ARTICLE VI.

PAUL'S PANEGYRIC OF LOVE. — A NEW CRITICAL TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND DIGEST.

BY A. W. TYLER, A.M., NEW YORK.

NO. I.—INTRODUCTIONS AND TRANSLATION.

In May, 1870, the Convocation of Canterbury, by an unanimous vote in the Upper House, and by a large majority in the Lower, declared, "That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken." This was the first of a series of resolutions which were proposed by a committee of eight bishops, the late Dean Alford, Dean Stanley, and other dignitaries of the Church of England. That church is justly proud of having formed our present incomparable version, and nothing is more fitting than that with her should originate the steps looking toward bringing it into accordance with what is rightly demanded by the present state of biblical science. A new translation is neither proposed nor needed; but what is wanted is a revision of the present version, which shall be worthy of the scholarship and Christianity of to-day, and which shall therefore most fully avail itself of the latest researches among the rich stores of manuscript treasures which have been recovered during the present century, and which shall embody the results of the most mature and discerning criticism which can be brought to bear upon the manuscripts, versions, and Fathers, for the restoration of the ipseissima verba, as nearly as may be, of the sacred text.

The Convocation also appointed a committee of eight bishops and eight presbyters to take the requisite steps for carrying out the resolutions. The Committee of Revision, as finally constituted, consisted of some thirty-six members, divided into two companies—one for the revision of the New Testament, and the other for that of the Old. Authority
was given to the committee, by the Convocation, "to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong."

Especial interest was felt in this country, when it was found that, under the authority thus granted, the British committee had invited Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, of New York, to form an associate committee of competent American scholars, who should join in the execution of the great work proposed. The American committee is also divided into an Old Testament company of eleven members, and a New Testament company of fifteen. Eight denominations are represented in their ranks, and many of their number are of acknowledged ability and tried skill in biblical criticism or exegesis. They have now fully entered upon the prosecution of their work.

As no building which is not founded upon rock can withstand the tempest, so no translation can bear searching criticism unless the text it renders be grounded upon all attainable evidence which is of a character worthy of confidence. In the opinion of the writer, the sources from which the primitive text is to be sought are the oldest uncial manuscripts (with such secondary aid as the later uncial and the cursive manuscripts can render), the ancient versions, and the early ecclesiastical writers, whether Greeks, Latins, or Syrians. It must not be denied that many and serious difficulties beset the use of citations from the ecclesiastical writers; but these difficulties render it none the less imperative that we should sift the wheat from the chaff, and avail ourselves of whatever the Fathers, so called, have preserved for us. (This subject will be discussed more fully in the Introduction to the second part of this Article, which will appear in the April Number.)

It ought to be an axiom in the criticism of the text of the Greek Testament, as it is in that of the classics, that the nearer we can get to the age in which a work was written, the more likely are we to obtain a pure text, and the less probably shall we find it corrupted by accident, carelessness, or design. Holding this to be the case, the writer sets the
highest value upon the uncial manuscripts of the fourth and fifth centuries, which have been so largely given to the Christian world through the indefatigable and painstaking researches of the master critic, Tischendorf. (It must not be forgotten that it is to him we owe it that we have at last a trustworthy edition of the great Vatican manuscript; for had he not shamed the pope into permitting the publication of the fac-simile edition of 1868, we should still have had to be satisfied with the very imperfect and faulty editions of Cardinal Mai, supplemented by such corrections as Tischendorf, Alford, and others were enabled, from time to time, to obtain by stealth from the manuscript itself.) The manuscripts of the sixth century, whether of the Gospels or Epistles, are of scarcely less value than the earlier. Still, a slight deterioration begins to make its appearance. Below the sixth century, we notice a very decided change for the worse in the character of text presented in what we may style the secondary uncial. These were copied from exemplars which greatly varied in the excellence and purity of their text. Occasionally, indeed, they may preserve a reading in its purity which has suffered change even in its transmission to the oldest manuscripts now extant. But this was by no means always, or even ordinarily, the case. Besides the frailties which beset all copyists, those of the later uncial were prone to attempt to assimilate or "correct" the text of the exemplar which they were copying into an accordance with that with which they were familiar, in their church lectionaries, or service-books, or in their daily work. This assimilation was often unintentional, and was caused by the habits of thought of the scribe; as, for example, when he would look at a passage with which he was verbally familiar, and then heedlessly fail to notice its differences from the text which he had in his mind. (Any one who has collated texts of ancient writers, or even corrected proof-sheets "by copy," need scarcely be reminded how easy it is to fall into this error, or rather how great exertion it requires to keep out of it). The later scribe was
also more likely to incorporate marginal notes, or scholia, into his text, ignorantly supposing them to be omissions which should be inserted in their proper place. It would be pleasing to believe that most of the variations found in the manuscripts and versions arose from these causes, or from other inadvertence, especially could there be any ground whatever for thinking that the famous interpolation, \( \epsilon\nu \tau\phi\ ou\\varphi \ldots\ \epsilon\nu \tau\phi\ \gamma\varphi \), in 1 John v. 7, 8, had any such innocent origin for the Greek form found in the Textus Receptus. But the phenomena of the manuscripts force us to the conclusion that many changes were those of design; some of them caused by a desire to harmonize or assimilate parallel passages; others to enforce some doctrinal opinion which was at the time occupying a prominent place in the discussions of the councils, or in the controversies of the bishops and heretics; yet others to remove difficulties, real or supposed, in the text itself; (and this last will amply account for the corruption of καυχήσωμαι into καυθήσωμαι, in vs. 8 of our passage); and still others arose, where the copyist did not, or could not, comprehend the passage as written, and attempted to form a smooth, grammatical reading from his own conception of what ought to be read in the passage before him.

Even better than most of the secondary uncials are some cursiveS, which possess a text retaining in a great degree its pristine purity and excellence. Such are 1. 33. 69. of the Gospels (which are, unfortunately, designated by other numbers in the other divisions of the New Testament); notably 61 of the Acts; and 38 of the Apocalypse. In important passages, these cursiveS nearly always join the ranks of the earlier uncials, rather than those of the later.

In manuscript authorities we finally come to the mass of cursiveS, numbered by hundreds, and the lectionaries or service-books of the Greek-speaking churches. These are to be trusted only so far as they approve themselves worthy of confidence. As auxiliaries, rare instances will occur where their testimony may be valuable; for example, in 1 John v. 7, 8, where every Greek manuscript of any char-
acter fails to furnish any evidence whatever for the spurious addition. The conservative critics, if they may be so styled, in a case where the truest conservatism is radicalism, protest against this sweeping condemnation of the mass of MSS., and urge that we may yet find cursive manuscripts which were transcribed from exemplars older in text, if not in vellum, than our most venerable uncialss. It is a sufficient reply to this, that no cursive manuscript has yet been produced for which any such origin can be claimed.

Upon investigation, we find the cursives agreeing, to a remarkable degree, with the later Fathers,—notably with Oecumenius and Theophylact,—and the uncialss with the earlier Fathers and versions, where the text of the latter can be depended upon. This state of affairs is utterly irreconcilable with the claim of antiquity set up for the text of the Receptus and of the mass of cursive manuscripts.

The next source from which we must seek the primitive text is in the oldest versions. Not a few of these were executed long anterior to the oldest Greek codices now extant. As now existing in printed editions, the text of but few of the versions is in a condition to satisfy the reasonable demands of the critical student of the originals of the New Testament. We need thoroughly critical editions, of the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Aethiopic versions. Even in their present unscholarly and unworthy condition, the testimony of these versions is frequently of the greatest moment, and in many cases can be cited with some degree of confidence. The editions of the works of the Fathers, which are our last source of evidence, are in nearly as bad a condition as the text of the versions. But this will be spoken of elsewhere.

The final edition of the Greek Testament cannot be produced while so many of our sources of evidence are in the confused and chaotic condition in which they now exist. For the present, at least, we must be satisfied with provisional texts and provisional translations. But it is the high privilege of each generation, and every biblical scholar, to make a fair
contribution toward the recovery of the text of our Scriptures, in the state in which it was delivered to man.

The translation published herewith is in no sense a popular one, but aims to present in English the shades of thought in this matchless passage, more nearly than is possible in such a version, and to note the force of the original as closely as may be. In some cases the literal rendering of the Greek will hardly be as clear as is desirable, and, therefore, in such places, brief notes of explanation have been appended.

The uncial manuscripts containing the Pauline Epistles, and that to the Hebrews are:

a. The Codex Sinaiticus, Century IV, now in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. Most probably it was written about the middle of the fourth Century, by four scribes, one of whom (Tischendorf's D) revised the work when completed. His corrections are of the highest value, frequently exceeding that of the text itself. In our digest he is cited, as well as in Tischendorf and Tregelles, as W. A corrector of Century VII, is X, who touched the manuscript very frequently. We cite from Tischendorf's fac-simile edition of 1862.


b'. The Codex Vaticanus, Century IV, now in the Vatican Library at Rome. B a corrector contemporary with the original scribe. B' a corrector of Century X or XI, who retouched the whole manuscript, where the original writing was fading out, and made many corrections. Cited from the Roman fac-simile edition of 1868.

c. The Codex Ephraemi, Century V, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale (sometime Impériale and Royale), at Paris. C a valuable palimpsest, having many sad hiatuses, one of which occurs at verse 8 of our passage. C' a corrector of Century VI; and C' one of Century IX. Cited from Tischendorf's edition of 1843.

d. The Codex Claromontanus, Century VI, now in the same library with Codex C. A highly important Graeco-Latin manuscript, having the Greek and Latin in parallel columns. It is blemished with a vast number of corrections, the work of many hands, only two of which we need notice here: D of Century VII, and D' of Century IX or X. Cited from Tischendorf's edition of 1852.

e. The Codex
San-Germanensis, Century IX or X. A Graeco-Latin manuscript copied from D, after it had received many of its corrections, and abounding in absurd readings resulting from the attempt to blend text and corrections. Cited from Tischendorf's digest. F. The Codex Augiensis, Century VIII, now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, England. Despite the inaccuracy of its spelling its readings are ancient and most valuable. (G is almost identical with it in this particular.) Cited from Scrivener's edition of 1859. G. The Codex Boernerianus, Century IX, now in the Royal Library at Dresden. This manuscript and F are copies of the same exemplar, though perhaps not directly, and their united testimony to its readings is of importance. They rarely differ from each other sufficiently to make a new reading. In G the Latin is written over the Greek, while in F it is in a column parallel with it. G is cited from Matthaei's edition of 1791. H. Fragmenta Coisliniana, Century VI, now in the same library with C. They do not contain our passage. I. Fragmenta Palimpsesta Tischendorfiana, Centuries V to VII, now at St. Petersburg. They do not contain our passage. K. Codex Mosquensis, Century IX, now in the Library of the Holy Synod, at Moscow. Matthaei's collation does not contain all the information desired by editors of to-day, and so it must be cited as agreeing with the Receptus where he is silent. In such cases it is marked K*. Cited from the digests of Tischendorf and Tregelles. L. The Codex Angelicus Romanus, or Pasieonei, Century IX, now in the Angelican Library at Rome. Cited from Tischendorf and Tregelles. M. The Codex Uffenbachianus, Century X. Fragments in the British Museum and at Hamburg. They do not contain our passage. P. The Codex Porfirianus, Century VIII or IX. This highly important palimpsest now belongs to Bishop Porfiri, at Moscow. Cited from vol. v. of Tischendorf's Monumenta Sacra Inedita, nova collectio, 1865.

Certain cursive manuscripts, having texts of especial excellence, are: 17. The Codex Colbertinus, Century XI. It is in the same Library with Codex C, and is known as "the Queen of the Cursives." (Cited as 33. in the Gospels; and as 13. in the Acts and Catholic Epistles). 37. The Codex Leicestrensis, Century XIV. Now in the Town Library at Leicester, England. (Cited as 69. in the Gospels; and 31. in the Acts and Catholic Epistles). 47. A ms. designated Roe 2, in the Bodleian Library, at Oxford. The readings of these three Cursives are cited from Tregelles's digest, be
having collated them very thoroughly. 2d. An Apostolus, or Lec-
tionary, in Cabinet K. 1, at the Harvard University Library, Cam-
bridge, Mass. "Perhaps of the X11th Century. Procured at Con-
stantinople, in 1819, by the Hon. Edward Everett, then Eliot
Professor of Greek Literature, through Mr. Cartwright, the British
Consul-General." This beautiful ms. has two columns to the page,
and averages twenty-three lines to the column, though it sometimes
has a line less or one more. It was kindly collated for this Article,
by Mr. E. A. Guy. The other cursives which are cited, are de-
scribed in the prolegomena to Tischendorf's Seventh edition, and
in Scrivener's Plain Introduction; those collated by the latter
gentleman are described at length in the introduction to his edition
of the Codex Angenensis.

The ancient Versions are cited as follows: Vulg. The Vulgate,
as formed by Jerome at the close of the IVth Century, which is
generally cited in this Article from the Codex Amiatinus, at Flo-
rence, written about A.D. 541, as published by Tischendorf in 1850.
The other codices cited are: Demid. Demidovianus, X11th Century;
Fuld. Fuldensis, VIth Century; Flor. Floriscensis; Harl. Harle-
ianus; Lux. Luxoviensis; Tolet. Toletanus, at Toledo, VIIIth
Century; f. The Latin column of F. These MSS., except Am. and
f, are cited from the digest of Tischendorf and Tregelles. Am.
includes Demid., Fuld., Harl., and Tolet., as well as the Clementine
edition (Vulg.-Clem.) unless they are expressly cited. The Old
Latin is cited from: d. The Latin column of D; e. that of E; g.
the interlinear translation of G; m. Readings found in the Specu-
um ascribed to Augustine, and published by Mai, in vol. i. of his
Nova Bibliotheca Patrum. The figures attached to m denote the
page of the Speculum. The other Versions are: Ps. The Peshito
Syriac, supposed to have been made in the II1d Century. Its MSS.,
ever, are of much later date, and its text is in a very un-
satisfactory condition. Hel. The Harclean Syriac, made in the Vth
Century, and revised, A.D. 616, by Thomas of Harkel. Memph.
The Memphitic, or Coptic, probably of the II1d Century. Theb.
The Thebaic, or Sahidic, an older and ruder version than the Memphitic.
Bash. The Bashmuric fragments of a third Egyptian
version. From the Rudimenta Linguae Coptae sive Aegyptiacae,
published at Rome, 1778, by the college of the Propaganda, im-
portant readings of Memph. and Theb., which have appeared in no
Greek Testament, are cited under the designation of Memph.-Rom.

In the list of Fathers below, the abbreviation given is that usually employed in the digest, and from which the others will be readily understood. The Fathers are cited as nearly chronologically as is practicable, in the order of the list. The first time, in each verse, that a Father is cited, full reference is made to treatise, book, chapter, section, volume, and page, so that the citation may be readily found in any edition of his works. Afterwards, in that verse, a new reference, to a citation already given, is made only by volume and page. However, as the works of Origen and Chrysostom are so frequently cited, and the standard editions are so easily accessible, (Migne's reprints also giving the paging of the originals,) they are referred to only by volume and page. Wherever errors of Tischendorf and Tregelles have been corrected, it is done in no carping spirit (for in the midst of so many minutiae, absolute accuracy is well nigh unattainable), but that the actual facts may be known for future use. In every such case reference is made to the very editions used by those accomplished critics. The dates are generally taken from Darling's Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, London, 1854, and are those of the birth and death of each writer, unless something else be stated.
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858-886. From Migne, vols. ci.-civ. **Oecumen.** Oecumenius of Trica, fl. latter part of the tenth century. From the Paris edition of 1631. *Theophyl.* Theophylact of Bulgaria, fl. 1077. From De' Rossi and Finetti, Venice, 1754-63. During the years 1838 to 1844, J. A. Cramer, of Oxford, England, published a series of *Catenae* upon the whole Greek Testament. They are cited by volume and page; e.g. Severian Cat. Cor. 248, Orig. Cat. in 1 Joan. 115, etc.


The critical Greek Testaments referred to are the following: **Tisch.** The Eighth edition of Tischendorf, Leipzig, 1871. **Ti.** His Seventh edition, 1859. **Tif.** His Second, 1849. **Ti.** and **Tif.** concur with **Tisch.** except when the contrary is stated. **Tr.** Tregelles's 1869. **Alf.** Alford's Sixth edition 1871. **Alf.** His Second edition, 1855. Cited to show how his valuation of MSS. evidence changed with the advancement of his studies. **Ln.** Lachmann's *editio major*, 1842. **Wd.** Wordsworth's Sixth edition, 1868. **Eras†.** Erasmus's First edition, 1516. **Eras‡.** His Second, 1519. **Eras§.** His Third, 1522. **Eras.** includes the three, except the contrary be
stated. 5. Stephens's edition of 1550. (The so-called Textus Receptus of America and England.) 5$. The Elzevir edition of 1624. (The Textus Receptus of the Continent.) 5$. The Complutensian, dated 1514, but not issued till 1522. Mill is sometimes cited as 5™. The sign $ includes these four editions except the contrary be stated. The following abbreviations require explanation: An asterisk, (*), after the notation of a codex signifies that the original reading, thus noted, has suffered correction by a later hand. Throughout this Article, the abbreviation MSS. refers to uncial manuscripts, and mss. to those written in cursive letters. Int. with the name of Father refers to the Latin interpretation of his works where the Greek is not extant. Ps. or Pseud. denotes the spurious writings attributed to the Father to whose name it is attached. Migne's reprints are noted by M., and the page in parentheses. In the text an asterisk (‡) refers to the digest, where a reading of equal value with that adopted will be found. A reading slightly inferior, but strongly supported, is noted by a dagger (†) in the digest, but not in the text. Readings adopted which differ from those in the Textus Receptus, are spaced; e.g. μείζονα.

1 CORINTHIANS XII. 27—XIII. 13.

27 'Τιμεία δὲ ἐστε ἀδώμα χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους.

28 Καὶ οὖσα μὲν θεοῦ ὁ θεός ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους, ἐπείτα δυνάμεις, ἐπετα χαράσματα ἱαμάτων, ἀντιλήψεις,

29 κυβερνήσει, γένε πνεύματος. μὴ πάντες ἀπόστολοι; μὴ πάντες προφήται; μὴ πάντες διδάσκαλοι; μὴ πάντες δύναμεις; μὴ πάντες χαράσματα ἱαμάτων; μὴ πάντες πνεύματα ἱαμάτων; μὴ πάντες πνεύματα διερμηνεύοντων;

30 Ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ χαράσματα τὰ μείζονα. καὶ ἔτι καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὁ διάδοτος ὡς καθιστᾷ ὑμᾶς δικαιομένους.

1 ὑπερβολὴν ὀδὸν ύμῶν δικεννυμι. ἐὰν ταῖς ἐλάφοις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἄγγελων, ἀγάπης δὲ μὴ ἔχω, γέγονα.

2 χαλκὸς ἡχῶν ἢ κύμβαλλον ἀλαλάζον. καὶ ἐὰν ἔχω προφητελαί καὶ εἰδώ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πάσαν τὴν γνώσιν, *καὶ ἐὰν ἔχω πάσαν τὴν πίστιν, δοστε ἐρημ. μεθιστάναι,

3 ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, οὐδὲν εἰμι. *καὶ ἐὰν ψωμισόω πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου, *καὶ ἐὰν παραδώ τὸ σῶμά μου ἵνα *καὶ χήρα

4 σῷ μαί, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, *οὐ θέλειν ὄφελούμαι. ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστεύεται. ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ ἐν ἡλικίᾳ. ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ
5 PERPÆREÆTÆ, OÙ FVΣOYOÚTÆ, OÙ ÓΣCΗΜΟΝΕI, OÙ ΖΗΤΕI TÀ
6 ΔΑΝΤΗΣ, OÙ ΠΑΡΟΣΙΝΤÆTÆ, OÙ ΛΟΥΙζΕTÆ TÒ KAKÒN, OÙ ΧΑIΡΕI
7 ἔΠÌ TÒ ἈΘΛΕΙA, ΣΥΝΧΑΙΡΕI ΔÈ TÒ ἈΛΘΕIÀ. ΠΑΝΤΑ ΣΤΕΓΕI,
ΠΑΝΤΑ ΠΙΣΤΕI, ΠΑΝΤΑ ΔΗΛΩΣΕI, ΠΑΝΤΑ ΥΠΟΜΕI.
8 *Η ΑΓΑΝI ΟΥΔΕΠΟΤΕ ΠÎΤΕI: EÎTE ΔÈ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕI, ΚΑ-
ΤΑΡΓΗΘΣΟΥΝΑI: EÎTE ΦΛΩΣΑI, ΠΑÚΣΟΝΤΑI: EÎTE *ΓΗΝΩΣΕI,
9 ΚΑΤΑΡΓΗΘΣΟΥΝΑI. ΕΚ ΜΕΡΟΥΣ ΓΑΡ ΓΗΝΩΣΟΚΟΜΕΝ ΚΑΛ ÈK
10 ΜΕΡΟΤΟ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕIΟΜΕΝ: ΔΤΑΝ ΔÈ ΕΛΘΗΤÒ ΤÒ ΤΕΛΕΙΟΝ ΤÒ ÈK ΜÈ-
11 ΡΟΥΣ ΚΑΤΑΡΓΗΘΣΟΥΝΑI. ΟTÈ HΜΗΝ ΝΗΣΙΟΣ, ΕΛÀΛΟΥΝ ΌΣ
ΝΗΣΙΟΣ, ΕΦΡΓΝΟΤΤΟΝ ΌS ΝΗΣΙΟΣ, ΕΛΟΓΙΣΜΗΗΝ ΌS
ΝΗΣΙΟΣ: ΟTÈ ΓΕΓΩΝΑ ΆΝΗΡ ΚΑΤΗΡΓΗΜΑ ΤÀ ΤÒΥ ΝΗΣΙΩΝ. 
12 ΒΛΕΠΟΜΕΝ ΓΑΡ άΡΤΙ ΔI ΕΣΩΠΤΡÒΝ ΕN ΑΙΝΙΓΜΑΤΙ, ΤÒΤÈ ΔÈ ΠΡÓ-
13 ΣΟΤΟΝ ΠΡÒ ΠΡΟΣΟΝΤÒΝ. ΆΡΤΙ ΓΗΝΩΣΕΚ ÈK ΜΕΡΟΥΣ, ΤÒΤÈ ΔÈ
ΕΠΙΓΝΩΣΟΜΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΕΓΝΩΣΘΗΝ. ΒΝΩI ΔÈ ΜΕΝΕΙ ΠΙΣΤΙΣ
ΕΛΠΙΔ ΑΓΑΝI, ΤÀ ΤΡΙΑ ΤΑIΤΑ: ΜΕΛΖΩΝ ΔÈ ΤΟΤΟΥΝ Η ΑΓΑΝI.
ΔΙΣΚΕΤΕ ΤΗΝ ΑΓΑΝI.

A LITERAL TRANSLATION.

27 Now are ye the body of Christ, and members individually.
28 And God placed some in the church, first apostles, secondly
prophets, thirdly teachers, then powers, then gifts of healing,
29 assistants, governings, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles?
Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all
powers? Have all gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues?
Do all interpret?

31 But earnestly desire the greater gifts; and moreover I am
1 showing you a supereminently excellent way to them. If I speak
with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love,
2 I have become as sounding brass or a clanging cymbal. And
even though I have the gift of prophecy, and comprehend all
the mysteries and all knowledge, and even though I have all
faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing.
3 And even though I dole out all my goods to feed the poor,
and even though I deliver over my body that I may glory, but have
not love, I am in no wise advantaged. Love suffereth long, is
kind; Love envieth not; Love vaunteth not; Love vaunteth not herself, is not self-
inflated, doth not behave herself unbecomingly, seeketh not her
own, is not easily provoked, reckoneth not the evil, rejoiceth not
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7 at iniquity, but rejoiceth together with the Truth; beareth all things, trusteth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.
8 Love never faileth; but whether there be gifts of prophecy, they will be brought to naught; whether there be tongues, they will be silenced; whether there be knowledges, they will be brought to naught. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part;
9 but when the perfect is come that which is in part will be brought to naught. While I was a child I spake as a child, I thought as a child, I reasoned as a child; since I have become a man I have laid aside the things of the child. For now we are seeing in a mirror obscurely, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then will I fully know even as here I was fully known.
10 And now there is abiding Faith, Hope, Love, these three, but the greater of these is Love: pursue after Love.

NOTES.
Verse 27. ἐκ μορφῶν may here mean "in part" (as in verses 9, 10 of Chapter xiii.), referring to the Corinthian church. So Bengel, Gnomon, ed. Edinburg, 1859, vol. iii. p. 299.
Verse 28. δυνάμεις "powers," (Latin, virtutes), i.e. possessors of powers to perform "mighty works." See Trench, Synonyms, seventh edition, London, 1871, pp. 320–325. For usage of the word compare Acts x. 38; 1 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 9; and as referring to the "mighty works" wrought, Matt. vii. 22; Mark vi. 2, 5; Luke x. 18; Acts ii. 22; viii. 13; xix. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 10; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Gal. iii. 5; Heb. ii. 4, and elsewhere repeatedly throughout, the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. ἀντιλημψῶν "assistants," the deacons and deaconesses of the early church.
Verse 1. ἀγάπη. It need hardly be said that the rendering "charity" is, in the words of Hodge, "peculiarly unhappy." Compare his admirable note upon this word, Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, N. Y., 1857, p. 265. ἐρώσω would be better "resounding," but the "sounding brass" of the Authorized Version, is now proverbial. ἀλαλάζων is not "tinkling" but, as a cymbal is struck with a sharp clang, the onomatopoeia "clanging" alone appears to represent the original.
Verse 3. ἤφωμίζω signifies to break into morsels and distribute. "Dole out" seems to represent the action pretty nearly. Some phrase must be supplied to complete the sense, as above. The Latin supplies, in cibos pauperum. After "body" must be supplied "to
death," or something similar. Is not this a strong point in favor of καυχάσωμαι? Copyists seeing that with this word the sense was incomplete, would readily light upon καυτήσωμαι, which would at once remove the difficulty, and at the same time make a smooth reading. καυχάσωμαι is supported by MAB. 17., and the two Egyptian versions, Memph. and Theb. Rom. (sic) made in the third century. See digest for a full statement of the evidence. The change, whichever way made, was a very early one.

Ver. 5. οὕκ ἄρχημουν, perhaps "doth not thrust herself forward," i.e. scheme, which has its root in the four letters σχήμ. οὐ ζητεῖ τὸ μὴ λανθάνει. If this very probable reading be preferred, render: "seeketh not that which is not her own." λογίζεται, "reckoneth not the evil," i.e. doth not remember evils suffered, in order to avenge them.

Ver. 6. "Truth " must be personified, or the force of the preposition in συγχαίρει is lost. So Meyer and Alford.

Ver. 8. γνώσωμ. The word "knowledges" was formerly in good usage, and, as Sir Wm. Hamilton says, "ought not to be discarded." It renders exactly the γνώσωμα of the text, and the scientias of Tertullian.

Ver. 9. τὸ τέλεον, "the perfect," or, if preferred, as A.V., "that which is perfect."

Ver. 11. ὥστε γέγονα ἀνὴρ. It should be remembered that the "since" by which ὥστε is rendered, is temporal and not causal. It is unfortunate that our word "since" can translate such entirely different conjunctions as ὥστε and ὥστι. We must mentally distinguish its use, even if it be not apparent to the ear.

Ver. 12. καὶ θόσπρον ἐν αἰνίγματι. The metallic mirrors of the ancients gave very obscure images, quite unlike those of our own glasses.

Ver. 13. μεῖζων, "greater" not "greatest." De Wette beautifully remarks, "The greater, because it contains in itself the root of the other two: we believe only one whom we love, we hope only that which we love." "Pursue after Love." See digest for reason for joining these words to this passage.

[To be continued.]