain many uncertainties. It is with these that I shall deal. The 13th chapter of 1st Corinthians is rightly regarded as the highest, because the most impressive literary performance of the Apostle in form and matter. It is therefore here, if anywhere, the duty of the exegete to bring text and understanding to the most complete certainty. The task of grasping the religious-historical significance of the hymn has hardly been approached. The final remarks will be devoted to that task.

ζηλοῦτε τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ κρείττονα καὶ ἔτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι.⁴

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. If I speak with the tongues
of men and of angels, | 1. Ἐάν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων
λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων, |
|---|--|

¹ Notice the lively anticipation expressed by the present tense.

² *Quis dives salu.* 38.

³ The most complete and the best which I know, is that of Joh. Weisz (*Kommentar z. 1 Korintherbrief*, 1910); but his proposal to change the place of our chapter and connect it with chapter viii. seems to be insufficiently justified, and has also the beginning of the hymn (speaking with tongues) against it. That Paul had already finished the hymn when he wrote his letter, might be inferred from the loose or, as it may rather be called, difficult connexion in which it stands to chaps. xi. and xii; but the delicate pedagogical references to the addresses in the beginning and the middle of the hymn make this supposition improbable.

⁴ [This stands without a German translation, apparently to mark that it is not part of the Hymn, but only the transition to it.]

- But have not love,¹
 I am become ² a booming
 brass or a clanging cymbal.
2. And if I have power of prophecy ³ and know all secrets and all knowledge,⁴
 and if I have all faith, so
 that I move mountains,
 but have not love,
 I am nothing.
3. And if I give away piece-meal all that I have,
 and if I sacrifice my body,
 so that I may glory [on
 good grounds]
 but have not love,
 I profit nothing.
4. Love is long-suffering, full of kindness is love, love envieth not,
 makes no display, is not puffed up, 5. does not masquerade,
 seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, does not bear malice,
6. rejoiceth not in injustice, but rejoiceth in truth.
7. covereth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.
- ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω,
 γέγονα χαλκὸς ἢ χρῶν ἢ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον.
2. καὶ εἰάν ἔχω προφητείαν καὶ εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γνῶσιν,
 καὶ εἰάν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν ὥστε ὄρη μεθιστάναι,
 ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω,
 οὐθέν εἰμι,
3. καὶ ψωμίσω πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου,
 καὶ εἰάν παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου, ἵνα καυχῆσμαι,
 ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω,
 οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦμαι.
4. ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστένεται ἡ ἀγάπη, οὐ ζηλοῖ ἡ ἀγάπη,
 οὐ περπερεύεται, οὐ φυσιοῦται, 5. οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ,
 οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς,⁵ οὐ παροξύνεται, οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν,
6. οὐ χαίρει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, συναχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.
7. πάντα στέγει, πάντα πιστεύει, πάντα ἐλπίζει, πάντα ὑπομένει.

¹ [The translation attempts to reproduce Dr. Harnack's German version very closely, and does not pretend to be a direct rendering of the original Greek text.]

² [The word "become" is here added, though not given in Dr. Harnack's translation. The omission is probably due to a slip, for he speaks later of *γένεγονα* as *treffend gewählt* in place of *εἰμι*.]

³ [Literally "have prophesying," which gives a clear meaning in German, *weissagung habe*, but not in English.]

⁴ [In the commentary Dr. Harnack prefers to understand *ἔχω* rather than *εἰδῶ* before *πᾶσαν τὴν γνῶσιν*.]

⁵ τὸ μὴ ἑαυτῆς.

⁶ [The meaning of *στέγει* remains uncertain: see commentary.]

8. Charity never ceaseth—
whether there be prophecies,
they shall be done away,
whether there be tongues,
they shall cease,
whether there shall be know-
ledge,¹ it shall be done
away ;
9. For piece-work is our know-
ing, and piece-work is our
prophesying ;
10. But when the perfect comes,
the piece-work will be
done away ;
11. When I was a child, I spoke
as a child, pondered as a
child, thought as a child,
when I became a man, I put
aside what is of the child.
12. For now we see by means of a
glass, in a riddle,
but then from face to face ;
Now I know piecemeal,
but then I shall perceive ²
as I also am perceived.
13. Now remaineth faith, hope,
love—these three,
but the greatest among
them is love.
8. ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε ἐκπίπτει—
εἴτε δὲ προφητεῖαι, καταρ-
γηθήσονται,
εἴτε γλῶσσαι, παύσονται,
εἴτε γνώσεις, καταργηθήσονται
9. ἐκ μέρους γὰρ γινώσκομεν καὶ
ἐκ μέρους προφητεύομεν
10. ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον, τὸ ἐκ
μέρους καταργηθήσεται
11. ὅτε ἤμην νήπιος, ἐλάλουν ὡς
νήπιος, ἐφρόνου ὡς νήπιος,
ἐλογιζόμην ὡς νήπιος·
ὅτε γέγονα ἀνὴρ, κατήργηκα τὰ
τοῦ νηπίου.
12. βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δι' ἐσόπ-
τρον ἐν αἰνίγματι,
τότε δὲ πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσ-
ωπον·
ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους.
τότε δὲ ἐπιγινώσομαι καθὼς καὶ
ἐπεγνώσθην
13. νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις, ἐλπίς,
ἀγάπη, τὰ τρία ταῦτα·
μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη

III. THE FIRST PART OF THE HYMN, 1—3.

That love, at least in the two first parts of the hymn, is the love for one's neighbour, there can be no doubt. It is a question whether the conception of it is not widened in the third part.³

V. 1. "Supposing the case that I be one who speaks with tongues," etc.—*ἐάν* is to be so understood in the two following

¹ [In the German the plural is used : perhaps "sciences," or "ways of knowing."]

² [*Erkenne*, I recognise, apprehend, take cognisance of.]

³ Compare Joh. Weisz, *ibid.* p. 312.

verses also ¹; whether this case can really be is of no consequence. The Apostle begins with the *glossolalia* because the Corinthians attached so much importance to that power. The "tongues of angels" may be taken as an abstract idea (Heinrici) which is probably used not entirely without irony; but it is more probable that Paul believed just as seriously in an angelic language as the Jews, or as the Pagans did in a language of the gods. The comparisons which depict the sounds of *glossolalia* show how we are to represent to ourselves the form which it took, not as a low-voiced stammering but as shouting, sometimes dully resounding, sometimes piercing and shrill. Unsurpassable is the contrast between the solemn commencement and the conclusion of the verse: on the one hand the tongues of men and of angels, on the other hand booming brass and clanging cymbal!

V. 2 is an intensification of verse 1. The verse contains in its protasis two clauses ² and the stress is laid on the πάντα. "Supposing that I had the gift of prophecy and knew all secrets and (had³) all knowledge, and supposing I had all faith," etc. But, although the sentence is formed of two clauses, it does not therefore follow that the Apostle places prophecy in the same category as the knowledge of mysteries (i.e. the knowledge of the secrets of salvation) and the Gnosis, or that he derives the two latter from the former: it is only as opposed to faith that they belong to-

¹ The differences of the manuscripts with regard to *καὶ ἐάν, καὶ ἄν* and *κάν* I pass over as unimportant, s. B. Weisz, *Texte u. Unters.*, xiv. 3, s. 62f. Some manuscripts have found it necessary to replace the tellingly-chosen perfect tense *γέγονα* by *εἶμι*, an old copyist's error, then changed it to *ἐν εἶμι*, and that has become "unum" or "in unum." Likewise *ἢ* (*velut*) has been inserted before *χαλκός*.

² *ἐάν* appears twice, not thrice.

³ It is not absolutely necessary to refer *εἰδῶ* to *πάσαν τὴν γνώσιν* also; *ἔχω* can keep its importance, and influence *γνώσιν*, especially as it is immediately repeated.

gether. It is worthy of notice that the Apostle differentiates between the *gnosis* and the knowledge of secrets or mysteries. The cause of this can only be that *gnosis* is more comprehensive. The knowledge of mysteries comprehends the understanding of certain problems, namely, the problems of salvation, but the *gnosis* comprehends the entire field of knowledge in the three realms of being *sub specie dei*. The highest faith is proved by being able to accomplish not merely miracles but the greatest miracles. The one which the Apostle names is the ensample of the greatest miracles; it is drawn from the very source from which Matthew xvii. 20, xxi. 21, and Mark xi. 23 drew it, namely the evangelical tradition.¹ Unsurpassable is again the contrast with the last sentence—"I am nothing." It could not be "I have nothing"; for such a man has the most extraordinary possessions; but in the midst of this wealth of knowledge he himself is nothing, thus poorer than poor.²

V. 3. The last intensification: even the highest works of love, done without love, are profitless for him who does them. The apodosis (*οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦμαι*) puts it beyond doubt that here deeds must be meant, by which it was hoped to attain salvation; for only thus can "profit" be understood. The first clause of the protasis forthwith proves this; for it is in accordance with the popular (late Jewish) view, which Paul shares,³ that alms, especially when one sacrifices the whole property, serve to win salvation.

¹ *Ὁρη μεθιστάνειν (not μεθιστάναι) is read by Westcott and Hort with ACKL and perhaps rightly; B. Weisz, *ibid.* p. 33, prefers to keep to the regular form.

² Besides *οὐθέν, οὐδὲν* is to be found in the MSS. That *ὠφελοῦμαι* instead of *εἶμι* is found in A would not be worth noticing, if it were not given also by Ambrosius and others. But in any case it must be regarded as due to influence from the following verse.

³ Instead of the perfectly attested *ψωμίσω*, Clemens Alex. has once *Pádag.* II. i. 5) *διαδώ*. This has arisen from the passage in Matt. xix. 21: *ἔπαγε πώλησόν σου τὰ υπάρχοντα καὶ δός πτωχοῖς* (Luc.: *διάδος*), which must be compared generally.

But what is the second clause: *ἐὰν παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου ἵνα καθήσωμαι* or *ἵνα καυχῆσωμαι*? All the German exegetes have decided for the first reading, indeed many of them scarcely notice the second reading, they are so sure of the matter; and nearly all the text-critics (with B. Weisz and v. Soden) are on their side; but besides Westcott-Hort, Lachmann is for *καυχῆσωμαι*.¹ The question cannot be decided by textual criticism alone. The tradition gives the following picture:

Καυθήσωμαι DEFG—but these four Codd. present in the letters one text—L and a large number of minuscule MSS., Aphra., Method., Basil, Euthal., Cyrill., Maxim., further Tertull., Cyprian, Pseudocyp. *de rebapt.*, Ambrosiaster, Greek and Latin Codd. which Hieronymus knew,² Augustine, the Latin Codd. d e f g m vulg., further syr. utr., Copt. MSS. [?], armen., aethiop. MSS. [?], goth.

Καυθήσωμαι CK and many others, Ephraem [?], Chrysost., Cyrill. Theodoret. The versions can of course be quoted for this reading as much as for the preceding.

Καυχῆσωμαι NAB, Greek Codd., which Hieronymus knew, 17, Copt. MSS., Aethiop. MS., Goth. marg., Ephraem.

Westcott-Hort call the reading *καυθήσωμαι* "Western and Syrian," but establish the fact that it appears elsewhere too. Soden writes to me on the basis of his rich material: "*Καυθήσωμαι* is certainly *κοινή* (Antiochian) and most prob-

¹ Lachmann's decision here, however, does not mean much, for he did not wish to restore the original text, but the oldest reading of the Greek MSS. Besides he only gives *καυχῆσωμαι* in brackets.

² Hieronymus writes (in Gal. T. vii. 517 Vall.): "Si tradidero corpus meum ut glorier," and also: "scio in Latinis codicibus, in eo testimonio quod supra posuimus: Si tradidero corpus meum ut glorier, 'ardeam' habere pro 'glorier'; sed ob similitudinem verbi, qua apud Graecos 'ardeam' et 'glorier,' i.e. *καυθήσωμαι* et *καυχῆσωμαι*, una litterae parte distinguitur, apud nostros error inolevit, sed et apud ipsos Graecos exemplaria sunt diversa." Comp. Hieron. in Esai. T. iv. 688: "Apostolus si etiam corpus suum tradat martyrio ut ardeat sive glorietur, utrumque enim fertur in exemplaribus."

ably Palestinian-Eusebian. Among the Egyptian texts four (or five) as against three (which however are younger) read *καυχῆσμαι*. *Καυχῆσμαι* appears also in nine Palestinian-Eusebian Codices, several times corrected to *καυθ*. It is to be found also in several *κοινή*-Codd. which have never been influenced by the Egyptian text.¹

This state of the facts does not, in my opinion, admit of a sure decision, even though *καυθήσμαι* (*καυθήσμαι*) is more widespread and according to this series of testimonies earlier attested than *καυχῆσμαι*, which appears first in the fourth century and for which there is on the whole almost none but Egyptian testimony. Although, however, the scales, from the point of view of textual criticism, lean towards *καυθήσμαι*, they regain their balance, nay even lean to the other side, as soon as three witnesses are called in who have not yet been heard.

(1) It is more than probable that Hieronymus in his statement, as usual, simply repeats Origen, whom he transcribes. It is therefore Origen who already remarks the difference of the tradition, but presupposes the correctness of *καυχῆσμαι* as a matter of course. How could Hieronymus—not to speak of his carelessness—have found the courage to differ from the common Latin tradition, if he had not possessed powerful authority? But now Westcott-Hort have really found the reading *καυχῆσμαι* in Origen. Cramer's edition indeed has (*Cat. S.* 252) *καυθήσμαι*, but

¹ v. Soden continues: "Thus the inclination of the writers to the word *καυχῆσμαι*, to which they are accustomed in Paul, is clear. The writers of the Palestinian-Eusebian Codd. may have been influenced by the reminiscence, if they did not take it over from the Egyptian. Since the Latin Codd. advocate *καυθήσμαι*, *καυχῆσμαι*, even if it were the Egyptian reading, based perhaps on Origenes (?), cannot come into consideration for the original text, even from the point of view of text criticism. The indicative *-σμαι* after *ἵνα* is very frequent later, but cannot compete with *-σμαι* for the Recensions (families): at best it might be *κοινή*."

that is an error; for the Scholion of Origen which follows presupposes *καυχῆσθαι*: ὡς δυνατοῦ ὄντος ψωμίσαι τινα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα οὐ διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν κενοδοξίαν, καὶ ὡς δυνατοῦ ὄντος καὶ μαρτυρῆσαι τινα ἕνεκεν καυχῆσεως. The reading *καυχῆσθαι* therefore was certainly followed by Origen.

(2) Clemens Alex. too attests the reading *καυχῆσθαι*; for both in *Strom.* iv. 18, 111, 4, and in *Strom.* vii. 10, 59, 4, he quotes our verse so that he takes *παραδιδόναι* absolutely (he says for it *ἐπιδιδόναι*), and leaves out the final sentence altogether. Such a quotation could only be made by one who read not *ἵνα καυθήσθαι* but *ἵνα καυχῆσθαι*. But we must still further agree with Westcott-Hort that in Clemens *καυχῆσθαι* can be proved directly, although the only MS. in the only place where Clemens quotes our verse verbally, has *καυθήσεται*. It runs (*Strom.* iv. 18, 111 f.): *Αὐτίκα ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος· Ἐὰν το σῶμά μου ἐπιδῶ,¹ φησίν, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, χαλκός εἰμι ἡχῶν καὶ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον² ἦν μὴ ἐκ διαθέσεως ἐκλεκτῆς, δι' ἀγάπης γνωστικῆς μαρτυρήσω, λέγει, φόβῳ δὲ εἴπερ οὖν καὶ μισθῷ προσδοκωμένῳ ἐπικροτῶν τὰ χεῖλη εἰς μαρτυρίαν κυρίου ὁμολογήσω κύριον, κοινός εἰμι ἄνθρωπος, ἡχῶν τὸν κύριον, οὐ γινώσκων. ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὁ τοῖς χεῖλεσιν ἀγαπῶν, ἔστι καὶ ἄλλος παραδιδούς τὸ σῶμα, ἵνα καυθήσεται.* The reading of the MS. (*καυθήσεται*) is unbearable; for the two last sentences cannot be adversative, but must be parallel. If they are adversative—which is already almost forbidden by the context—then *καυθήσεται*, alone would not suffice; it would be necessary that the good motive for which the martyr lets himself be burned should be mentioned. The MS. should therefore be corrected in this place.

(3) Clemens Romanus, too, most probably did not read

¹ See the remark already made above.

² Contamination of verses 3 and 1.

καυθήσομαι. In his letter from C. 47 onwards he is very dependent on our letter; and in C. 55 he says: "But, to bring forward examples of Gentiles also, many kings and rulers . . . have delivered themselves over to death, that they might rescue their fellow-citizens through their own blood . . . We know that many among ourselves have delivered themselves to bondage, that they might ransom others. Many have sold themselves to slavery, and receiving the price paid for themselves have fed others" (Lightfoot).¹

We can assuredly not ignore the fact that Clemens is thinking of our passage, but he read nothing in it about death by fire. With *παραδίδοναι* he connects *εἰς θάνατον*, *εἰς δεσμὰ*, *εἰς δουλείαν*; but he passes over the death by fire because he has not been led to it by 1 Corinthians xiii. 3. He cannot have left it out intentionally, therefore he did not read it in the text.

Thus the reading *καυχῆσθαι* is to be traced beyond Origen to Clemens Alex., and in all probability to Clemens Romanus. It is immensely strengthened by this. But even this series of witnesses is not decisive; for Clemens Romanus is not quite a certain witness, and Clemens Alex. and Origen only testify to us that in Egypt *καυχῆσθαι* was read, not merely in the fourth century, but as early as the end of the second century. Let us examine the internal arguments.

For *καυθήσομαι* and against *καυχῆσθαι* the following argument is adduced: the voluntary death by fire, or the suffering of torment by fire, for the sake of others is

¹ 47, 1: *ἀνάλαβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου, namely our letter. In C. 49 in his hymn of love he has made use of 1 Corinthians xiii. Now in C. 55 he writes: "Ἴνα δὲ καὶ ὑποδείγματα ἐθνῶν ἐνεγκωμεν πολλοὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγούμενοι . . . παρέδωκαν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς θάνατον, ἵνα ῥύσωνται διὰ τοῦ ἑαυτῶν αἵματος τοὺς πολίτας . . . ἐπιστάμεθα πολλοὺς ἐν ἡμῖν παραδεδωκῆτας ἑαυτοὺς εἰς δεσμὰ, ὅπως ἐτέροις λυτρώσονται: πολλοὶ ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν εἰς δουλείαν καὶ λαβόντες τὰς τιμὰς αὐτῶν ἐτέροις ἐψώμισαν.*

particularly suitable as the strongest example of sacrifice ; further, the example is chosen through recollection of Daniel iii. 28 (95) : *καὶ παρέδωκαν τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν εἰς ἔμπυρισμόν* : the reading is much too difficult to have been introduced by the emendators. On the other hand, *καυχῆσωμαι* as an emendation may be easily explained, because the word is usual with Paul ; but as regards the sense it is intolerable, because it introduces a point of view entirely foreign to the context, and even spoils the sense of the verse ; for inasmuch as it has already been conceded in the protasis that the motive for giving up life is ambition (*κενοδοξία*), no assurance is required that such sacrifice is worthless, and the words : *ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω*, become superfluous. " If ever a reading is to be rejected without more ado, that is the case here " (Godet). Heinrici more carefully speaks only of the greater strength which the thought gains through reading *καυθήσομαι*, whereas *καυχῆσωμαι*, according to him, is weak.

The arguments here adduced do not, in my opinion, hold good ; moreover the following considerations are opposed to them :

(1) The reading *καυθήσομαι* is not only " difficult " (B. Weisz), but also very suspicious ; for it is with reason that the commentators are in doubt as to how far the voluntary death by fire may be regarded as a sacrifice for the good of others. Godet and others are thinking of martyrdom by fire, but that is not a sacrifice for others, and besides it had not yet come within the Apostle's range of vision.¹ Now it may be assumed that the Apostle had no particular case in mind, but had chosen as heroic an example as possible, and

¹ In the case of *καυθήσομαι* Weisz thinks of torture by which confessions detrimental to others may be extorted. Very improbable ! Mr. Holl tells me that he understands the passage as referring to the mark which was branded on slaves. That calls for more attention, but this meaning cannot so readily be understood from the words. Who thinks immediately on reading *καυθήσομαι* of the brand of a slave ?

had left to the reader the question of sacrifice for the sake of others, but why he then specialises at all is not very clear: "If I give all my possessions piece by piece, and if I give even my body"¹ is certainly stronger and more terse.

(2) The place in Daniel, which is adduced in support of the reading *καυθήσομαι*, can also be used against it; it was very well known and could easily have induced a correction on the part of an old copyist.

(3) After the church had entered on the epoch of martyrdom, in which death by fire was not rare, it is easier to understand how the variant *καυθήσομαι* for *καυχήσωμαι* could force its way into the text, than the opposite case. On the other hand the substitution of *καυχήσωμαι* for *καυθήσομαι* could not possibly be regarded as a chance error in writing which had propagated itself in copies; and, since a thoughtlessly introduced *καυχήσωμαι* cannot be assumed, the introduction of this word must be regarded as intentional. It is an unsatisfactory explanation that *καυχήσωμαι* was brought in because it is usual with Paul. *Καυθήσομαι* gave positively no cause to expunge it; *καυχήσωμαι*, on the other hand, was probably expunged for the very reason which still makes it appear unacceptable to many as is shown below.

(4) *Παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου ἵνα καυθήσομαι* is certainly tolerable in itself, but remarkably cumbersome. ("I give up my body, in order that I may be burnt"—the Greek language does not require such periphrases): besides this, the change to the first person is rather surprising; more natural is *καυθῆ* (which is read in Basilus). But in the case of *καυχήσωμαι* this difficulty disappears.

¹ That *παραδίδουαι* used absolutely is to be so understood can be proved by numerous examples. "Ὅς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν," writes Paul, Rom. iv. 25, and Westcott-Hort point to Plut., *Demet.* 49 f. (p. 913 f.): *τολμήσαντος δὲ τινος εἰπεῖν τι, ὡς Σελεύκῳ χρητὸ σῶμα παραδίδουαι Δημήτριον, ὤρμησε μὲν τὸ [ξίφος σπασάμενος ἀνελεῖν ἑαυτὸν κ.τ.λ. . . . εἰ καὶ πρότερον ἐδόκει τὴν παράδοσιν τοῦ σώματος ἀσχαρὰν πεποιήσθαι.*

(5) "*Καυθήσωμαι*," remarks von Soden (s. above)—"not *καυθήσομαι*—is to be recognised as the traditional form in the families of MSS. which do not give *καυχῆσωμαι*." Now it is true that the deformity of a Conj. Fut. appears in Byzantine times, but to saddle Paul with it is serious: on the other hand, too, *ἵνα* with the Indic. Fut. cannot be proved in Paul! The assumption is therefore almost imperative that the deformity *καυθήσωμαι* arose from *καυχῆσωμαι* through the substitution at first of one single letter for another.

(6) But all these reasons would seem to give way before the chief argument against the reading *καυχῆσωμαι*, namely that it spoils the sense of the verse. If this were the case, it would of course be necessary after all to reject it. It must be conceded that the sense of the verse is almost spoiled, that it at least loses its force, if *καυχᾶσθαι*, here as elsewhere, has only and always the meaning of "idle boasting." But that is not at all the case.

Καυχᾶσθαι (*καύχημα*, *καύχησις*, *ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι*= קָוַחְתָּ) is found in Paul not less than fifty-five times,¹ is therefore a particularly usual word with him, and must therefore be evaluated in accordance with the psychological characterisation of Paul, a task which has not yet been done sufficiently. Paul feels it as a *vox media*. If the thing boasted of is right, then the Christian, and especially the Apostle, may and should take pride in it; he may and must take pride in it, because the time will come when before the judgment-seat of God everyone will receive according as his deeds have been. He must then have something (a treasure) to show before God—how this is brought about may be left undecided here—and he may already pride himself on that which he will show there; such pride is no *κενοδοξία*. That is the

¹ In Rom. 8 times, in 1 Cor. 9 times, in 2 Cor. 29 times, in Gal. 3 times, in Eph. once, in Phil. 3 times, in 1 Thess. once, in 2 Thess. once.

opinion of the Apostle; we cannot retrench anything from it, whether we like it or not.¹ The second epistle to the Corinthians shows particularly how Paul (as Apostle) feels himself justified in boasting, compare also 2 Thessalonians i. 4; 1 Thessalonians ii. 19; Philippians ii. 16: *εἰς καύχημα ἐμοὶ εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ*.

This *καύχημα* is therefore something which, when it is the right *καύχημα*, "brings profit" (*συμφέρει*). Paul says this bluntly in 2 Corinthians xii. 1, even if he does deny it for the special case: "I must needs glory, though it is not profitable; but I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord."² This very juxtaposition of "glory" and "profit" is to be found in our passage, and that is decisive. It removes all difficulties and establishes firmly the reading *καυχῆσωμαι*. The sentence *ἵνα καυχῆσωμαι* refers of course to the two foregoing sentences, and the whole verse may therefore be thus translated or paraphrased:

"And if I should give all my goods, piece by piece, and even if I were to offer my body, that I might glory—that is that I might have a *καύχημα εἰς ἡμέραν θεοῦ*³—but had not love, it would profit me nothing."⁴

Thus the reason for glorying founded on the sacrifice becomes profitless purely through the want of love; for in

¹ Because his opinion is such, he writes, 1 Cor. ix. 15 f.: *καλὸν μοι μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν ἢ τὸ καύχημά μου οὐδεὶς κενώσει. ἂν γὰρ εὐαγγελίζωμαι, οὐκ ἔστιν μοι καύχημα (Rom. v. 2 f.): καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν—so why not too: καυχώμεθα ἐν τῇ παραδόσει τοῦ σώματος—(1 Cor. v. 6): οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν.*

² *Καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, οὐ συμφέρον μὲν, ἐλεύσομαι γὰρ εἰς ὄπτασις.*

³ "If thou sellest that thou hast and givest to the poor, thou shalt have treasure in heaven," so runs the parallel passage cited above, in Matt. xix. 21. One may glory in a treasure in heaven. 2 Cor. viii. 24 Paul says that the Corinthians' readiness to sacrifice themselves is a subject of glorying for him, how much more for themselves; comp. ix. 2 f. and ix. 9 with reference to the almsgiver: *ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκεν τοῖς πένησιν, ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.*

⁴ *Οὐδέν* is here (as against *οὐθέν*) incontestably proved, see B. Weiss, *ibid.* p. 32.

itself the distribution of possessions and the sacrifice of life are a true reason for glorying (*καύχημα*), and it is allowable to strive after it. Therefore the assertion made in the words *ἵνα καυχῆσωμαι* appears neither debilitated nor weak: it rather becomes now more weighty: even what may be a ground for glorying in the presence of God becomes nothing when love is wanting!

The Pauline use of *καυχᾶσθαι* was, however, not the ordinary one, and the objection which modern readers make to it was made already by the Hellenic antiquity. Read Ignatius and Hermas—they, as citizens of the age of Greek vain self-glorification, recognise *καυχᾶσθαι* only as something bad.¹ But Paul knows it as something justifiable, because from youth upward he had lived in the Pharisaic outlook on life, which not only did not object to claims, titles of right and titles of glory before God, but even demanded them.

The nature of this way of thinking was radically amended by the Apostle to the extent of entirely removing it; but, as so often happens, he kept the form and with it a remnant of the idea itself. Later in Augustine the case is the same: "God crowns our merits" (*Deus coronat nostra merita*), says the very man who will recognise no merits except the "gifts of God" (*munera Dei*).

The rejection of the true reading *καυχῆσωμαι* is thus explained: The word was objectionable and by "correction" was easily eliminated. Nothing more was necessary than to change one letter, and this brought the welcome support of the passage in Daniel and of the records of martyrdom. As early as the second century, certainly before Tertullian, the substitution took place in authorita-

¹ An exception is Clemens Rom., who however shows in his language as a whole much dependence on Paul, c. 34, 5: τὸ καύχημα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ παρρησία ἔστω ἐν τῷ θεῷ. Comp. also 2 Cor. vii. 4: πολλή μοι παρρησία πρὸς ὑμᾶς, πολλή μοι καύχησις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.

tive MSS. How natural it was can be estimated from the fact that even those early fathers who read *καυχῆσθαι*, interpret *παραδόναι τὸ σῶμα* here of the martyrs; whereas Paul had not thought of them, but of such cases as are quoted by Clemens Rom. c. 55 (as above mentioned).

Finally, it must be pointed out that we have another passage in the New Testament which exactly reproduces the thought that was here in Paul's mind. In 1 John iv. 17¹ it is said: "Herein is love made perfect among us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment." It is only necessary here to substitute *καύχημα* for *παρρησία*² and the Pauline idea is exactly reproduced: only love makes a *καύχημα* possible at the judgment day;³ thus without love all reason for glorying, even the greatest, is profitless (*οὐ συμφέρει τὸ καύχημα*).

IV. THE SECOND PART OF THE HYMN, 4-7.

In verse 4 the third repetition of *ἡ ἀγάπη* is wanting in many of the authorities (B, 17, 73, 74, etc., etc., f, Vulg., Copt., Armen., Clemens Alex. and many Fathers), but the number of authorities which give the word preponderates. It was expunged because the copyists did not understand the effective chiasmic arrangement: *ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστεύεται ἡ ἀγάπη* (thus Lachmann, Heirici, B. Weisz: see the distribution of the kola in Cod. D), and therefore connected the second *ἀγάπη* with the following *οὐ ζηλοῖ*.⁴

¹ Ἐν τούτῳ τελελεῖται ἡ ἀγάπη μεθ' ἡμῶν, ἵνα παρρησίαν ἔχωμεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως. Compare also 1 John ii. 28.

² With regard to the homogeneousness of the two words, see the two notes immediately preceding.

³ See Phil. ii. 16, quoted above.

⁴ It is not impossible that the Apostle intended *ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστεύεται ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ ζηλοῖ ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ περπερεύεται, οὐ φυσιοῦται*; but the sentence is not made stronger and finer thereby.

Verse 5, Clemens Alex. and Cod. B have, instead of τὰ ἐαυτῆς rather τὸ μὴ ἐαυτῆς, and Westcott-Hort have put this reading in the margin as alternative. B. Weisz (*ibid.*, p. 17, 103) calls it arbitrary, thoughtless and impossible; but (1) because the other reading is quite usual with Paul,¹ it might readily be inserted. (2) τὸ μὴ ἐαυτῆς also is not unknown to Paul (see 2 Cor. xii. 14: οὐ ζητῶ τὰ ὑμῶν). (3) The reading is not at all "impossible," neither is it as weak as it appears at the first glance: it even fits in better with the context than τὰ ἐαυτῆς, because the other words beside which it is all express an attitude of love towards the external or to others. What prevents me, nevertheless, from deciding with certainty on it, is purely the weak attestation,² and the observation that Clemens Romanus, before he begins his hymn on love (which is based on 1 Cor. xiii.) writes in c. xlix. 6: ὀφείλει ζητεῖν τὸ κοινωφελὲς πᾶσιν καὶ μὴ τὸ ἐαυτοῦ.

Verse 7. A branch of the old Western translations³ has for πάντα στέργει "omnia diligit," and therefore probably read wrongly στέργει; it may be, however, that the wish to retain the triad, "agape omnia diligit, credit, sperat," was influential here. The reading is worthless.

Verses 4-7 contain two rare words, and a word whose explanation must remain uncertain. Gataker and Heinrici

¹ Phil. ii. 21: τὰ ἐαυτῶν ζητοῦσιν, 1 Cor. x. 24: μηδεὶς τὸ ἐαυτοῦ ζητεῖτω, x. 33: μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ.

² Clemens comments in *Paedag.* iii. 1, 2. on several verses from 1 Cor. xiii. In this connexion he writes: τὸ δ' ἐπίπλαστον ἀλλότριον, ὅπερ ἐξηγεῖται σαφῶς "οὐ ζητεῖ" "φῆσας" "τὸ μὴ ἐαυτῆς" τὸ γὰρ ἰδιον ἢ ἀλήθεια τὸ οἰκείον καλεῖ, τὸ δ' ἀλλότριον ἢ φιλοκοσμία ζητεῖ, ἐκτὸς οὕσα . . . τῆς ἀγάπης. It is certain that Clemens had here before him a MS. with the reading τὸ μὴ ἐαυτῆς (that there is no error of memory B. testifies), but it is just as certain in *Quis dāves salu.* 38, that he had seen a MS. which read, τὰ ἐαυτῆς; for he writes, in p. 956 (not 947, as Tischendorf gives): σὺ δὲ μάθε "τὴν <καθ> ὑπερβολὴν ὁδόν," ἣν δείκνυσι Παῦλος ἐπὶ σωτηρίαν "ἡ ἀγάπη τὰ ἐαυτῆς οὐ ζητεῖ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐκκέχυνται."

³ See Soden jun., *das lat. Neue Testament in Africa zur Zeit Cyprians (Texte und Untersuchungen, xxxiii.)*, p. 598.

have contributed excellent commentaries to *περπερεύεται*.¹ We must understand that the meaning is "to display" or "to make a show."²

Χρηστεύεσθα, as far as I know, is to be found first in Greek literature in the Gospel or collection of sayings which Clemens Romanus made use of. He cites, chapter xiii. : *μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, οὓς ἐλάλησεν διδασκῶν ἐπιείκειαν καὶ μακροθυμίαν. οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν* "Ἐλεάτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε, ἀφίετε ἵνα ἀφεθῆ ὑμῖν ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτω ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν . . . ὡς χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν." In accordance with this he writes himself in the following chapter : *χρηστευσώμεθα ἑαυτοῖς κατὰ τὴν εὐσπλαγχνίαν καὶ γλυκύτητα τοῦ ποήσαντος ὑμᾶς*. Did not Paul borrow the verb (which, wherever it appears in the Fathers, may be traced to him) from that *Evangel*, which was probably a recension of Q ?

What meaning for *στέγειν* the Apostle had in mind, it is difficult to decide. The meaning, "endure," cannot very well come into consideration (contrary to Weisz) ; for in the immediate sequel we read : *πάντα ὑπομένει*. But we may well translate "cover, hide," or "protect," or "keep quietly to oneself."³ The word is further found in the New Testament only in 1 Corinthians ix. 12, and 1

¹ Latt. strangely : "*perperam agit*," but Tertullian "*non protervum sapit*." *Μακροθυμεί* is translated in the Old African bible (see also Tertull., *de pat.*, 12) *by magnanimita est* ! Here we have two fine examples of the slavish fashion of the *Vetus Latina*.

² "Display" or "parade" is better than the closely related idea "swagger" ; Clemens Alex. writes (*Paedag.* iii. 1, 3) : *περπερεία ὁ καλλωπισμὸς περιττότητος καὶ ἀχρειώτητος ἔχων ἔμφασιν. διὸ καὶ ἐπιφέρει [ὁ ἀπόστολος]. "οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ"* : *ἀσχημον γὰρ τὸ ἀλλότριον καὶ μὴ κατὰ φύσιν σχῆμα*. So our "undisguised" comes nearest to the meaning of *οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ*, but "unseemly behaviour" is not to be understood. In Tertullian, strange to say, *οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ* is rendered by "*non proterit*," which certainly gives a good sense, but is hardly correct. The opposite idea to *οὐ παροξύνεται* here occurs in Heb. x. 24, *eis paroξusmon ἀγάπης*.

Hesychius says *στέγειν κρύπτειν, συνέχειν, βαστάζειν, ὑπομένειν*.

Thessalonians iii. 1, 5 (in the LXX, too, it is very rare). In the first instance it signifies—here, too, it is πάντα στέγομεν—quite clearly: “we restrain ourselves in everything (lest we should hinder the gospel).” In the two other instances it is best to translate it by “bear,” “endure.” The translation, “love restrains itself in everything” (Heinrici) does not however appear to me sufficiently strong and significant beside the words which follow, and the πάντα also then no longer corresponds exactly to the three following πάντα. The fundamental meaning appears to me to be most appropriate: “love hides (palliates?) all things,” comp. 1 Peter iv. 8 (James v. 20): ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλήθος ἁμαρτιῶν.¹

If Paul in Colossians iii. 14 calls love “the bond of perfectness,” our verses 4–7, and especially the last, are like a comment upon them. Although, as worked out in details, they were certainly not written without regard for the loveless conditions in the Corinthian community, yet they rise above this narrower reference to a general description which is stripped of everything particular. What deep experience is the cause that the analysis of love begins with “suffereth long” (μακροθυμεί) and ends with “endureth” (ὑπομένει), that the absolute πάντα stands out so powerfully at the end of the description, and that within that description the culminating point is the sentence that love rejoiceth in the truth.²

¹ These very words are given by Clemens Rom. in his hymn, which is dependent on our chapter, before πάντα ἀνέχεται, πάντα μακροθυμεί (c. 49), and we may perhaps conclude from this that he understood στέγει in the sense of “tegit.” But this is uncertain.

² The words: συγκαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ are to be thus understood. Σὺν only strengthens and is introduced for the sake of rhythm. The other explanation (“rejoices with the truth”) brings in an alien element. Truth is here, as elsewhere with the Apostle, considered as something ethical, which comes very near to the idea of right and good; comp. v. 8: μὴ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας, ἀλλ’ εὐδικρίας καὶ ἀληθείας, Rom. ii. 8: ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, κειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, also 2 Thess. ii. 12: μὴ πιστεύσαντες τῇ

As regards the disposition of the fifteen sayings, the nine first verbs arrange themselves easily into three verses. The first verse describes the principal qualities of love, the second the simplicity and truth of its appearance, the third the selflessness and unalterable kindness of its inmost nature. This eulogistic description closes with the pithy balanced sentence, "It rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth." This leads over to the 2 x 2 great positive sayings.

A. HARNACK.

Helena Ramsay, transl.

THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

THE subject of the ark was much discussed some years ago by German scholars. The opinion of Wellhausen, that the ark was an old sanctuary belonging to the clan of Joseph and that it was afterwards adopted as the chief sacred symbol of Jahve, held the field among critical scholars. It was promulgated by Wellhausen's *Prolegomena* (3rd edition, p. 47) and accepted by such scholars as B. Stade (*G.V.I.*, i. 458), W. Nowack (*Hebr. Arch.* ii. 6), T. K. Cheyne (*Enc. Bibl.*, i. 307), K. Marti (*Geschichte der Isr. Religion*, 68), Holzinger (*Exodus*, p. 123) and others. A new solution, however, was offered by Reichel (*Ueber die vorhebräischen Götterkulte*, Wien, 1897), and J. Meinhold (*Die Lade Jahves*), who supposed the ark to be a throne. M. Dibelius (*Die Lade Jahves*, Göttingen, 1906) shared this opinion and sup-

ἀληθεία ἀλλὰ εὐδοκῆσαντες τῇ ἀδικίᾳ. This meaning for ἀληθεία was at that time current among both Jews and pagans; two parallel developments took place here. Hundreds of Jews and Greeks at that time might have written the sentence of Clemens Rom. (xxxv. 5): ἀκολουθήσωμεν τῇ ὁδῷ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπορριψάντες ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν καὶ πονηρίαν. Clemens Alex. writes (*Quis dives*, 38): οὐκ ἐπιχαίρει τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, σύγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. For love and truth, comp. also 2 Thess. ii. 10, and Eph. iv. 15.